



Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers

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

Volume 12, Issue 10 – November 2012

Across ICANN

[Issues Currently Open for Public Comment](#)

ccNSO

[Greece Joins ccNSO](#)

[Keith Davidson Reelected ccNSO Councilor](#)

[Katrina Sataki to Replace Juhani Juselius on ccNSO Council](#)

[ccTLD News Session Gets High Marks in Toronto](#)

[Send Us Your Local ccTLD Events](#)

[Apply for ccNSO Travel Support with New Online Form](#)

[ccNSO Working Group Urges Focus on Development of New Strategic Plan for ICANN](#)

[Framework of Interpretation Working Group Responds to Governmental Advisory Committee Comments on ccTLD Redelelegation](#)

[Council to Survey Members about Translations](#)

GNSO

[Plan to Complete Registrar Accreditation Agreement Negotiations by Year End](#)

[New GNSO Council Leadership Determined at ICANN 45 Toronto Meeting](#)

[GNSO Council Requests Issue Report on the Uniformity of Reporting](#)

[Whois Study Shows Significant Differences in gTLD Use by Different Registrant Entities](#)

[Whois Technical Requirements Study Now Closed](#)

[Council Adopts Recommendations for Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part C](#)

[Update on Protection of Red Cross, International Olympic Committee and Other Names in New gTLDs](#)

[Call for Volunteers - "Thick" Whois Policy Development Process Working Group now forming](#)

[GNSO Council Approves Recommendations for the Display of Internationalized Registration Data](#)

ASO

[Issues Active in the ASO](#)

At-Large

[Key At-Large Achievements during ICANN's 45th ICANN Meeting](#)

[North American Regional At-Large Organization Capacity Building and Outreach Activities Successful](#)

[ALAC Ratifies White Paper on Future Challenges, Seeks Broader Input](#)

SSAC

[SSAC Publishes Advisory on Impacts of Content Blocking via the Domain Name System](#)

GAC

[Where to Find GAC Information](#)

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

Across ICANN

Issues Currently Open for Public Comment

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

- [Application for New GNSO Constituency Candidacy-"Public Internet Access/Cybercafe Ecosystem"](#). The Cyber Café Association of India submitted the first application to form a new GNSO constituency. Comment period ends 17 November 2012; reply period (if necessary) ends 17 December 2012.
- [Expired Registration Recovery Policy](#). For ICANN accredited registrars, establishment of certain minimum communications requirements as well as uniformly available domain name renewal and redemption. Comment period extended to 18 November 2012; reply period (if necessary) ends 7 December 2012.
- [IDN Variant TLD Program – Interim Report Examining the User Experience Implications of Active Variant TLDs](#). Proposed guiding principles for activating variant TLDs in the root. Comment period ends 22 November 2012; reply period ends 13 December 2012.
- [Registry Stakeholder Group Charter Revisions \(Sep 2012\)](#). Charter changes include the addition of a provision to recognize formation of

Observer Interest Groups and the deletion of a permanent fixed membership fee schedule. Reply period ends 27 November 2012.

- [Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy \(IRTP\) Part C Policy Development Process \(PDP\) Recommendations for Board Consideration](#). The GNSO Council recommended to the Board a new change of registrant policy, time-limiting Form of Authorization (FOA), and a requirement for registries to use IANA IDs. Reply period ends 3 December 2012.
- [Proposed Modification of GNSO PDP Manual to Address the Suspension of a PDP](#). Should a Policy Development Process within GNSO be suspended or terminated for significant cause with a supermajority vote? Reply period ends 3 December 2012.
- [Community Input Draft 2013-2016 Strategic Plan](#). As part of its latest round of strategic planning, ICANN leadership is looking for input into this year's draft Strategic Plan. Reply period closes 4 December 2012.
- [ICANN Consolidated Meetings Strategy Proposal](#). Should ICANN change how it chooses meeting sites? Reply period ends 7 December 2012.
- [Expert Recommended Improvements to ICANN's Accountability Structures](#). Recommendations from three international experts in corporate governance on how to enhance and refine ICANN's Reconsideration Process and Independent Review Panel. Reply period ends 8 December 2012.

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

ccNSO

Greece Joins ccNSO

At a Glance

The ccNSO welcomes Greece as its newest member.



Recent Developments

The Foundation for Research and Technology – Hellas, Institute of Computer Science (FORTH-ICS), the ccTLD operator of .gr, Greece, has joined the ccNSO as its 134th member.

Next Steps

Continue welcoming more members to the ccNSO.

More Information

- [Announcement of Greece's ccNSO membership](#)
- [List of ccNSO Members](#)

Staff Contact

[Gabiella Schitteck](#), ccNSO Secretariat

Keith Davidson Reelected ccNSO Councilor

At a Glance

The most recent ccNSO Council Elections have concluded.

Recent Developments

Keith Davidson, .nz, remains ccNSO Councilor for the Asia-Pacific region.

Next Steps

Keith Davidson's term will be renewed for three more years, starting April 2013 and ending March 2016.

Background

As there were two candidates put forward in the Asia-Pacific region during the nomination period, the ccNSO held regular elections to fill the seat on the Council for this region (term starting in April 2013). Keith Davidson was standing against Sun Xiantang, .cn.

Keith Davidson will take his seat together with the other Councilors, who were selected in the ordinary ccNSO Nominations, immediately after the ccNSO Council meeting in Beijing in April 2013 (terms ending 2016).

The other Councilors who will be taking their seats in April 2013 are:

- African Region: Ntahigiye Abibu, .tz
- European Region: Lesley Cowley, .uk
- Latin American Region: Luis Diego Espinoza, .cr
- North American Region: Becky Burr, .us

More Information

- [Announcement of start of elections](#)
- [Announcement of election results](#)

Staff Contact

[Gabriella Schitteck](#), ccNSO Secretariat

Katrina Sataki to Replace Juhani Juselius on ccNSO Council

At a Glance

The most recent ccNSO Extraordinary Council Election has come to an end.

Recent Developments

Katrina Sataki, .lv, takes seat on the ccNSO Council for the European region, replacing Juhani Juselius, .fi.

Next Steps

Katrina Sataki takes up her seat immediately, replacing Juhani Juselius. Katrina's term will end in March 2015.

Background

Extraordinary elections were held in the European region to fill the seat of Juhani Juselius, who stepped down before the end of his term. In the extraordinary nomination period, two candidates were nominated for this position which lead to the extraordinary election. Katrina Sataki was standing against Andrei Kolesnikov, .ru.

More Information

- [Announcement of start of elections](#)
- [Announcement of election results](#)

Staff Contact

[Gabriella Schitteck](#), ccNSO Secretariat

ccTLD News Session Gets High Marks in Toronto

At a Glance

ccTLDs were asked to evaluate the ccNSO Members' meeting during ICANN's 45 meeting in Toronto.

Recent Developments

According to the results of the ccNSO Members meeting survey from Toronto, the majority of respondents rated most sessions as “good.” More than 35 percent rated the ccTLD News Session as “excellent,” the highest rating.

Next Steps

The ccNSO Programme Working Group, which is responsible for developing the ccNSO Meeting Agendas, will review the survey results and take the input into consideration when developing upcoming meeting agendas.

Background

The ccNSO has a tradition of asking meeting participants for feedback on the different sessions of the ccNSO meeting after every meeting.

More Information

- [Results of ccNSO Members meeting survey](#)

Staff Contact

[Gabiella Schitteck](#), ccNSO Secretariat

Send Us Your Local ccTLD Events

At a Glance

Community members can now share information about local ccTLD events via a new online form.

Recent Developments

The ccNSO has developed an online submission form to notify the community about local events.

Next Steps

Members of the ccTLD Community – as well as other community members – are invited to use the new form to raise awareness of local events that are of interest to the ccTLD Community.

Background

Responding to community input, the ccNSO developed a “Local Events Calendar” on its website, where ccTLD Registries can promote their local events, which may be of interest for their fellow colleagues. However, until recently there was no structured way of providing input and the ccNSO Secretariat had to

actively seek contributions. Now the ccTLD community will be responsible for keeping their own calendar updated, by using the new form.

More Information

- [Local events calendar](#) (left bar)
- [Local events form](#)

Staff Contact

[Gabriella Schitteck](#), ccNSO Secretariat

Apply for ccNSO Travel Support with New Online Form

At a Glance

The ccNSO Travel Funding Application period for travel to the Beijing meeting is now open.

Recent Developments

On 9 November 2012, the ccNSO opened up its travel application period for applications to the Beijing meeting. New to this round is that a special web-form has been developed through which applications shall be submitted.

Next Steps

The last day to apply for ccNSO Travel Funding is 23 November 12.00 UTC.

Background

ccNSO Travel Funding is open for those who actively participate in the work of the ccNSO and make a special contribution to its projects and meetings.

More Information

- [Call for travel funding applications](#)
- [Travel Funding Application Guidelines](#) [PDF, 82 KB]
- [Travel Funding Application Form](#)

Staff Contact

[Gabriella Schitteck](#), ccNSO Secretariat

ccNSO Working Group Urges Focus on Development of New Strategic Plan for ICANN

At a Glance

At a meeting to discuss the current Strategic Plan, the ccNSO Strategic and Operational Planning Working Group (SOP WG) advised ICANN to focus all efforts on developing a Strategic Plan 2014-2019 under guidance of ICANN's new CEO.

Recent Developments

During the ICANN Public Meeting in Toronto, the ccNSO Strategic and Operational Planning Working Group (SOP WG) met to discuss how they would respond to ICANN's Strategic Plan 2013-2016 that was posted for public comment. Members noted little difference between ICANN's Strategic Plan 2013-2016 as presented for public comment, and the current 2012-2015 Strategic Plan.

ICANN staff advised the SOP WG that the process to arrive at the next full Strategic Plan would considerably change with the appointment of Fadi Chehadé as ICANN's new CEO. In addition, the time horizon would change from three to five years.

In light of these envisioned changes, and the marginal update of the current Strategic Plan, the SOP WG has submitted its advice to discontinue the development of the 2013-2015 Strategic Plan and focus all efforts on the development of the 2014-2019 Strategic Plan. At the same time, the SOP WG committed to provide ICANN with a high-level overview and summary of its main comments since the creation of the SOP WG since 2009, and will also inform the ccNSO Council accordingly.

Next Steps

The ccNSO SOP WG will produce an overview of its comments on past Strategic Plans since 2009.

Background

The SOP WG was created at ICANN's 33rd Public Meeting in Cairo in November 2008. The goal of the SOP WG is to coordinate, facilitate, and increase the participation of ccTLD managers in ICANN's strategic and operating planning processes and budgetary processes. The SOP WG may provide input to the public comments forum and work directly with ICANN or other Supporting Organizations and Advisory WGs.

More Information

- [ccNSO SOP WG background material and all its submissions](#)

Staff Contact

[Bart Boswinkel](#), ccNSO Policy Advisor

Framework of Interpretation Working Group Responds to Governmental Advisory Committee Comments on ccTLD Redelegation

At a Glance

The ccNSO Framework of Interpretation Working Group (Fol WG) responds to GAC comments on its Interim Report “Support of Significantly Interested Parties for ccTLD Delegation and Redelegation.”

Recent Developments

In June 2012, ICANN’s Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) submitted comments on the Fol WG’s Interim Report on the support of Significantly Interested Parties (formerly known as Local Internet Community or LIC) for delegations and re-delegations of ccTLDs. During its 25 October 2012 meeting, the Fol WG agreed on a response and submitted it to the GAC.

Next Steps

The Interim Report will now be finalized and take into account the GAC comments and the Fol WG response. The members of the WG have made considerable progress on the third topic of un-consented re-delegations, and will publish an Interim report for public comment prior to ICANN’s 46th Public Meeting in Beijing, China next April.

Background

The objective of the Fol WG is to develop and propose a Framework of Interpretation for the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs. This framework should provide a clear guide to IANA and the ICANN Board on the interpretation of the current policies and guidelines pertaining to the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs. Having a framework can foster consistent and predictable decisions while enhancing accountability and transparency for all stakeholders.

The scope of the Fol WG also clearly specifies that:

- Any proposal to amend, update or change the Policy Statements is outside the scope of the Fol WG.
- The IANA functions contract between the U.S. Government and ICANN (including any contract implementation issues or procedures relating to it) is also outside the scope of the Fol WG’s work.

The Fol WG is looking at five topics individually and in the following order:

- Obtaining and documenting consent for delegation and redelegation of ccTLDs.
- Obtaining and documenting support for delegation and redelegation requests from Significantly Interested Parties (sometimes referred to as Local Internet Community or LIC).
- Developing recommendations for "un-consented" redelegations.
- Developing a comprehensive glossary of the terms used for the delegation and redelegation of ccTLDs.
- Developing recommendations for IANA reports on delegation and redelegation.

More Information

- [GAC comment on FoI WG Interim Report](#) [PDF, 37 KB]
- [FoI WG Response to GAC comments](#) [PDF, 52 KB]
- [FoI WG web page](#)

Staff Contact

[Bart Boswinkel](#), ccNSO Policy Advisor

Council to Survey Members about Translations

At a Glance

After reviewing ccNSO Improvements to date, the Council will look into needs and other aspects of translations of ccNSO documents.

Recent Developments

At its meeting in Toronto the ccNSO Council noted that the only open topics are the recommendations relating to the translation of ccNSO related documentation and the method for doing so (translations by volunteers from the community). It was noted that the recommendations are based on survey from early 2010. Since that time, the landscape has changed significantly, for example in terms of need for translations, availability and quality of translation tools and translation policies. Council members agreed to investigate:

- A better understanding from the ccTLD community on the current need for translations (via a survey).
- The various current methods for translation of documentation, including their costs, the quality of the translations, the supported languages and the funding aspects.

Next Steps

The results from the survey and an overview assessment will be presented to the community at the ICANN Public Meeting in Beijing. At that time the Council will also revisit the two remaining ccNSO Review recommendations.

Background

- [Material relating to the ccNSO review and improvements](#)

Staff Contact

[Bart Boswinkel](#), ccNSO Policy Advisor

GNSO

Plan to Complete Registrar Accreditation Agreement Negotiations by Year End

At a Glance

In Toronto, under the vision and direction of its new President and Chief Executive Officer, Fadi Chehadé, ICANN called for the negotiations to amend the Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) to be completed by December 2012.

Background

In 2009, the GNSO Council embarked on a collaborative process with the At-Large Advisory Committee regarding the Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA), which resulted in proposals for improvements to the RAA from the law enforcement community, the Intellectual Property Constituency, as well as other stakeholders, seeking to enhance the RAA. These proposals were published a [Final Report](#) [PDF, 6.7 MB].

The ICANN Board-directed negotiations on the RAA have been ongoing for the past year, and have focused on the law enforcement and GNSO working group recommendations, as well as other topics that would advance the twin goals of registrant protection and DNS stability.

Recent Developments

In Toronto, ICANN's new President and CEO Fadi Chehadé impressed the community with his insights regarding the challenges faced by ICANN. Chehadé indicated that completion of the RAA negotiations is one of his two top priorities for ICANN, and that he planned to be personally involved in this project. Consistent with this vision, ICANN plans to complete the RAA negotiations by

year end, and to seek adoption of the new RAA as part of the New gTLD Program.

Next Steps

ICANN intends to post the updated RAA for public comment, reflecting the outcomes of the final negotiations, by 31 December 2012.

More Information

- [Announcement for the RAA Negotiations Update](#)
- [Transcripts and presentations from the RAA Update Session](#)
- The [ICANN RAA Community wiki](#) describing the current status of the negotiations
- The [Final Report on Improvements to the RAA](#)

Staff Contact

[Margie Milam](#), Senior Policy Counselor

New GNSO Council Leadership Determined at the ICANN 45 Toronto Meeting

At a Glance

Six new members took their seats on the GNSO Council in October. The new Council members elected Jonathan Robinson of the Registry Stakeholder Group as Council Chair at their meeting in Toronto. The community thanks the outgoing Chair Stéphane van Gelder for his years of remarkable service and dedication.

New Developments

The new GNSO Councilors and new officers are:

- Jonathan Robinson – GNSO Council Chair (new officer)
- Jennifer Wolfe – Nominating Committee Appointee
- Mason Cole – Council Vice-Chair Contracted Parties House (new officer)
- Volker Greimann – Registrar Stakeholder Group
- Petter Rindforth – Intellectual Property Interests Constituency
- David Cake – Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group
- Maria Farrell – Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group
- Magaly Pazello – Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group

Background

Each year at its annual general meeting, the GNSO conducts elections of Council members representing the Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies that form the structure of the GNSO. Where a respective Council member's term expires, each Stakeholder Group and Constituency is responsible for electing their new term Counselors per each group's charter guidelines. Typically elections are performed prior to the annual meeting and in some cases, Council members are elected for a second term where a change may not be as easily noticeable.

Additionally, the election of a new Chair for the GNSO Council also occurred at the Toronto Meetings. The Chair role is based on a two-year cycle with Dr. Jonathan Robinson of the Registry Stakeholder Group being selected by the GNSO Council. Robinson's involvement within the community is long standing and across varying roles within the GNSO and the Internet community.

More Information

- [Dr. Jonathan Robinson's Welcome Message](#)
- [2013 GNSO Council Structure](#)
- [2012 GNSO Council Structure](#)
- [Statements of Interest](#)

Staff Contact

[Glen de Saint Géry](#), GNSO Secretariat

GNSO Council Requests Issue Report on the Uniformity of Reporting

At a Glance

The GNSO Council requested an Issue Report on the current state of uniformity in the mechanisms to initiate, track, and analyze policy-violation reports. The Council also asked ICANN staff to provide its recommendation(s) on how this issue can be further addressed outside of a Policy Development Process (PDP) if recommendations in relation to this issue do not require consensus policies to implement.

Recent Developments

Building on recommendations made by the Registration Abuse Policies Working Group (RAPWG) in its final report published in May 2010, the GNSO Council requested that the ICANN Compliance Department present its findings on existing systems that:

- Report and track violations and/or complaints
- Detail improvements / changes made since the RAPWG Report or foreseen in the near future
- Identify gaps and any improvements that might be desirable but not foreseen at this stage

Further, the GNSO Council discussed the RAPWG recommendation in light of the feedback received from the ICANN Compliance Department in its March 2012 report. Mikey O'Connor (former member of the RAPWG) volunteered to provide additional information on how the RAPWG recommendation could be implemented. He created and presented the findings to the GNSO Council in September 2012.

Next Steps

ICANN staff members are constructing the Initial Issue Report and intend to make it available for public comment in December 2012.

Background

The 2009 Registration Abuse Policies Working Group (RAPWG) identified in its Final Report the “need for more uniformity in the mechanisms to initiate, track, and analyze policy-violation reports” and as a result recommended in its Final Report that “the GNSO and the larger ICANN community in general, create and support uniform reporting processes.”

More Information

- [RAPWG Final Report, section 9.1](#) [PDF, 1.7 MB]
- [ICANN Compliance Department Report](#), March 2012 [PDF, 522 KB]
- [Thought paper from Mikey O'Connor](#)

Staff Contact

[Policy Staff](#)

Whois Study Shows Significant Differences in gTLD Use by Different Registrant Entities

At a Glance

Initial findings of a survey of 1600 domains in the top five ICANN gTLDs point to differences in how different registrant entities, such as natural persons, legal persons and Privacy/Proxy service providers, use their domains. For instance, Privacy/Proxy registrants have a higher percentage of parked domains compared to other registrants, while natural person registrants show a high percentage of domains used for legal entities, such as businesses.

Recent Developments

Whois Study 2, the Whois Registrant Identification Study, is nearing publication. This study uses Whois to classify entities that register gTLD domain names, including natural persons, legal persons, and Privacy/Proxy service providers. Using associated Internet content, the study then classifies entities using those domains and potentially commercial activities.

NORC at the University of Chicago presented [initial findings](#) [PDF, 189 KB] from its Whois Registrant Identification Study at ICANN's 45th Public Meeting in Toronto. The research team examined 1600 domains in order to gain understanding of domain users and registrants and the types of entities using these services.

In addition to insights into how different registrant entities use domains, there are also interesting relationships between apparent commercial activity and registrant entity types.

Next Steps

NORC is continuing to assess their findings and its draft report will be available later this year for public comment.

Background

The Domain Name Registration Data Directory Service (Whois) is an Internet standard mechanism for providing public access to identity and contact information about domain name registrants. ICANN-accredited domain name registrars are contractually obligated to provide accurate information about all registrants via Whois, either directly or through a generic top-level domain (gTLD) registry. Some registrars and third-party service providers offer registrants the opportunity to limit the public disclosure of their personal contact information by offering privacy services that publish alternative contact information. Other providers act as “proxies” by registering domain names for another user, who may access and use the domain name through a separate arrangement with the proxy service provider.

Over time, the public-information requirement and the use of proxy and privacy services have led to debates among privacy and data protection advocates and law enforcement and intellectual property interests over access to domain name registrant data. This issue has been challenging to address, and in the absence of accurate and authoritative information about the way in which registrant contact information access is affected by the use of proxy and privacy services, the debate has been driven more by anecdote than by data. Recognizing this as an impediment to resolving the issue, ICANN's GNSO Council has commissioned several studies to collect reliable data on Whois deployment and use, including this study of the effect of proxy and privacy services on access to domain name registrant data.

More Information

- [Initial Findings Presentation on Whois Registrant Identification Study](#) [PDF, 189 KB]
- [Background on Whois Studies](#)

Staff Contact

[Barbara Roseman](#), Policy Director

Whois Technical Requirements Survey Now Closed

At a Glance

The Whois Survey Working Group (WSWG) aims to draft, implement, and analyze the results of a survey measuring the level of support for various technical requirements outlined in the [GNSO Whois Service Requirement Report](#) [PDF, 632 KB]. The Whois Survey Working Group will produce a report to be delivered to the GNSO Council describing the results of the survey and recommendations for next steps for the GNSO Council's consideration concerning the Whois service requirements.

Recent Developments and Next Steps

- The WSWG released the final survey to the community on 13 September 2012 making it available through the month of October.
- The survey closed on 31 October 2012 and the WG will now analyze the survey results and formulate recommendations for its final report to the GNSO Council.

More Information

- [WSWG web page](#)
- [Wiki page](#)

Staff Contact

[Barbara Roseman](#), Policy Director

Council Adopts Recommendations for Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part C

At a Glance

The GNSO Council adopted recommendations for a new change of registrant policy, time-limiting Form of Authorization (FOA), and a requirement for registries to use IANA IDs. The Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) Part C Working Group is one of five groups to be chartered to work on policy revisions related to how domain name holders transfer their names from one ICANN-accredited registrar to another.

Recent Developments and Next Steps

The IRTP Part C WG submitted its Final Report to the GNSO Council just prior to the ICANN Public Meeting in Toronto. The GNSO Council unanimously adopted the Report and its recommendations, which included:

- **Recommendation #1** – The adoption of change of registrant consensus policy, which outlines the rules and requirements for a change of registrant of a domain name registration. Such a policy should follow the requirements and steps as outlined in the section “proposed change of registrant process for gTLDs.” (**Note:** further details concerning the rules and requirements for the change of registrant policy are detailed in the [IRTP Part C Final Report](#) [PDF, 1.93 MB] under the heading 'Proposed "Change of Registrant" Process for gTLDs' on pages 4-8.)
- **Recommendation #2:** Forms of Authorization (FOAs), once obtained by a registrar, should be valid for no longer than 60 days. Following expiration of the FOA, the registrar must re-authorize (via new FOA) the transfer request. Registrars should be permitted to allow registrants to opt-into an automatic renewal of FOAs, if desired. In addition to the 60-day maximum validity restriction, FOAs should expire if there is a change of registrant, or if the domain name expires, or if the transfer is executed, or if there is a dispute filed for the domain name. In order to preserve the integrity of the FOA, there cannot be any opt-in or opt-out provisions for these reasons for expiration of the FOA. As recommended and approved as a result of

the IRTP Part B PDP, Losing Registrars under IRTP-B are now required to send an FOA to a Prior Registrant. Losing Registrars may send a modified version of this FOA to a Prior Registrant if the transfer is automated where the FOA would be advisory in nature.

- **Recommendation #3:** All gTLD Registry Operators be required to publish the Registrar of Record's IANA ID in the TLD's Whois. Existing gTLD Registry operators that currently use proprietary IDs can continue to do so, but they must also publish the Registrar of Record's IANA ID. This recommendation should not prevent the use of proprietary IDs by gTLD Registry Operators for other purposes, as long as the Registrar of Record's IANA ID is also published in the TLD's Whois.

As required by the ICANN Bylaws, public notice has now been provided of the policies that are considered for adoption as well as an opportunity to comment on the adoption of the proposed policies, prior to consideration by the ICANN Board of [these recommendations](#). Community comments were accepted until 12 November 2012. Reply comments will be accepted until 3 December 2012.

In addition, at the same meeting in Toronto, the GNSO Council requested an Issue Report on IRTP Part D, which includes the following remaining IRTP issues to be considered:

- a) Whether reporting requirements for registries and dispute providers should be developed, in order to make precedent and trend information available to the community and allow reference to past cases in dispute submissions
- b) Whether additional provisions should be included in the Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy (TDRP) on how to handle disputes when multiple transfers have occurred
- c) Whether dispute options for registrants should be developed and implemented as part of the policy (registrants currently depend on registrars to initiate a dispute on their behalf)
- d) Whether requirements or best practices should be put into place for registrars to make information on transfer dispute resolution options available to registrant
- e) Whether existing penalties for policy violations are sufficient or if additional provisions/penalties for specific violations should be added into the policy
- f) Whether the universal adoption and implementation of EPP AuthInfo codes has eliminated the need of FOAs

ICANN staff is expected to publish a Preliminary Issue Report for public comment shortly.

Background

The IRTP is a GNSO consensus policy that was adopted in 2004 with the objective to provide registrants with a transparent and predictable way to transfer domain name registrations between registrars. As part of its implementation, it was decided to carry out a review of the policy in order to determine whether it was working as intended or whether there are any areas that would benefit from further clarification or improvement. As a result of this review, a number of issues were identified that were grouped together in five different policy development processes or PDPs, titled A to E, that are being addressed in a consecutive order.

The IRTP Part C PDP Working Group considered the following three questions:

- "Change of Control" function, including an investigation of how this function is currently achieved, if there are any applicable models in the country-code name space that can be used as a best practice for the gTLD space, and any associated security concerns. It should also include a review of locking procedures, as described in Reasons for Denial #8 and #9, with an aim to balance legitimate transfer activity and security.
- Whether provisions on time-limiting the Form Of Authorization (FOA) should be implemented to avoid fraudulent transfers out. For example, if a Gaining Registrar sends and receives an FOA back from a transfer contact, but the name is locked, the registrar may hold the FOA pending adjustment to the domain name status, during which time the registrant or other registration information may have changed.
- Whether the process could be streamlined by a requirement that registries use IANA IDs for registrars rather than proprietary IDs.

More Information

- [IRTP Part C Final Report](#) [PDF, 1.9 MB]
- [IRTP Part C Initial Report](#) [PDF, 1.23 MB]
- [IRTP Part C Final Issue Report](#) [PDF, 625 KB]
- [Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy](#)

Staff Contact

[Marika Konings](#), Senior Policy Director

Update on Protection of Red Cross, International Olympic Committee and Other Names in New gTLDs

At a Glance

The GNSO Council has initiated a Policy Development Process (PDP) on the protection of names and acronyms of certain international organizations in the top and second levels of all gTLDs including, International Government Organizations and Non-Governmental Organizations such as the Red Cross/Red Crescent (RCRC) and the International Olympic Committee (IOC).

Recent Developments

The GNSO Council initiated a PDP at its public meeting in Toronto to evaluate the need for, and to develop any policy recommendations to provide additional special protections at the top and second level in *all* gTLDs for the names and acronyms of certain international organizations. These organizations are International Government Organizations (IGOs) and International Non-Government Organizations (INGOs).

This PDP specifically includes the International Committee of the Red Cross, the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies and the American Red Cross (collectively, the “RCRC”) and the International Olympic Committee (“IOC”). Currently, there are no permanent special protections available for these international organization names beyond the general Rights Protection Mechanisms established for existing and new gTLDs. The PDP will be considering possible permanent protections in all gTLDs, including at the second level of the first round of new gTLDs, for the IOC and RC names, as well as additional special protections for the names of IGOs and other INGOs that are protected by international treaties and national laws in multiple jurisdictions.

Next Steps

A PDP Working Group will be formed after the GNSO Council adopts the PDP WG Charter. After considering specific issues as outlined in its charter and the Final Issue Report, the Working Group is expected to make recommendations to the GNSO Council for any specific necessary additional special protections for the names of certain international organizations. The Working Group is expected to publish its Initial Report for public comment in early 2013.

More Information

- [GNSO Resolution on the Initiation of the PDP](#)
- [Final GNSO Issue Report on the Protection of International Organization Names in New gTLDs](#) [PDF, 675 KB]

Staff Contact

[Margie Milam](#), Senior Policy Counsel

Call for Volunteers - "Thick" Whois Policy Development Process Working Group now forming

At a Glance

At its meeting in Costa Rica, the GNSO Council initiated a Policy Development Process (PDP) on "thick" Whois. Following a short delay, the GNSO Council has approved the Charter for the PDP Working Group that is now forming.

Recent Developments

Following the submission of [the 'Thick' Whois Final Issue Report](#) [PDF, 645 KB] the GNSO Council initiated a Policy Development Process on "thick" Whois at its Public Meeting in Costa Rica. Following a short delay, the GNSO Council decided to form a draft team in August 2012 to develop a charter for the PDP Working Group. The DT submitted its proposed charter to the GNSO Council prior to Toronto and the GNSO Council subsequently adopted the charter at its meeting in Toronto. The PDP WG will be tasked to provide the GNSO Council with a policy recommendation regarding the use of 'thick' Whois by all gTLD Registries, both existing and future. As part of its deliberations on this issue, the PDP WG should, at a minimum, consider a number of elements as detailed in its [charter](#). A [call for volunteers](#) has been launched to form the working group and the [WG web page](#) includes information about an upcoming first meeting.

Background

ICANN specifies Whois service requirements through Registry Agreements (RAs) and the Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) for the generic top-level domain (gTLD) registries.

Registries have historically satisfied their Whois obligations under two different models. The two models are often characterized as "thin" and "thick" Whois registries. This distinction is based on how two distinct sets of data are maintained.

Whois contains two kinds of data about a domain name; one set of data is associated with the domain name (this information includes data sufficient to identify the sponsoring registrar, status of the registration, creation and expiration dates for each registration, name server data, the last time the record was updated in the Registry database, and the URL for the registrar's Whois service),

and a second set of data that is associated with the registrant of the domain name.

In a thin registration model the Registry only collects the information associated with the domain name from the Registrar. The Registry in turn publishes that information along with maintaining certain status information at the Registry level. Registrars maintain data associated with the registrant of the domain and provide it via their own Whois services, as required by Section 3.3 of the RAA for those domains they sponsor.

In a thick registration model the Registry collects both sets of data (domain name and registrant) from the Registrar and in turn publishes that data via Whois.

A Policy Development Process has been initiated to not only consider a possible requirement of “thick” Whois for all gTLDs in the context of Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy, for which it is considered beneficial, but to also consider any other positive and/or negative effects that are likely to occur outside of IRTP that would need to be taken into account when deciding whether a requirement of “thick” Whois for all gTLDs would be desirable or not.

More Information

- [‘Thick’ Whois Workspace](#)
- [Final Issue Report on ‘Thick’ Whois](#) [PDF, 646 KB]
- [Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy](#) web page
- [PDP Recommendations](#) [PDF, 41 KB]

Staff Contact

[Marika Konings](#), Senior Policy Director

GNSO Council Approves Recommendations for the Display of Internationalized Registration Data

At a Glance

On 17 October 2012 the GNSO Council passed a motion that approved the recommendations in the Final Report of the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group (IRD-WG). In its motion the Council also requested staff to prepare an Issue Report on the translation and transliteration of contact information (Recommendation 2 in the IRD-WG Final Report).

Recent Developments

On 17 October 2012 the GNSO Council passed a motion approving the recommendations in the Final Report. Specifically, the Council noted that

Recommendation 2, translation and transliteration of contact information, requires timely action at the policy level, which involves collaboration among domain name registrants, registrars, and registries.

Next Steps

Within its motion to approve the recommendations, the Council requested that ICANN staff should prepare an Issues Report considering three factors:

- Whether it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language or transliterate contact information to a single common script
- Who should bear the burden and who is in the best position to address these issues
- Whether to start a policy development process (PDP) to address those questions

In addition, the Council asked for regular updates from ICANN staff on relevant technical developments of internationalized registration data. These updates should include the estimated timeline or roadmap of such technical developments so that the GNSO Council and the rest of the ICANN community can fully prepare for implementing internationalized registration data features.

The Council also noted that should there be any policy implication arising from these updates, it will consider, in consultation with SSAC and technical communities, requesting one or more issue reports as appropriate to initiate separate PDP processes based on all available technical recommendations or standards.

Background

In June 2009, in response to recommendations from SSAC in its report on the display and usage of internationalized registration data (SAC037), the ICANN Board approved a resolution requesting that the GNSO and SSAC, in consultation with staff, convene a working group comprised of individuals with knowledge, expertise, and experience in these areas to study the feasibility and suitability of introducing display specifications to deal with the internationalization of registration data. On 03 October 2011 the IRD-WG published a draft Final Report in the public forum for comment and after consideration of the comments sent the Report to the GNSO and the SSAC on 06 March 2012. As a result of changes requested by the SSAC, on 10 May 2012 the IRD-WG sent a revised Final Report to the GNSO Council for consideration.

More Information

- [GNSO Council Motions 17 October 2012](#)
- Final Report of the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group (IRD-WG): [Final Report](#)
- [Board Resolution establishing the IRD-WG](#)

- [SAC037 “Display and usage of Internationalized Registration Data” \(SAC037\)](#) [PDF, 896 KB]

Staff Contact

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

ASO

Issues Active in the ASO

[Public Comment Period Now Closed on Implementing Global Policy for Post Exhaustion IPv4 Allocation Mechanisms by IANA](#)



At-Large

Key At-Large Achievements during ICANN’s 45th ICANN Meeting

At a Glance

Members from all five At-Large regions represented the At-Large community at ICANN’s 45th Public Meeting in Toronto last month. During the four-day gathering, At-Large representatives participated in [25 formal meetings](#) as well as several ad hoc meetings to develop policy comments and statements. The meeting also marked a change in leadership within the ALAC and its liaisons.

Recent Developments

Among the many policy and process-related issues discussed during these meetings, there are several of particular note:

- **North American Regional At-Large Organization (NARALO) Toronto Events**

- The NARALO Toronto Events included capacity building sessions, a General Assembly, an event that commemorated the five-year anniversary of the RALOs, and outreach activities. (See more details of the NARALO Toronto Events in the next article.)
- **Establishment of an At-Large Capacity Building Working Group**
 - The ALAC agreed to create an [At-Large Working Group on Capacity Building](#). This WG will work on issues related to capacity building within the At-Large community.
 - The At-Large Capacity Building Working Group will send a call for membership shortly.
- **Ratification of the Joint ALAC/NCSG Statement on the Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) System**
 - The ALAC voted to adopt the [Joint ALAC/NCSG Statement on the Uniform Rapid Suspension \(URS\) System](#) on Thursday, 18 October 2012.
- **Ratification of the ALAC Statement on the Community Input and Advice Process**
 - The ALAC voted to adopt the [ALAC Statement on the Community Input and Advice Process](#) on Thursday, 18 October 2012.
- **ALAC and At-Large Leadership Updates**
 - The 2012 Annual General Meeting marks a change in leadership within the ALAC and its liaisons.

Outgoing

The ALAC wishes to recognize the valuable contributions of the following ALAC members who left their leadership positions at the end of the Toronto Meeting.

- ALAC Representatives:
 - Edmon Chung – ALAC representative from the APRALO Region. Term served between AGM 2010-AGM 2012
 - Dr. Ganesh Kumar - NomCom Interim Selectee to the ALAC from the North America Region. Term served between 6 September 2011 and AGM 2012
 - Sergio Salinas Porto - ALAC representative from the LACRALO Region. Term served between AGM 2010-AGM 2012
- At-Large Delegates to the 2012 Nominating Committee

- Yjrö Lansipuro, At-Large Delegate to the 2012 NomCom from the Europe Region
- Jacqueline Morris – At-Large Delegate to the 2012 NomCom from the Latin America and Caribbean Islands Region

Incoming and Returning

The ALAC is pleased to announce the incoming and returning ALAC Officers, Representatives, and Liaisons, and At-Large Regional Officers.

- ALAC Officers:
 - Chair: Dr. Olivier Crépin-Leblond (Representative from the Europe Region) – for a two year term between AGM 2012 and AGM 2014.
 - Vice-Chair: Evan Leibovitch (Representative from the North America Region)
 - Vice-Chair: Carlton Samuels (Representative from the Latin America and Caribbean Islands Region)
 - Rapporteur: Tijani Ben Jemaa (Representative from the Africa Region)
 - Representative from the Asia, Australia, Pacific Region: Rinalia Abdul Rahim (NomCom Selectee to the ALAC from the Asia, Australia, Pacific Region)
- ALAC Representatives:
 - Tijani Ben Jemaa – Returning ALAC representative from the AFRALO Region. Term to serve between AGM 2012 - AGM 2014
 - Alan Greenberg – Incoming NomCom selectee from the North American Region. Term to serve between AGM 2012 - AGM 2014
 - Sandra Hoferichter – Returning ALAC representative from the EURALO Region. Term to serve between AGM 2012 - AGM 2014
 - Holly Raiche – Incoming ALAC representative from the APRALO Region. Term to serve between AGM 2012 - AGM 2014
 - Dev Anand Teelucksingh – Incoming ALAC representative from the LACRALO Region. Term to serve between AGM 2012 - AGM 2014

- Evan Leibovitch – Returning ALAC representative from the NARALO Region. Term to serve between AGM 2012 - AGM 2014
- ALAC Liaisons
 - ccNSO Liaison: Cheryl Langdon-Orr (APRALO) – Term to serve AGM 2012 – AGM 2013
 - GNSO Liaison: Alan Greenberg (NARALO) - Term to serve AGM 2012 – AGM 2013
 - IDN Liaison: Edmon Chung (APRALO) - Term to serve AGM 2012 – AGM 2013
 - NCSG Liaison: Evan Leibovitch (NARALO) - Term to serve AGM 2012 – AGM 2013
 - SSAC Liaison: Julie Hammer - Term to serve AGM 2012 – AGM 2013
- At-Large Delegates to the 2013 Nominating Committee
 - Mohamed El Bashir - At-Large Delegate to the 2013 NomCom from the Africa Region
 - Siranush Vardanyan - At-Large Delegate to the 2013 NomCom from the Asia, Australia, Pacific Region
 - NARALO – Glenn McKnight - At-Large Delegate to the 2013 NomCom from the North America Region

More Information

- See the [ALAC Chair's Report](#) of the 44th ICANN Meeting

Staff Contact

[Heidi Ullrich](#), Director for At-Large

North American Regional At-Large Organization Capacity Building and Outreach Activities Successful

At a Glance

The North American Regional At-Large Organization (NARALO) held a series of Capacity Building Sessions, its General Assembly and held successful outreach events during ICANN's 45th Public Meeting in Toronto. NARALO was represented by a total of 18 At-Large Structure (ALS) representatives.

As a result of its outreach activities, a number of organizations have applied to become certified as NARALO ALSes. The accreditation process is currently underway for these applicants.



ICANN President and CEO Fadi Chehadé addressed the At-Large community during the celebration of the five-year anniversary of the RALOs.

Recent Developments

The NARALO Toronto Events included:

- A General Assembly which focused on In-Reach/Outreach efforts, particularly to bring new ALSes into the region, reaching out to specific areas of North America, such as Island states and to specific stakeholder groups such as the handicapped community; and simplifying steps for ALS applications. Other issues discussed included ideas for the next At-Large Summit, and how NARALO sees the region fitting in within the 'new' (i.e., post new gTLDs) ICANN. The General Assembly had the objectives of strengthening NARALO relations and to increase the ability of NARALO ALS Representatives to participate effectively within At-Large and ICANN.
- NARALO also held a series of capacity building sessions synchronized with the Fellowship and Newcomer meetings. The sessions were carried out during four days and included issues such as the development of a NARALO Communication Strategy Development, streamlining information,

meeting data reorganization and reaching out to Newcomers within NARALO, and actions to take with inactive ALSes.

- The NARALO Outreach events included an At-Large Regional At-Large Organization (RALO) Five Year Anniversary celebration entitled “*An Evening with At-Large: Honoring the RALOs.*” The event celebrated the Five Year Anniversary of the five RALOs and commemorated the achievements of the RALOs and their growing role within the At-Large community. Guest speakers included Fadi Chehadé, ICANN President and CEO; Sebastien Bachollet, ICANN Board Member; Patrick Ryan, Policy Counsel, Open Internet at Google; Philipp Grabensee, Chairman of Afiliias; Paul Andersen, Chairman of the Board of the Canadian Internet Registration Authority (CIRA); and Dr. Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Chair of the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC). [Event photos and video](#) are online. NARALO representatives also volunteered to carry out outreach activities at the ICANN information booth during the ICANN Meeting.

Background

The Toronto Outreach Event was part of a series of regional events that started with the [AFRALO Showcase](#) at the ICANN Meeting in Nairobi in March 2010. Next came the [EURALO Showcase](#) in Brussels in June 2010, the [LACRALO Showcase](#) in Cartagena in December 2010, the [NARALO Showcase](#) in San Francisco in March 2011, and the [APRALO Showcase](#) in Singapore in June 2011. These events were taken to the next level with the addition of capacity building sessions and regional General Assemblies beginning with the [AFRALO Dakar Events](#) in October 2011 and the [LACRALO Costa Rica Events](#) in San Jose in March 2012. In June 2012, EURALO organized the [10 Year Anniversary of the ALAC](#) in Prague.

More Information

- [NARALO wiki Workspace](#)
- A complete list of [certified and pending ALSes](#)
- [Statistical information on global ALS representation](#)
- [Global map of certified ALSes](#)

Staff Contact

[Silvia Vivanco](#), Manager, At-Large Regional Affairs

ALAC Ratifies White Paper on Future Challenges, Seeks Broader Input

At a Glance

In September, the ALAC ratified the At-Large White Paper entitled “Making ICANN Relevant, Responsive and Respected” (R3 White Paper). The globally diverse At-Large Future Challenges Working Group developed the paper through wide consultation with the At-Large community.

Over the next several months, the At-Large Future Challenges Working Group is seeking input from within ICANN and the broader Internet community. The next milestone in the development of the R3 White Paper will be a public session during the 46th ICANN Meeting scheduled for Beijing in April 2013.

Recent Developments

The R3 White Paper identifies four major challenges that ICANN is facing:

- The global public interest – In a continuously evolving and challenging environment, will ICANN be able to keep pace with growing public interest requirements and adapt its methods to better serve the global user community, while escaping capture by narrower interests?
- The multistakeholder system – Is ICANN’s multistakeholder approach sufficiently robust and sustainable in the long run under increased external pressure?
- Global governance – Are the arrangements related to the governance of the Internet’s critical resources, including that of ICANN’s own internal governance, adequate to meet the needs of the growing and diverse community of internet users worldwide?
- Institutional and practical cooperation – Can ICANN coordinate and cooperate effectively with organizations that have been set up to deal with Internet governance issues beyond ICANN’s remit of technical coordination?

A series of recommendations is offered for each of these four challenges.

More Information

- [At-Large White Paper on Future Challenges entitled Making ICANN Relevant, Responsive and Respected](#) (available in the six UN languages)

Staff Contact

[Heidi Ullrich](#), Director for At-Large

SSAC Publishes Advisory on Impacts of Content Blocking via the Domain Name System

At a Glance

On 9 October 2012 the Security and Stability Advisory Committee published an [Advisory on the impacts of content blocking via the Domain Name System \(DNS\)](#). This Advisory complements an earlier document, [SAC050: DNS Blocking: Benefits Versus Harms – An Advisory from the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Blocking of Top Level Domains at the Domain Name System](#) (14 June 2011) [PDF, 139 KB].

Recent Developments

In this Advisory, the SSAC notes that in 2011 and 2012 several governments proposed or established formal guidelines, laws, court orders, or law enforcement actions related to DNS blocking, DNS filtering, and/or domain name seizure. In some cases the objective of these activities was to develop new legislation aimed at controlling Internet usage, while in other cases courts or law enforcement agencies have relied on DNS blocking or domain name seizures as a mechanism to block access to certain Internet sites or addresses. The Advisory examines the technical impacts of various types of DNS blocking that have been implemented or proposed. The aim of this paper is to inform the Internet community, policymakers, government officials, and others of the high-level technical implications of using the DNS blocking to control access to Internet resources.

More Information

- [\[SAC056\]: SSAC Advisory on Impacts of Content Blocking via the Domain Name System](#) (9 October 2012) [PDF, 358 KB]

Staff Contact

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

Where to Find GAC Information

At a Glance

ICANN receives input from governments through the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC). The GAC's key role is to provide advice to ICANN on issues of public policy, and especially where there may be an interaction between ICANN's activities or policies and national laws or international agreements. The GAC usually meets three times a year in conjunction with ICANN meetings, where it discusses issues with the ICANN Board and other ICANN Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees and other groups. The GAC may also discuss issues between times with the Board either through face-to-face meetings or by teleconference.

Recent Information

The GAC met in Toronto, Canada during the week of 13 October 2012. Fifty GAC Members and three Observers attended the meetings.

A successful High Level Meeting of Governments was held on 15 October 2012, in Toronto centered on the theme of “Preserving and Improving the Multistakeholder Model.”

[GAC communiqués](#) are posted online.

More Information

- [GAC web site](#)
- [Toronto High Level Meeting of Governments transcript](#)

Staff Contact

[Jeannie Ellers](#), ICANN staff