

Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers

<http://www.icann.org/topics/policy/>

Volume 09, Issue 05 – May 2009

1. [YOUR INPUT NEEDED NOW ON POLICY-RELATED ISSUES](#)
2. [COMPOSITION OF IDN CCPDP WORKING GROUP ANNOUNCED](#)
3. [CCNSO DNSSEC SURVEY TO BE RELAUNCHED](#)
4. [GNSO IMPROVEMENTS IMPLEMENTATION EFFORTS CONTINUE TO ADVANCE](#)
5. [GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS REVIEW CHARTER READY FOR BOARD APPROVAL](#)
6. [RIRS DISCUSS GLOBAL POLICY PROPOSAL FOR RECOVERED IPv4 ADDRESS SPACE](#)
7. [SSAC PROJECTS PROGRESS ACROSS A RANGE OF ISSUES](#)
8. [GNSO COUNCIL REQUESTS RESEARCH ON WHOIS REQUIREMENTS](#)
9. [REGISTRATION ABUSE POLICIES GET CLOSER LOOK](#)
10. [GNSO CONSIDERS EXPIRED DOMAIN NAME RECOVERY CHANGES](#)
11. [MAKING IT EASIER TO TRANSFER DOMAINS BETWEEN REGISTRARS](#)
12. [HOW DO WE DEAL WITH FAST FLUXING CYBERCRIMINALS?](#)
13. [AT-LARGE COMMUNITY POLICY ADVICE DEVELOPMENT SCHEDULE ONLINE](#)
14. [AT-LARGE PROVIDES POLICY ADVICE IN FOUR KEY AREAS](#)
15. [AT-LARGE COMMUNITY SUMMIT FOLLOW-UP PROCESS CONTINUES](#)
16. [ON THE MOVE](#)

The [ICANN Policy Update](#) contains brief summaries of issues being addressed by the ICANN community's bottom-up policy development structure, as well as information on related policy development activities. ICANN's Policy Staff publishes these monthly updates to maximize transparency and encourage broad community participation in ICANN's policy development activities.

Links to additional information are included and readers are encouraged to go beyond these brief summaries to learn more about the ICANN community's work. As always, the Policy Staff welcomes comments and suggestions on how to improve its policy communications efforts. Please send these comments to policy-staff@icann.org.

ICANN Policy Update Available in Russian, Chinese, Arabic, French, Spanish, English

The *ICANN Policy Update* is available in all six official languages of the United Nations: English (EN), Spanish (ES), French (FR), Arabic (AR), Chinese (Simplified -- siZH), and Russian (RU). The *Policy Update* is posted on ICANN's website and available via online subscription. If you would like us to send these updates directly to your inbox each month, simply go to the ICANN [subscriptions page](#), enter your e-mail address, and select "*Policy Update*" to subscribe. This service is free of charge to subscribers. More information is available at:

- ICANN Policy Updates: <http://www.icann.org/en/topics/policy/>
- Subscribe to Policy Updates: <http://www.icann.org/en/newsletter/>
- ICANN Policy Area: <http://www.icann.org/en/policy/>

What's on the Calendar for today?

Keep up-to-date on what's happening in ICANN policy development by visiting the online calendars of ICANN's policy development and advisory bodies. Three of the most active calendars include:

- At-Large Calendar at <http://www.atlarge.icann.org/>
- Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO) Master Calendar, including links to agendas and MP3 recordings of meetings at <http://ccnso.icann.org/calendar/>
- Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Master Calendar, including links to agendas and MP3 recordings of meetings, at <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/index.html>

1. YOUR INPUT NEEDED NOW ON POLICY-RELATED ISSUES

Numerous public comment periods are open on issues of interest to the ICANN community (check [here](#) for a complete list). Act now for the opportunity to share your views on such items as:

- Formation of Stakeholders Groups and new Constituencies are important parts of the effort to make the GNSO more inclusive and representative. Comments are being sought on 1) a proposed [IDNgTLD Constituency Petition and Charter](#), and 2) a revised [gTLD Registries Stakeholder Petition](#). Comment periods close 20 May and 10 June 2009, respectively.
- Possible solutions to the trademark issues raised in the Applicant Guidebook for the introduction on new gTLDs has been issued for public comment by the “Implementation Recommendation Team (IRT). [Comment period closes 24 May 2009](#). (Note an incorrect deadline of 20 May was posted elsewhere on ICANN website; comments will be considered and the IRT will issue a final report for community consideration shortly).
- RegistryPro seeks to amend its registry agreement to allow allocation of single, two and select three-character second-level domain names. [Comment period closes 05 June 2009](#).
- Consider proposed revisions to improve the effectiveness of the ICANN Conflict of Interest policy. [Comment period closes 05 June 2009](#).
- Help protect domain name registrants and the overall security and stability of the DNS by commenting on a proposed procedure for registrar disqualification. [Comment period closes 28 May 2009](#).
- The community is encouraged to comment on the Draft FY10 Operating Plan and Budget, especially on plan elements that might be streamlined, reduced, or deferred. [Comment period closes 17 June 2009](#).

2. COMPOSITION OF IDN CCPDP WORKING GROUP ANNOUNCED

At a Glance

IDN ccTLDs have the potential to make the Internet far more accessible to those language speakers in the community who do not use Latin-based character sets or readily recognize US-ASCII characters in domain name strings. At the same time, however, introduction of new character sets must assure Internet security and stability. The ccNSO Council is establishing working groups to delve into various aspects of IDN ccTLD introductions, and recently confirmed the composition of the first, broad-based working group.

Recent Developments

Many individuals volunteered to serve on the Country Code Name Supporting Organisation's (ccNSO's) new "Working Group 1," which is charged with identifying and reporting on a feasible policy for the selection and delegation of IDN ccTLDs. During its telephone conference on 12 May 2009, the ccNSO Council confirmed the [working group participants](#), which include members from the ccNSO, GNSO, and the At-Large community. GAC participation remains to be defined.

Next Steps

Follow on work involves defining GAC representatives, set-up of a mailing list, the election of vice-chairs, and beginning work on a Topic Paper.

Background

The IDN ccPDP Issues Report, 9 April 2009, calls for the formation of two working groups in order to proceed with the work of establishing IDN ccTLDs (associated with the territories listed in the ISO 3166-1).

In addition to Working Group 1 described above, Working Group 2 will deal with the changes to Article IX and relevant Annexes in the ICANN Bylaws and will be formed in October 2009. The ccNSO called for volunteers for membership in Working Group 1, inviting both members and non-members of the ccNSO. The group will have 10 members in total, plus the ccNSO Chair. Two ccTLD managers or their nominees from each of the five ICANN Geographic Regions were invited to form the group. Two representatives each from the GAC, GNSO and ALAC were also invited to join.

Click [here](#) for more details.

More information

- ccNSO Council IDN ccPDP Resolution:
<http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/resolutions-initiation-idn-ccpdp-07apr09.pdf>

- Final Issues Report on IDN ccPDP:
<http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/final-issues-report-idn-ccpdp-02apr09.pdf>
- ccNSO Council Telephone Conference 7 April 2009 Minutes:
<http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/minutes-council-07apr09.pdf>
- Timetable for the IDN PDP Process:
<http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/idn-pdp-process-time-table-02dec08.htm>

Staff Contact

[Bart Boswinkel](#), Senior Policy Advisor, [Gabriella Schitteck](#), ccNSO Secretariat

3. CCNSO DNSSEC SURVEY TO BE RELAUNCHED

At a Glance

DNSSEC could make a major difference to the security and stability of the Internet. Unclear, however, is the extent to which the community understands let alone embraces this concept. To get at the answers to this question, the ccNSO Council decided to re-launch the ccNSO DNSSEC Survey. The survey was first conducted in September and October 2007.

Recent Developments

The Swedish Registry [IIS.SE](#) and the European Network and Information Security Agency ([ENISA](#)) jointly requested that the DNSSEC survey be repeated. During its teleconference on 12 May 2009, the ccNSO Council agreed. Results will be compared to those of the 2007 survey.

Next Steps

The ccNSO Secretariat is preparing to launch the survey by the end of May 2009.

More Information

- DNSSEC 2007 Survey Results: <http://ccnso.icann.org/surveys/dnssec-survey-report-2007.pdf>

- DNSSEC 2007 Survey Questions: <http://ccnso.icann.org/surveys/ccnso-survey-on-dnssec.pdf>

Staff Contact:

[Gabriella Schitteck](#), ccNSO Secretariat

4. GNSO IMPROVEMENTS IMPLEMENTATION EFFORTS CONTINUE TO ADVANCE

At a Glance

The Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) community is working to implement a comprehensive series of organizational and structural changes designed to improve the efficiency, effectiveness and accessibility of the organization. Interested community members are encouraged to offer their expertise and brainpower by [volunteering to participate in the effort](#) and by joining any one of a number of focused work teams making implementation recommendations.

Recent Developments

Progress continues in overall implementation, coordination and planning for transition to a newly structured GNSO Council. To become familiar with the GNSO's new structure and organization, please see the discussion and diagrams on the [GNSO Improvements webpage](#).

New Stakeholder Groups -- The Public Comment Forum for the four new GNSO Stakeholder Groups' Proposed Charters submitted to the Board closed in April and a Summary/Analysis of the comments has been [published](#). Its proponents subsequently revised the Registry Stakeholder Group Petition and Charter document and a [public comment forum](#) has been created to allow for community comments on the revised proposal.

New Constituencies – To date, Staff has received four Notice of Intent to Form a New GNSO Constituency (NOIF) document – CyberSafety, City TLDs, Consumers and IDN gTLD interests. The Public Forum Comment period for the proposed [CyberSafety Constituency](#) closed on 5 April with over 300 comments submitted. Staff is collating and summarizing the comments. The Public Forum Comment periods for the [Consumer](#) and [IDN gTLD](#) Constituencies were scheduled to close on 14 May and 20 May respectively.

Council and Work Team Implementation Efforts -- The five GNSO Improvements work teams are all continuing their efforts to craft implementation recommendations for community review to improve a variety of GNSO processes, structures and operations. Specific areas identified for improvement are GNSO operations, Constituency and Stakeholder Operations, Communications, the Policy Development Process (PDP), and Adoption of a Working Groups model.

The GNSO Operations Work Team is: considering a proposal for high-level principles to establish the role of the Council as a "strategic manager of the policy process"; and developing a draft "Statement of Interest"/"Declaration of Interest" policy.

The Constituency & Stakeholder Group Operations Work Team is developing a Work Plan and timelines to determine recommendations for best practices in the following areas: a framework for participation in any ICANN constituency that is objective, standardized, and clearly stated; operating principles that are representative, open, transparent, and democratic; creating and maintaining a database of all constituency members and others not formally a part of any constituency that is up-to-date and publicly accessible; and a "tool kit" of basic administrative, operational and technical services available to all constituencies.

The Communications Work Team is developing: high-level business requirements to improve the GNSO website and to improve document management; recommendations to improve the GNSO's ability to solicit meaningful feedback and, as a first task, is considering the current ICANN translation process for documents associated with policy development; and recommendations to improve GNSO's coordination with other ICANN structures.

The Working Group Model Work Team has identified and is in the process of developing two new guidebooks that are being targeted to separate audiences as follows: "Working Group Implementation and Charter Drafting Guidelines" is intended for sponsoring organizations such as the GNSO Council and will contain a comprehensive set of elements to be considered in creating, purposing, funding, staffing, and instructing/guiding a WG to accomplish the desired outcome; and "Working Group Operating Model Guidebook" is intended for leaders/members of working groups and will provide guidance on such elements as structuring, norming, tasking, reporting, and delivering the outcome(s) as chartered.

The PDP Work Team is developing a new policy development process (PDP) (including a report of proposed new bylaws, rules and procedures) that is better aligned with the contractual requirements of ICANN's consensus policies, expands early issue scoping and fact-finding prior to launch of a PDP, is more flexible and effective, and includes a post PDP assessment process to measure the effectiveness of policy recommendations. The team is meeting weekly and currently is discussing the pre-PDP planning and initiation phase, which includes

initial issue scoping and fact-finding steps. In recent weeks, the team has explored the parties who should be able to “raise an issue” and the types of recommendations and policy outcomes that might result from a PDP.

A [special drafting team of the GNSO Council](#) is also continuing its discussion on transition issues and has engaged in a spirited discussion with Staff on potential Bylaw changes that will be necessary to complete the transition to a new GNSO Council structure later this year. That work is ongoing.

Next Steps

While the ICANN Board still officially expects a new Council to be seated at the June 2009 ICANN Meeting in Sydney, that timeframe continues to face significant community bandwidth pressures and the subject is likely to be discussed at the May Board meeting. Resolution of the comprehensive effort will likely require a longer timetable to produce a more effective and efficient GNSO framework. Members of the potential new Commercial Stakeholders Group have asked the Board to delay implementation of the new Council structure.

In the meantime, the various work teams and steering committees will continue to work on developing recommendations on the broader improvements issues in the hope of realizing the new GNSO as soon as practically possible.

Background

Through a series of decisions at its February, June, August and October 2008 meetings, the ICANN Board has endorsed a series of goals, objectives and recommendations for improving several aspects of the GNSO’s structure and operations. These decisions are a culmination of a two-year effort of independent review, community input and Board deliberations.

[Click here](#) for more details.

More Information

- GNSO Improvements Information Web Page:
<http://gns0.icann.org/en/improvements/>
- Announcements -- GNSO IMPROVEMENTS IMPLEMENTATION – How You Can Become Involved:
<http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-08jan09-en.htm> --
Help Build the New GNSO:
<http://icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-09jan09-en.htm>

Staff Contact

[Robert Hoggarth, Senior Policy Director](#)

5. GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS REVIEW CHARTER READY FOR BOARD APPROVAL

At a Glance

The proposed charter of the community-wide working group tasked with the review of ICANN's system of geographic regions has received favorable community reaction and is now ready for approval by the ICANN Board.

Recent Developments

The Geographic Regions Working Group produced a [proposed charter document](#) that was posted for community review and comments through 24 March 2009. The comments submitted in that forum were generally positive and have been [summarized by the Policy Staff](#), and the charter is now ready for approval by the Board. Meanwhile, members of the working group continue to gather information on the application of geographic regions throughout various ICANN structures and operational processes.

Next Steps

The proposed charter awaits Board approval and is likely to be considered at the May Board meeting. The working group will otherwise be working toward publication of its Initial Report in early June.

Background

[Click here](#) for more details.

More Information

- ccNSO Working Group Report and Recommendations:
<http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/ccnso-final-report-regions-wg-240907.pdf>
- ICANN Board Resolutions: November 2007
<http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-02nov07.htm>; November 2008
<http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-07nov08.htm>
- Proposed WG Charter: <http://www.icann.org/en/topics/geographic-regions/wg-draft-charter-18feb09-en.pdf>
- Summary and Analysis of Community Comments on Proposed WG Charter:
<http://forum.icann.org/lists/geo-charter/msg00002.html>

Staff Contact:

6. RIRS DISCUSSING GLOBAL POLICY PROPOSAL FOR RECOVERED IPv4 ADDRESS SPACE

At a Glance

Regional Internet Registries are currently discussing a proposed global policy for handling IPv4 address space returned from the RIRs to IANA. IANA has proposed to allocate such space to the RIRs in smaller blocks than currently, once the free IANA IPv4 address space has been depleted.

Recent Developments

The proposal is in the early discussion stages in all RIRs, except in APNIC, where it has already entered final call.

Next Steps

Discussions at the upcoming RIR meetings will indicate if the proposal has support as currently drafted or requires any modifications. If adopted by all RIRs, the proposal will be reviewed by the Number Resource Organization Executive Committee and the Address Supporting Organization Address Council (ASO AC) and then forwarded to the ICANN Board for ratification and implementation by IANA.

Background

IPv4 is the Internet Protocol addressing system used to allocate unique IP address numbers in 32-bit format. With the massive growth of the Internet user population, the pool of such unique numbers (approximately 4.3 billion) is being depleted and a 128-bit numbering system (IPv6) will need to take its place.

The proposed global policy has two distinct phases; 1) IANA only receives returned IPv4 address space from the RIRs and 2) IANA continues to receive returned IPv4 address space and also reallocates such space to the RIRs. This proposal is connected to a recently adopted global policy for allocating the remaining IPv4 address space. When that global policy takes effect, it also triggers phase two in the proposal.

Click [here](#) for more details.

Next Steps

A Background Report on recovered IPv4 addresses is soon to be announced on the ICANN web site.

More Information

- Background Report IPv4, updated 2 December 2008
<http://www.icann.org/announcements/proposal-ipv4-report-29nov07.htm>
- Final Call for Comments and updated Background Report, 5 February 2009
<http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-2-05feb09-en.htm>

Staff Contact

[Olof Nordling, Director Services Relations](#)

7. SSAC INITIATIVES DELVE INTO MANY PROTECTIVE MEASURES

At a Glance

SSAC has numerous initiatives underway or recently completed, all intended to assure the security and stability of the Internet.

Recent Developments

SSAC projects of note include:

- A recently completed study on the use of characters from local languages in domain registration records. The document has been forwarded to the ICANN Board, SOs and ACs for consideration;
- Continuation of a study of protection measures for domain registrations;
- A DNSSEC status report for consideration by the DNSSEC deployment working group. The report is nearing completion;
- Development, in collaboration with RSSAC, of a framework for an impact analysis on the root zone (one of the four overarching issues related to new GTLDs);
- A review of three recent attacks against registrants, registrars, and registries. The committee is in the fact finding stage and will consider its

findings in the context of its report on protective measures for domain registrations.

In addition, SSAC members are participating in GNSO security-related activities (Dave Piscitello in the Fast Flux WG, Jeremy Hitchcock in the Pre-PDP registration abuse a.k.a. "RAP" WG). The committee is also studying the independent SSAC review and considering the recommendations therein.

Next Steps

In the near future, SSAC will complete SAC040, Protective Measures for High Value Domains and prepare a DNSSEC status report for DNSSEC community review and publication.

Background


Malicious use of domain names has become a mainstay for criminals, "[hacktivists](#)," and notoriety seekers. Much of SSAC's attention is by necessity directed at these events. At the same time, the Internet community is preparing for dramatic changes over the next several years, including the introduction of DNSSEC, IPv6, IDN, and new GTLDs. Each of these changes individually poses new issues; introduced together, even over a span of years, they represent additional issues. SSAC will be reviewing these changes for potential new vectors for attacks in both contexts.

More Information

- New gTLD Overarching Issues/New gTLD Overarching Issues:
<http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-02apr09-en.htm>
- Public Comment: SSAC Review:
www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-20mar09-en.htm
<http://mex.icann.org/files/meetings/mexico2009/ssac-dnssec-status-report-02mar09-en.pdf>
- Protecting High Value Domains:
<http://cai.icann.org/files/meetings/cairo2008/piscitello-high-value-domains-03nov08.pdf>
- DNSSEC Status Report:
<http://mex.icann.org/files/meetings/mexico2009/ssac-whois-usage-display-02mar09-en.pdf>
- SAC037: Display and Usage of Internationalized Registration Data:
<http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac037.pdf>

Staff Contact

[Dave Piscitello](#) Senior Technology Specialist



8. GNSO COUNCIL REQUESTS RESEARCH ON WHOIS REQUIREMENTS

At a Glance

WHOIS is the data repository containing registered domain names, registrant contacts and other critical information. Questions persist concerning the use and misuse of this important resource. The GNSO Council continues its inquiries into the suitability of WHOIS going forward.

Recent Developments

The GNSO Council has approved a resolution requesting that the Policy Staff, with help from technical staff and Council members, collect and organize a comprehensive set of requirements for the WHOIS service policy tools. The effort will involve a review of previous GNSO WHOIS policy work and the development of a compendium of past suggested service or technical requirements.

The GNSO Council vote reflects increasing community concerns that the current WHOIS service is deficient in a number of ways, including data accuracy and reliability, as well as in other technical areas noted in recent SSAC reports.

In addition, the Council is concerned that the current WHOIS database will not be able to support potential future requirements, such as accessibility and readability of WHOIS contact information in an IDN environment. In discussions leading up to its vote, Council members cited “tiered access” and “privacy capabilities” as examples of areas where possible technical service requirements might be enumerated.

The resolution also includes a recommendation made by the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) Working Group “A”. The IRTP A Working Group recently concluded that there currently is no simple and secure way for registrars to make registrant e-mail address data available to one another when a registrant requests a transfer from one registrar to another.

In its Final Report, the Working Group recommended that staff be asked to explore whether the Internet Registry Information Service (IRIS) protocol might be a viable option to exchange registrant email information between registrars. The CRISP Working Group of the Internet Engineering Task Force developed the IRIS standard, a directory-based protocol that could provide a foundation for a replacement of WHOIS in the future. Such a protocol might also support the secure exchange of registrant email addresses between registrars.

Next Steps

Staff will be taking up this work, including consultation with the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees as requested, and will be reporting back to the GNSO Council with estimated timeframes for completion.

Meanwhile, Staff continues its work on cost and feasibility estimates in six Council specified WHOIS study areas, involving data misuse, use of non-ASCII character sets, proxy and privacy services, and the provision of inaccurate information.

Background

[Click here](#) for more details.

More Information

- SSAC 027: Comment to GNSO Regarding WHOIS Studies: <http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac027.pdf>
- SSAC 033: Domain Name Registration and Information Services: <http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac033.pdf>
- SSAC 038: Registrar Abuse Point of Contact: <http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac038.pdf>
- GNSO WHOIS policy development page: <http://gns0.icann.org/issues/whois/>
- IRTP Working Group A Final Report: <http://gns0.icann.org/issues/transfers/irtp-final-report-a-19mar09.pdf>
- GAC WHOIS study suggestions, 16 April 2008: <http://www.icann.org/correspondence/karlins-to-thrush-16apr08.pdf>
- WHOIS Study Hypothesis Report, 26 August 2008: <http://gns0.icann.org/issues/whois/whois-study-hypothesis-group-report-to-council-26aug08.pdf>
- The GNSO Council Motion in Mexico City, March 2009: https://st.icann.org/gns0-council/index.cgi?04_mar_2009_motions
- Motion on WHOIS Service Tools: https://st.icann.org/gns0-council/index.cgi?07_may_motions

Staff Contact

[Liz Gasster](#), Senior Policy Counselor

9. REGISTRATION ABUSE POLICIES GET CLOSER LOOK

At a Glance

Registries and registrars seem to lack uniform approaches to dealing with domain name registration abuse, and questions persist as to what actions constitute “registration abuse.” The GNSO Council has launched a Registration Abuse Policies (RAP) Working Group to take a closer look at registration abuse policies.

Recent Developments

The RAP Working Group is meeting on a bi-weekly basis to address the issues outlined in its charter such as: what is the difference between registration abuse and domain name use abuse; the effectiveness of existing registration abuse policies; and which areas, if any, would be suitable for GNSO policy development to address registration abuse.

Next Steps

The working group will report back to the GNSO Council within 90 days and the Council will consider its output.

Background

Click [here](#) for more details.

More Information

- Registration Abuse Policies Issues Report, 29 October 2008:
<http://gns0.icann.org/issues/registration-abuse/gns0-issues-report-registration-abuse-policies-29oct08.pdf>
- Translations of the Executive Summary of the Issues report:
<http://gns0.icann.org/policies/>
- Registration Abuse Policies WG Charter:
https://st.icann.org/reg-abuse-wg/index.cgi?action=display_html;page_name=registration_abuse_policies_working_group
- Registration Abuse Policies Workshop Transcript:
<http://mex.icann.org/files/meetings/mexico2009/transcript-gns0-registration-abuse-policies-workshop-03mar09-en.txt>
- Registration Abuse Policies Working Group Workspace (Wiki):
https://st.icann.org/reg-abuse-wg/index.cgi?registration_abuse_policies_working_group

Staff Contacts

[Marika Konings](#), Policy Director, and [Margie Milam](#), Senior Policy Counselor

10. GNSO CONSIDERS EXPIRED DOMAIN NAME RECOVERY CHANGES

At a Glance

To what extent should registrants be able to reclaim their domain names after they expire? At issue is whether the current policies of registrars on the renewal, transfer and deletion of expired domain names are adequate. An Issues Report requested by the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) on this topic was submitted to the GNSO Council on 5 December 2008.

Recent Developments

At its last meeting on 7 May, the GNSO Council adopted a motion initiating a Policy Development Process (PDP) on Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery. Issues in the PDP will consider whether:

- Adequate opportunity exists for registrants to redeem their expired domain names;
- Adequate expiration-related provisions in typical registration agreements are clear and conspicuous enough;
- Adequate notice exists to alert registrants of upcoming expirations;
- Additional measures need to be implemented to indicate that once a domain name enters the Auto-Renew Grace Period, it has expired (e.g., hold status, a notice on the site with a link to information on how to renew, or other options to be determined);
- To allow the transfer of a domain name during the RGP.

Next Steps

A drafting team will be formed to develop a charter for a Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery Working Group.

Background

During the ICANN meeting in Cairo, the ALAC voted to request an Issues Report on the subject of registrants being able to recover domain names after their formal expiration date. The ALAC request was submitted to the GNSO Council on 20 November 2008. ICANN Staff prepared the Issues Report on post-expiration domain name recovery and submitted it to the GNSO Council on 5 December 2008. ICANN Staff provided the GNSO Council with clarifications on the questions raised in a motion that was adopted at its 18 December meeting. The GNSO Council reviewed these clarifications during its meeting on 29

January and agreed to create a Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery drafting team to eventually propose a charter and provide recommendations.

Click [here](#) for more details.

More Information

- ALAC motion and request:
https://st.icann.org/alac/index.cgi?recovery_of_expired_domain_names;
<http://www.atlarge.icann.org/en/correspondence/correspondence-20nov08-en.htm>
- GNSO Issues Report on Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery
<http://gnso.icann.org/issues/post-expiration-recovery/report-05dec08.pdf>
- Translations of the GNSO Issues Report on Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery: <http://gnso.icann.org/policies/>
- ICANN Staff response to GNSO request for clarifications:
<http://gnso.icann.org/mailing-lists/archives/council/msg06162.html>

Staff Contact

[Marika Konings](#), Policy Director

11. MAKING IT EASIER TO TRANSFER DOMAINS BETWEEN REGISTRARS

At a Glance

The Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) aims to provide a straightforward procedure for domain name holders to transfer their names from one ICANN-accredited registrar to another. The GNSO is reviewing and considering revisions to this policy.

Recent Developments

New IRTP Issues -- Set A

The GNSO Council discussed the IRTP Part A Final Report at its meeting on 16 April, reviewed its recommendations and adopted a motion which resolved:

- To encourage staff to explore further assessment of whether the Internet Registry Information Service (IRIS) would be a viable option for the exchange of registrant email address data between registrars and to conduct an analysis of IRIS' costs, time of implementation and appropriateness for IRTP purposes;

- To include in future IRTP working groups the issue of the appropriateness of a policy change that would prevent a registrant from reversing a transfer after it has been completed and authorized by the admin contact; and
- That ICANN staff communicate to registries and registrars that the current bulk transfer provisions do apply to cases requiring the transfer of all names in one single gTLD under management of a registrar.

Next Steps

Staff will implement these recommendations and report back to the GNSO Council accordingly.

Recent developments

IRTP Issues – Set B

At the same meeting, the GNSO Council adopted a request for an Issues Report on a second set of issues related to the overall review of the IRTP. The issues included in this request are whether:

- A process for urgent return/resolution of a domain name should be developed, as discussed within the SSAC hijacking report (<http://www.icann.org/announcements/hijacking-report-12jul05.pdf>; see also <http://www.icann.org/correspondence/cole-to-tonkin-14mar05.htm>);
- Additional provisions on undoing inappropriate transfers are needed, especially with regard to disputes between a Registrant and Admin Contact. The policy is clear that the Registrant can overrule the AC, but how this is implemented is currently at the discretion of the registrar;
- Special provisions are needed for a change of registrant near a change of registrar. The policy does not currently deal with change of registrant, which often figures in hijacking cases;
- Standards or best practices should be implemented regarding use of Registrar Lock status (e.g., when it may/may not, should/should not be applied);
- And if so, how best to clarify denial reason #7: A domain name was already in "lock status" provided that the Registrar provides a readily accessible and reasonable means for the Registered Name Holder to remove the lock status.

Next Steps

Staff is in the process of developing the Issues Report and submitting it to the GNSO Council by 16 May at the latest.

Background

As part of a broader review of the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy, the first in a set of five distinct policy development processes (PDPs) has now been completed and a second one is in preparation.

[Click here for more details.](#)

More Information

- Public comment period: <http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-2-09jan09-en.htm>
- Draft Advisory: <http://gns0.icann.org/issues/transfers/gns0-draft-transfer-advisory-14nov07.pdf>
- PDP Recommendations: <http://gns0.icann.org/drafts/transfer-wg-recommendations-pdp-groupings-19mar08.pdf>
- Issues Report, Set A: <http://gns0.icann.org/issues/transfers/transfer-issues-report-set-a-23may08.pdf>
- Charter Inter Registrar Transfer Policy -- Part A PDP Working Group: https://st.icann.org/gns0-council/index.cgi?irtp_pdp_a_wg_charter
- Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy : <http://www.icann.org/en/transfers/>
- Final Report IRTP Part A PDP <http://gns0.icann.org/issues/transfers/irtp-final-report-a-19mar09.pdf>

Staff Contact

[Marika Konings](#), Policy Director

12. HOW DO WE DEAL WITH FAST FLUXING CYBERCRIMINALS?

At a Glance

Fast flux attacks refer to techniques used by cybercriminals to evade detection by rapidly modifying IP addresses and/or name servers. The GNSO is exploring appropriate action.

Recent Developments and Next Steps

The Working Group is reviewing the public comments received and working on finalizing its report.

Background

Following a SSAC Advisory on Fast Flux Hosting and an Issues Report, the GNSO Council launched a Policy Development Process (PDP) on Fast Flux Hosting in May 2008. The Working Group published its Initial Report in January 2009, which discusses a series of questions about fast flux hosting and the range of possible answers developed by Working Group members. The Report also outlines potential next steps for Council deliberation. These next steps may

include further work items for the Working Group or policy recommendations for constituency and community review and comment, and for Council deliberation.

[Click here for more details.](#)

More Information

- SSAC Report 025 on Fast Flux Hosting, January 2008: <http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/ssac-documents.htm>
- Issues Report on Fast Flux Hosting, corrected 31 March 2008: <http://gns0.icann.org/issues/fast-flux-hosting/gns0-issues-report-fast-flux-25mar08.pdf>
- Limited translations of the Issues Report on Fast Flux Hosting: <http://gns0.icann.org/issues/>
- 25 June GNSO Council Resolution on Fast Flux Hosting : <http://gns0.icann.org/resolutions/>
- Fast Flux Hosting Initial Report: <http://gns0.icann.org/issues/fast-flux-hosting/fast-flux-initial-report-26jan09.pdf>
- Limited translations of the Executive Summary of the Initial Report on Fast Flux Hosting: <http://gns0.icann.org/issues/>
- Fast Flux Public Comment Forum: <http://forum.icann.org/lists/fast-flux-initial-report/>
- Fast Flux Workspace (Wiki): https://st.icann.org/pdp-wg-ff/index.cgi?fast_flux_pdp_wg

Staff Contact

[Marika Konings](#), Policy Director

13. AT-LARGE COMMUNITY POLICY ADVICE DEVELOPMENT SCHEDULE ONLINE

At-a-Glance

Policy Staff have begun publishing an “at-a-glance” page of information related to policy advice development processes in the At-Large community.

Recent Developments

In order to make it easier for the At-Large community and all other ICANN communities to see in one place what policy advice development processes are underway, the Policy Staff supporting At-Large has created a single page, and associated menu item, on <http://www.atlarge.icann.org> where this information can always be found.

Next Steps

The page currently shows processes where a draft statement has been finalized by a working group or issue lead and is ready for At-Large community-wide review. It is being revised to include all active policy advice development activities in the community.

More Information

- At-Large Policy Advice Development Schedule:
<http://www.atlarge.icann.org/policycalendar>

Staff Contact

[Policy Staff, At-Large Support](#)

14. AT-LARGE PROVIDES POLICY ADVICE IN FOUR KEY AREAS

At-a-Glance

The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) and the larger At-Large community concluded their consultation processes and issued Advisories/Public Consultation Inputs on New gTLDs, Improving Institutional Confidence, Intellectual Property Recommendations for New gTLDs, and FY2010 Budget and Operating Plan Framework Statements.

Background

In addition to the Advisories/Public Consultation Inputs noted above, the Regional At-Large Organizations (RALOs) have provided several complimentary statements to public consultations reflecting their regionally differentiated views.

More Information

At-Large Advisories/Public Consultation Inputs:
<http://www.atlarge.icann.org/en/correspondence>

Staff Contact

[Policy Staff, At-Large Support](#)

15. AT-LARGE COMMUNITY SUMMIT FOLLOW-UP PROCESS CONTINUES

At-a-Glance

The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) agreed to a roadmap in March to help maintain the enthusiasm and engagement resulting from the February At-Large Summit. Ongoing work and policy advice continues to be generated by the At-Large community as a result, including the four Advisories/Public Consultation noted above.

Recent Developments

[At its March teleconference meeting](#), the ALAC agreed to a post-At-Large Summit action plan that included:

- The five Summit working groups will continue to follow the issues within their remit, and all At-Large community members are asked to participate in one or more of them. Regular meetings of each working group will be held and a [dedicated wiki work environment](#) has been created to support their work.
- Each of the five working group statements will become not just a Summit conclusion, but also an Advisory of the ALAC to the Board of ICANN. This bottom-up process ensures that all At-Large community members can provide their thoughts on the statements before they are voted on by the ALAC. The [schedule for the five processes](#) has been posted on the At-Large website.

More Information

At-Large announcement:

<http://www.atlarge.icann.org/announcements/announcement-26mar09-en.htm>

Staff Contact

[Policy Staff, At-Large Support](#)

16. ON THE MOVE

Ray Plzak, former CEO of ARIN, has been elected by the Address Supporting Organization (ASO) Address Council (AC) to succeed David Wodelet on the ICANN [Board](#).