



POLICY UPDATE

Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers

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

Volume 11, Issue 5 – May 2011

Across ICANN

[Issues Currently Open for Public Comment](#)

ccNSO

[Three-Year Policy Road Map for ccNSO In the Works](#)

[Council Prioritizes Actions, Based on Organizational Review](#)

[GAC Members, Others Respond to Call for Volunteers for Framework of Interpretation WG](#)

[Incident Repository Implementation Working Group Established](#)

[Draft ccNSO Agenda Posted for Singapore Meeting](#)

GNSO

[GNSO Council Moves Forward with Two Whois Studies](#)

[Inter-Registry Transfer WG to Deliver Final Report in Singapore](#)

[Registration Anti-Abuse Recommendations Move Toward Implementation](#)

[Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery Final Report to Incorporate Broad Community Input](#)

[GNSO Improvements: Council Reduces Bureaucracy](#)

ASO

[New Global Policy Proposal Introduced to Handle Recovered IPv4 Address Blocks](#)

Joint Efforts

[GNSO and ccNSO Concur on Single-Character IDN TLDs Final Report](#)

At-Large

[At-Large Reviews Second Milestone Report from Joint Applicant Support WG](#)

[At-Large Staff Gains Coordinator as Director Takes Leave](#)

SSAC

[Security & Stability Advisory Committee Comments on gTLD Registry Transitions](#)

Read in Your Preferred Language

ICANN Policy Update is available in all six official languages of the United Nations. *Policy Update* is posted on ICANN's [web site](#) and available via online subscription. To receive the *Update* in your Inbox each month, visit the ICANN [subscriptions page](#), enter your e-mail address, and select "Policy Update" to subscribe. This service is free.

[ICANN Policy Update statement of purpose](#)

Send questions, comments and suggestions to: policy-staff@icann.org.

Policy Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees

Address Supporting Organization	ASO
Country Code Names Supporting Organization	ccNSO
Generic Names Supporting Organization	GNSO
At-Large Advisory Committee	ALAC
Governmental Advisory Committee	GAC
Root Server System Advisory Committee	RSSAC
Security and Stability Advisory Committee	SSAC

Issues Currently Open for Public Comment

Numerous public comment periods are open on issues of interest to the ICANN community. Act now to share your views on such topics as:

- [Proposed .MOBI Contract Amendment](#). This proposed amendment would allow .MOBI, a registry operator, the use of additional equitable allocation options for one- and two-character domain names, such as a.mobi. Comment by 25 May 2011.
- [Academia Representation on Nominating Committee](#). Seeking input and ideas on which, if any, entities representing academic and similar organizations should be approached about annually selecting a voting delegate of the NomCom. Comments are also sought on a proposed amendment to the Bylaws to remove this seat should an entity continue to prove difficult to identify. Comment by 30 May 2011.
- [ICANN FY12 Security, Stability & Resiliency Framework](#). The Framework has been revised for FY12 to include the coming year's operational priorities regarding security, stability and resiliency of the Internet, along with clear descriptions of ICANN's role in this regard, and the organization's place in the Internet ecosystem. In six UN languages. Comment by 7 June 2011.
- [Proposed ICANN Process for Handling Requests for Removal of Cross-Ownership Restrictions for Existing gTLDs](#). A proposed process is now open for review and comment for gTLD registry operators to become an affiliate or reseller of an ICANN accredited registrar, or to subcontract the provision of registry services to an ICANN accredited registrar, registrar reseller or any affiliate. Comment by 1 June 2011.
- [Proposed Permanent Charter of GNSO Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group](#). This document details the proposed mission, principles, organizational structure, membership rules, voting procedures, etc. for the Stakeholder Group representing non-commercial interests in the GNSO. Comment by 5 June 2011.

For the full list of issues open for public comment, plus recently closed and archived public comment forums, visit the [Public Comment Web Page](#).

Three-Year Policy Road Map for ccNSO in the Works

At a Glance

Taking action on one of the ccNSO Improvements identified in the Organizational Review, the Council agreed upon the process it will use to produce a high-level, flexible strategy document for current and upcoming policy work.

Recent Developments

At its May meeting, the ccNSO Council defined and adopted the process to develop and maintain a three-year policy road map and work plan to ensure participation and feedback on the work plan from the ccTLD community and the working groups.

Background

The recent ccNSO Organizational Review identified the development and annual publication of a policy road map for the next three years as one of the improvements recommended for the ccNSO. The Council deemed this recommendation a high priority and plans to implement it within six months.

Next steps

The draft policy road map and procedures will be presented to the ccTLD community at the ccNSO meeting in Singapore.

Staff Contact

Bart Boswinkel, ccNSO Policy Advisor

Council Prioritizes Actions, Based on Organizational Review

At a Glance

The ccNSO Council prioritized and agreed on actions to implement the recommendations made in the recent Organizational Review of the ccNSO.

Recent developments

At its May meeting the ccNSO Council adopted a work plan describing how it would implement recommendations from the review. The plan includes a prioritized list of actions to implement the recommendations, such as documenting the process to develop a ccNSO statement or response, and developing and maintaining a policy road map. A description of the roles and responsibilities of chair, vice-chairs and councilors of the ccNSO is completed.

Background

Organizational Reviews are part of ICANN's program of continuous improvement. They are intended to ensure an in-depth examination of the role and operation of key structures of ICANN, with support from external, independent professional consultants.

As specified in Article IV, Section 4 of ICANN's [Bylaws](#), the "goal of the review, to be undertaken pursuant to such criteria and standards as the Board shall direct, shall be to determine (i) whether that organization has a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure, and (ii) if so, whether any change in structure or operations is desirable to improve its effectiveness."

The [Final Report](#) of the Organizational Review of the ccNSO was issued on 4 March 2011.

More Information

- [Country Code Names Supporting Organization Review Web Page](#)

Staff Contact

[Bart Boswinkel](#), ccNSO Policy Advisor

GAC Members, Others Volunteer for Framework of Interpretation WG

At a Glance

GAC members and others responded to last month's call for volunteers to develop a Framework of Interpretation related to resolving issues regarding the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs.

Recent Developments

At the invitation of the ccNSO, individual members of the GAC will participate fully in the Framework of Interpretation Working Group (Fol WG). In addition, ALAC has appointed a liaison, and the ccNSO Council appointed the ccNSO

participants at its meeting on 10 May. The ccNSO web site offers a complete [list of members](#), liaisons, and invited experts.

Next Steps

The first task of the FoI Working Group will be to develop and propose a work plan.

Background

The objective of the FoI Working Group is to develop a Framework of Interpretation for the current Policy Statements RFC 1591, GAC 2005 Principles and the Internet Domain Name System Structure and Delegation (ICP-1). The framework will help resolve the issues regarding the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs (including IDN ccTLDs) identified by the Delegation and Redellegation Working Group (DRD WG). Having a framework can also foster consistent and predictable decisions while enhancing accountability and transparency for all stakeholders.

More Information

- [Framework of Interpretation WG Web Page](#)

Staff Contact

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

Incident Repository Implementation WG Established

At a Glance

The ccNSO's Working Group for Incident Repository Implementation has been established and will soon begin to explore costs and other factors in implementing, maintaining and operating a repository of ccTLD contacts and channels of communication in the event of a widespread malfunction or threat to the DNS.

Recent Developments

At its last meeting, the ccNSO Council appointed members to a new Working Group to study and make recommendations on how best to implement an incident response repository.

Background

The activities of the newly appointed WG will build upon the work of the original Incident Response Working Group (as proposed in their Final Report, presented in Cartagena in December 2010) by advising the ccTLD community and ccNSO

Council on various matters involved in maintaining and operating a repository of contact information to enable the engagement of and interaction with ccTLD registries during incidents that may impact the DNS.

Specifically, the WG will:

- Explore in detail the costs and other relevant factors for creating and maintaining a repository and inform the ccTLD community and Council accordingly.
- Explore various funding, management and governance models and recommend a preferred option to the ccTLD community and Council.

Following those steps and at the request of the ccNSO Council, the WG will:

- Prepare and send out a request for proposal and review the responses.
- Advise the ccTLD community and ccNSO Council on preferred options.

Next Steps

The first task of the WG will be to develop a work plan.

More Information

- [Incident Repository Implementation WG Web Page](#)

Staff Contact

[Bart Boswinkel](#), ccNSO Policy Advisor

Draft ccNSO Agenda Posted for Singapore Meeting

At a Glance

The ccNSO Council draft meeting agenda for the ICANN 41 Singapore Public Meeting covers three days of sessions and other activities.

Recent Developments

The ccNSO Meetings draft agenda for Singapore has now been published. The Singapore sessions will take place 20 – 22 June, 2011.

Background

The agenda was developed by the ccNSO Program Working Group, based on community input provided in past meeting surveys.

Next Steps

Minor amendments might still take place.

More Information

- [Agenda](#)
- [Meeting Surveys](#)

Staff Contact

[Gabriella Schitteck](#), ccNSO Secretariat

GNSO

GNSO Council Moves Forward with Two Whois Studies

At a Glance

Whois is the data repository containing registered domain names, registrant contacts and other critical information. Because of the global scale and critical importance of Whois, adjustments to it must be handled with great care. Questions persist concerning the use and misuse of this important public resource. The GNSO Council is considering four studies to provide current, reliable information for community discussions about Whois.

Recent Developments

ICANN staff members have completed scoping all proposed studies for cost and feasibility; the GNSO Council began to discuss these studies as well as the Whois Service Requirements Report at the Silicon Valley meeting in March 2011.

The Whois studies are grouped into four broad categories:

- **Whois Misuse.** This study is intended to discover to what extent public Whois information is used for harmful purposes. The GNSO Council decided to proceed with this study and ICANN staff recently announced that Carnegie Mellon University Cylab in Pittsburgh, PA, USA, would conduct this year-long study.
- **Whois Registrant Identification.** This effort would examine the extent to which domain names registered by legal persons or for commercial purposes are not clearly represented in Whois data. ICANN issued an RFP, and staff members prepared an analysis of vendor responses for GNSO Council and community consideration. The Council is still

considering whether or not this study should be conducted. [Staff Analysis of Whois Misuse and Registrant Identification Studies](#) [PDF, 488 KB]

- **Whois Proxy and Privacy Services Reveal Study.** This study would focus on the extent to which domain names used to conduct illegal or harmful Internet activities are registered via privacy or proxy services to obscure the perpetrator's identity. Seeking to engage independent research organizations to undertake this study, ICANN staff posted an RFP for this study on 20 May 2010. Three responses were received. More information was requested of those submitting the strongest responses. Staff has analyzed this information and on 28 April, 2011 the GNSO Council decided to move forward with this study. See [Staff Analysis of the Whois Privacy and Proxy Service Abuse Studies](#) [PDF, 436 KB]. Staff will now make arrangements for the study to be conducted.
- **Whois Proxy and Privacy Services Reveal Study.** This study would measure proxy and privacy service responsiveness to registrant "identity reveal" requests. An RFP to conduct this study was posted in September 2010 but no bids were received. ICANN staff found that potential bidders had significant concerns with the feasibility of this study, and whether a pool of able volunteers would be willing to participate, given concerns about the sensitivity of data to be shared. To address this concern, staff proposed that a feasibility survey be conducted to clarify the uncertainties and determine whether a full study would be possible. See the most recent [Staff Report on Whois Proxy and Privacy Relay and Reveal Study](#) [PDF, 247 KB]. At its recent 28 April meeting, the GNSO Council also decided to proceed with a pre-study survey as recommended by staff, and staff will now also make arrangements for that work to begin.
- **Whois Service Requirements.** The GNSO Council is also discussing an [Inventory of Whois Service Requirements – Final Report](#) [PDF, 636 KB], which was completed last year. This report is a comprehensive list of Whois service requirements based on current policies and previous policy discussions, but does not make policy recommendations. These discussions are continuing.

More Information

- [GNSO Whois policy development page](#)
- [Background on Whois Studies](#)
- [Whois misuse RFP announcement](#)
- [Whois registrant identification RFP announcement](#)
- Whois privacy and proxy abuse study [announcement](#)
- Whois privacy and proxy relay and reveal study [announcement](#)
- [Staff analysis of the Whois Privacy and Proxy Service Abuse Studies](#) [PDF, 436 KB]

- [Staff Analysis of Whois Misuse and Registrant Identification Studies](#) [PDF, 488 KB]
- [Staff report on Whois Proxy and Privacy Relay and Reveal study](#) [PDF, 247 KB]
- ICANN Board Resolution regarding [display and usage of internationalized registration data](#)
- SSAC037: [Display and Usage of Internationalized Registration Data](#)
- [Internationalized Data Registration Working Group Charter](#) [PDF, 112 KB]
- Audio Briefing: [Introduction to the Whois Service Requirements Inventory](#) [MP3, 15 MB]
- [Inventory of Whois Service Requirements – Final Report](#) [PDF, 636 KB]
- [28 April Resolution on Whois Studies](#)

Staff Contact

[Liz Gasster](#), Senior Policy Counselor

Inter-Registrar Transfer WG to Deliver Final Report in Singapore

At a Glance

The aim of the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) is to provide a straightforward procedure for domain name holders to transfer their names from one ICANN-accredited registrar to another. The GNSO Council is reviewing and considering revisions to this policy and has established a series of Working Groups to conduct these efforts.

Recent Developments and Next Steps

Following the review of the public comments on the [Initial Report](#) [PDF, 764 KB], the IRTP Part B PDP Working Group published its [Final Report](#) [PDF, 733 KB]. The Report contains nine recommendations including:

- A Registrar Emergency Action Channel
- An Issue Report on “Thick” Whois
- An Issue Report on “Change of Control” function
- Modification of denial reasons #6 and #7 or the IRTP, and
- Clarification of Whois status messages in relation to Registrar Lock Status.

The Working Group has been reviewing [public comments](#) received as part of the public comment forum and deliberating on the proposed Registrar Emergency Action Channel proposed in the Final Report. The Working Group is expected to deliver its Final Report to the GNSO Council before the ICANN meeting in Singapore in June 2011.

For further information, please consult the [IRTP Part B Working Group Workspace](#).

Background

The aim of the IRTP is to provide a straightforward procedure for domain name holders to transfer their names from one ICANN-accredited registrar to another. The GNSO Council established a series of five Working Groups (Parts A through E) to review and consider various revisions to this policy.

The IRTP Part B PDP is the second in a series of five scheduled PDPs addressing areas for improvements in the existing policy. The Part B Working Group addresses five issues focusing on domain hijacking, the urgent return of an inappropriately transferred name, and lock status. For further details, refer to the group's [Charter](#).

More Information

- [IRTP Part B Proposed Final Report](#) [PDF, 733 KB]
- [Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy](#) web page
- [IRTP Part B Status Report of Ongoing Progress](#) page
- [IRTP Part B Issues Report](#) [PDF, 256 KB]
- [PDP Recommendations](#) [PDF, 124 KB]
- *ICANN Start* podcast: [audio explanation of IRTP Part B](#) [MP3, 18 MB]

Staff Contact

[Marika Konings](#), Policy Director

Registration Anti-Abuse Recommendations Move Toward Implementation

GNSO Council Requests Best Practices Paper

At a Glance

Registries and registrars lack uniformity when dealing with domain name registration abuse, and questions persist about what activities constitute "registration abuse." The GNSO Council launched the Registration Abuse

Policies Working Group (RAP WG) to examine registration abuse policies. After reviewing the RAP WG's proposed approach, the GNSO Council is moving ahead with several RAP recommendations.

Recent Developments & Next Steps

The GNSO Council reviewed and discussed the proposed approach of the Registration Abuse Policies (RAP) Implementation Drafting Team (DT) at a [working session in Cartagena](#). At its February 2011 meeting, the Council decided to move ahead with a number of the RAP Recommendations, including:

- Request a discussion paper on the creation of non-binding best practices to help registrars and registries address the abusive registration of domain names.
- Move forward on two recommendations that will require input from the ICANN Compliance Department:
 - Whois Access recommendation number two requiring the ICANN Compliance Department to publish more data about Whois accessibility, at minimum, annually. This data would include the number of registrars showing unreasonable restriction of access to their Port 43 Whois servers and results of an annual audit of compliance with contractual Whois access obligations.
 - Fake Renewal Notices recommendation number one, which suggests that the GNSO refer this issue to ICANN's Compliance Department for possible enforcement action, including investigation of misuse of Whois data.

The GNSO Council has instructed ICANN Policy Staff to "add the remaining RAP Recommendations to the GNSO Project List so that the Council can keep track of the remaining recommendations and address these as appropriate."

ICANN Compliance Staff provided the GNSO Council with its [feedback](#) on Whois Access recommendation number two and Fake Renewal Notices recommendation number one. The Council discussed the feedback received as well as an initial outline of the Issue Report on the current state of the UDRP at its Silicon Valley meeting (see [the meeting schedule](#) for further details).

Background

The RAP WG [presented its final report](#) [PDF, 1.7 MB] and recommendations to the GNSO Council in June 2010. The Council then formed a group of volunteers, the Registration Abuse Policies Implementation Drafting Team (RAP DT), to draft a proposed approach to implementing the report's recommendations. The Registration Abuse Policies (Implementation Drafting Team developed a matrix categorizing the RAP WG [final report](#) [PDF, 1.7 MB] recommendations in order of priority, expected complexity and required resources and submitted a [letter](#) [PDF,

184 KB] to the GNSO Council outlining a recommended approach for its consideration. See the web site for [further information](#).

A short history of the RAP WG is available on [ICANN's web site](#).

More Information

- [Registration Abuse Policies WG Final Report](#) [PDF, 1.7 MB]
- [Registration Abuse Policies Issues Report](#), 29 October 2008 [PDF, 400 KB] and [translation](#) of summary
- [Registration Abuse Policies WG Charter](#)
- [Registration Abuse Policies WG Workspace](#) (wiki)
- [Registration Abuse Policies Implementation Drafting Team Workspace](#) (wiki)
- [RAP Implementation Drafting Team Letter to the GNSO Council](#) [PDF, 184 KB]

Staff Contacts

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

Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery Final Report to Incorporate Broad Community Input

At a Glance

Should registrants be able to reclaim their domain names after they expire? At issue is whether current registrar policies regarding the renewal, transfer and deletion of expired domain names are adequate.

Recent Developments

After completing its review of community comments on the initial [GNSO Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery \(PEDNR\)](#) report [PDF, 1 MB] and the [accompanying survey](#) [PDF, 948 KB], the Working Group has updated the report and developed specific recommendations. The proposed [Final Report](#) [PDF, 971 KB] was published for comment on 21 February 2011.

The [Public Comment Forum](#) closed on 22 April after drawing 10 community contributions. ICANN staff has posted a [summary of the comments](#). The WG has started its review of the public comments received and aims to finalize its report for submission to the GNSO Council in time for the ICANN meeting in Singapore.

The proposed Final Report contains 14 recommendations including:

- Providing a minimum of eight days after expiration for renewal by registrant.
- Having unsponsored gTLDs and registrars offer Redemption Grace Periods.
- Requiring posting of fees charged for renewal; requiring that at least two notices prior to expiration are sent at set times, one after expiration; that an expired web site must explicitly say that registration has expired, and offer instructions on how to redeem the domain.
- Development of educational materials about how to prevent unintentional loss.

Background

The PEDNR PDP WG published its Initial Report on 31 May 2010 – (see the related community [Public Comment Forum](#)). In addition, a survey asked several specific questions about renewal and expiration practices. Nine comments were submitted, including comments from representatives of the Registrars and Registries Groups, ALAC, and the Commercial and Business Users Constituencies. More than 400 survey responses were received (see [summary and analysis](#)).

For a history of the ICANN community's policy development activities related to Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery, please refer to the PEDNR [background page](#).

More Information

- [PEDNR Proposed Final Report](#) [PDF, 971 KB]
- Details on [PEDNR Public Consultation Session in Brussels](#)
- [GNSO Issues Report on Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery](#) [PDF, 416 KB]
- [Translations](#) of the GNSO Issues Report on Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery
- [WG presentation: Registrar Survey Final Results](#) [PDF, 948 KB]

Staff Contact

[Marika Konings](#), Senior Policy Director

GNSO Improvements: Council Reduces Bureaucracy

Outreach Comments Get Close Look; Comments Invited on Proposed Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group Charter

Council Terminates Policy Process Steering Committee – with Thanks

At a Glance

Members of the GNSO community are working to implement a comprehensive series of structural and operational changes designed to improve the effectiveness and accessibility of the organization. The materials in this section relate to only the most recent developments regarding implementation of the GNSO Improvements.

Comment Forum Opens For Permanent Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group Charter Proposal

On 6 May, ICANN Staff opened a Public Comment Forum seeking community comments on the proposed permanent Charter of the GNSO's Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG).

Consistent with its oversight authority regarding GNSO Stakeholder Group Charters (see ICANN Bylaws [Article X](#), Section 5.3), the ICANN Board passed a resolution at its 18 March 2011 [meeting](#) directing Staff to post the proposed NCSG Charter in a Public Comment Forum for 30 days. The Board is seeking the community's input concerning the Charter's provisions and, in particular, the fundamental organizational structure proposed.

All members of the ICANN community are invited to review the document and share comments and observations with the Board and the wider community through 5 June 2011.

Background :

As part of the comprehensive Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Improvements effort, last July the ICANN Board approved (see [ICANN Board Resolution 2009.30.07.09](#)) the Charters of four new GNSO Stakeholder Groups (SGs). These SG structures represent a new concept for the GNSO that was originally envisioned by ICANN Board members in 2008 (see the [BGC WG's February 2008 Report here](#) [PDF, 193 KB]).

The [original Charter](#) [PDF, 60 KB] approved for the NCSG was to be "transitional" through the ICANN annual meeting in 2011. The Board expected the NCSG to develop a permanent charter that would take effect upon the

expiration of the transition period. Over the past several months, NCSG members have been working with the Board's Structural Improvements Committee and have developed a proposed permanent NCSG Charter (see - <http://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/#ncsg-charter>).

Council Begins to Dismantle Improvements Bureaucracy; Terminates Policy Process Steering Committee

Progress on the implementation of many GNSO Improvements recommendations has reached a point where the GNSO Council can begin dismantling the bureaucracy that was created to resolve them.

Last month we reported that the GNSO Council had formed a Standing Committee to oversee the implementation of the various improvements prompted by the ongoing GNSO Review process. It commissioned a drafting team to develop a charter for the Standing Committee. At its April meeting, the Council approved the [charter](#).

At its 28 April meeting, the Council took the next logical step and determined that with more and more of the improvements work undergoing formal implementation, that the new Standing Committee could do the work of at least one of its existing Improvements Steering Committees. The Council terminated the Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC) and expressed "its gratitude and appreciation to the PPSC for their dedication and commitment."

The Council determined that most of the final work needed to modify the GNSO's Policy Development Process could be handled by the existing PDP Work Team (PDP-WT). The PDP-WT will now be responsible for making the final recommendations to the Council concerning the development of and transition to a new PDP for the GNSO Council's review. The new PDP will ultimately need to be approved by the ICANN Board before it can go into effect.

Global Outreach Strategy Comments Under Review

The GNSO Council invited the community to provide comments in a [public forum](#) on proposed recommendations for a global GNSO Outreach Program. The public comment period ended 10 April. ICANN Staff has prepared a [Summary and Analysis](#) of the community comments in the proceeding.

At its 28 April meeting, the GNSO Council directed its Operating Steering Committee to ask the Constituency/Stakeholder Group Work Team to review the Staff Summary and Analysis document as well as the individual community comments and to "make any changes to the proposed recommendations as are deemed appropriate, or to make those changes directly as it sees fit."

More Information about the GNSO Improvements

- [GNSO Improvements Information Web Page](#)

- [GNSO Home Page](#)
- [PDP Work Team wiki](#)
- [Working Group Work Team wiki](#)
- [Constituency Operations Work Team wiki](#)
- [Public Forum For Proposed Permanent NCSG Charter](#)
- [Public Forum For GNSO Outreach Recommendations](#)

Staff Contact

[Robert Hoggarth](#), Senior Policy Director

ASO

New Global Policy Proposal Introduced to Handle Recovered IPv4 Address Blocks

At a Glance

Now that the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) has allocated all the addresses in IPv4, Regional Internet Registries (RIRs) have discussed a couple of proposed global policies for handling IPv4 address space returned from the RIRs to IANA. The RIRs have yet to agree on a policy.

Recent Developments

A third proposal on the same theme has now been launched and introduced in all RIRs. It has reached the final call stage in APNIC, where it originated. According to this new proposal, IANA would establish and administer a Pool of returned address space. Because the free pool of IANA IPv4 address space is depleted, IANA would subsequently allocate IPv4 address space from this Pool to the RIRs in smaller blocks than previously allocated. The main difference compared to the previously abandoned second proposal is that allocations would be made in equal size blocks to all RIRs simultaneously and occur every six months, if the size of the Pool so permits.

Next Steps

The third proposal may soon be adopted by APNIC and will be discussed in all other RIRs. If and when this policy proposal is adopted by all RIRs, the Number Resource Organization Executive Committee (NRO EC) and the Address Supporting Organization Address Council (ASO AC) will review the proposal and

forward the policy 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 unique numbers (approximately 4.3 billion) has been depleted and a 128-bit numbering system (IPv6) is taking its place.

More Information

- A [Background Report](#) for the new, third proposal is posted on the ICANN web site and includes a comparison between the proposals so far on this theme.
- [Background Report](#) for the second proposal.

Staff Contact

[Olof Nordling](#), Director, Service Relations

Joint Efforts

GNSO and ccNSO Concur on Single-Character IDN TLDs Final Report

At a Glance

Both the GNSO and ccNSO councils have adopted the Final Report from the joint ccNSO-GNSO Internationalized Domain Name (IDN) Working Group (JIG-WG).

Recent Developments

Both the GNSO and ccNSO Councils have now adopted the recommendations made by the joint ccNSO-GNSO IDN Working Group in its final report. Among the recommendations are that Single Character IDN TLDs should be acceptable under the IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process and as part of the recommendations for overall policy in IDN ccPDP.

Background

The purpose of the ccNSO/GNSO Joint IDN Working Group is to deal with issues related to the introduction of IDN ccTLDs and IDN gTLDs that are of common interest to both the GNSO and ccNSO. The WG focuses on introduction of single character IDN TLDs and variant management.

Next Steps

The Final Report and the recommendations contained therein will be forwarded to the ICANN Board for adoption.

More Information

- [Ad Hoc Group announcement on ccNSO.icann.org](https://www.icann.org/announcements/ad-hoc-2014-05-01)

Staff Contact

[Bart Boswinkel](#), ccNSO Policy Advisor

At-Large

At-Large Reviews Second Milestone Report from Joint Applicant Support WG

At a Glance

Following the advice of the ALAC, the Joint Supporting Organization/Advisory Committee Working Group on New gTLD Applicant Support (JAS WG) submitted its Second Milestone Report for consideration.

Recent Developments

The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) made a series of recommendations to the JAS WG on 29 April, including recommending a focus on developing consensus about some fundamental issues central to its mandate – particularly, on the criteria an applicant for a new gTLD should meet to qualify for support; and on the type of support an applicant could get.

A subgroup of the JAS WG, the JAS Drafting Team, had already begun sorting out these issues in its JAS Issues and Recommendations summary document. Taking the ALAC's advice, the JAS WG turned this document into its draft Second Milestone Report, which it submitted to the ALAC and GNSO on 7 May. At that point, the ALAC and GNSO initiated independent reviews of the Report. To date, the GNSO has not completed its review of the Report.

ALAC Chair Olivier Crépin-Leblond called for comments on the Report to be submitted by the At-Large Community. Prior to sending the Board the Report, ALAC included a selection of these comments, and held an ALAC ratification vote.

In the attempt to reduce obstacles to proposed gTLD applications (and to support applications from developing economies), the Report explains the WG's recommendations regarding the following topics:

- Why certain gTLD applicants should receive support;
- Which applicants qualify for support (and how their applications should be evaluated);
- What support should be given; and
- How the support process relates to the procedures in the gTLD Applicant Guidebook.

Background

The Internet's Domain Name System contains roughly two dozen generic top-level domains -- .com, .org and .net being perhaps the best known. In order to promote competition (while still ensuring Internet security and stability), ICANN's Board decided to increase that number in June 2008 through a [New gTLD Program](#). The result could be hundreds of new gTLDs.

Within this program, the Board has made inclusiveness a priority. To this end, at ICANN's Nairobi Meeting in March 2010, it issued a Resolution asking ICANN stakeholders "to develop a sustainable approach to providing support to applicants requiring assistance in applying for and operating new gTLDs."

As a result, a cross-constituency Working Group, the SO-AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group was formed and chartered by the ALAC and GNSO. This Working Group's mandate is to recommend ways ICANN can support applicants for new gTLDs, including ways of [reducing barriers to new gTLDs in developing regions](#).

More Information

- [JAS WG main workspace](#) (including list of members, affiliations and Statements of Interest)

Staff Contact

[Seth Greene](#), Interim Manager, Regional Affairs

At-Large Staff Gains Coordinator as Director Takes Leave

At a Glance

ICANN's At-Large Staff has undergone three personnel changes since March.

Recent Developments

Matt Ashtiani joins the At-Large Staff as Coordination Officer. His new responsibilities include tracking policy issues, developing At-Large's new knowledge management system, and working on the Community's social media presence.

Many in the At-Large Community already know Matt as ICANN's Constituency Travel Coordinator, a role he began in June 2009 when he joined ICANN. Currently, Matt is splitting his time between his old and new positions, but will fully be in place as At-Large Coordinator in time for ICANN's Singapore Meeting in June.

Matt graduated from UCLA with a Bachelor of Arts degree in International Development, Political Science, and History, as well as a minor in Middle Eastern and North African Studies. After UCLA, Matt lived in Dublin, where he earned a Masters of Philosophy in International Peace Studies from Trinity College Dublin. In addition to English, Matt speaks fluent Farsi.

Heidi Ullrich, Director for At-Large, began her maternity leave on 2 May. Every effort has, of course, been made by Heidi and the entire Policy Staff to ensure seamless support for the At-Large Community during her absence. Heidi will return to work full-time on 1 September 2011, though will begin working part-time before then. **During her leave, please email any inquiries for the At-Large Staff to staff@atlarge.icann.org.**

Matthias Langenegger, who was the At-Large Regional Affairs Officer, left ICANN following the Silicon Valley Meeting in March. He has joined fellow At-Large Staff alumnus Nick Ashton-Hart in Google's Brussels office. Efforts are currently underway to fill the position of At-Large Regional Affairs Officer.

Staff Contact

[Seth Greene](#), Interim Director for At-Large

Security & Stability Advisory Committee Comments on gTLD Registry Transitions

At a Glance

The SSAC published its comment on New gTLD Program [Explanatory Memorandum](#): gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model, which describes ways to provide safeguards for registrants in cases where a registry ceases operation, or where a registry experiences prolonged technical outages.

Recent Developments

On 15 April 2011, the SSAC published its comment on the Explanatory Memorandum, in a document called [“SAC047: SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model”](#) [PDF, 200 KB].

The SSAC Comment considers each of the circumstances where the transition processes are to be implemented. In particular, the SSAC considers the objectives, scope and application of the transition processes and recommends that the Explanatory Memorandum clearly identify risks that are mitigated by the proposed transition processes. The Comment asks whether matters such as emergency operator eligibility and regular auditing of emergency operators merit additional consideration. Given the real-time operational implications of a registry transition, the Comment pays particular attention to the security and stability of the Emergency Back-End Registry Operator Temporary Transition Process. Finally, the Comment asks that ICANN consider testing, retention of operational data from ex-registries, zone data escrow, and other information that will facilitate restoration of name resolution service for registrants.

Background

ICANN published in May 2010 an [Explanatory Memorandum](#) to describe processes being developed to mitigate registrant difficulty in moving a gTLD from one registry to another. The memorandum outlined goals for the processes that included ensuring registry services are operational to the greatest extent possible and to make sure a new registry operator is evaluated using the appropriate level of scrutiny to maximize the chance of success in the operation of the transitioned gTLD.

More Information

- [SAC 047: SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model](#) [PDF, 200 KB]

- SSAC [2011 Work Plan](#)
- Other [SSAC documents](#)

Staff Contact

[Julie Hedlund](#), Director, SSAC Support