



## Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers

### POLICY UPDATE

Volume 15, Issue 3 – April 2015

---

### **New ICANN Meetings Strategy Implementation**

Last November, the Board of Directors approved the [recommendations](#) of the cross-community Meetings Strategy Working Group after two years of work. The recommendations address the changing landscape of ICANN public meetings and recognize growing attendance and the increasing number of sessions.

ICANN will continue to host three meetings a year, but each meeting will have a different duration and scope. Meeting A (the first meeting of the calendar year) will feel very much like a current ICANN public meeting (6 day duration) except for an additional public forum at the beginning of the week. Meeting B will be shorter (4 days) and focus on community policy development work. Meeting C will be longer (8 days) and feature the Annual General Meeting and showcase ICANN's work. The rotational schedule among the five regions will continue, ensuring that meetings remain accessible to stakeholders worldwide.

The Policy Development Support team, in collaboration with the Meetings and Global Stakeholder Engagement teams, is working to better define the schedule of the first Meeting B scheduled to take place in Latin America in June 2016. The goal is to facilitate both inter- and intra-community activities with fewer scheduling conflicts.

Of course, we look forward to ongoing conversations about Meeting B and appreciate all input during this process. This will ensure ICANN's public meetings continue to serve as important bottom-up gatherings that advance our multistakeholder model.

Thank You,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David Olive".

David Olive  
Vice President, Policy Development Support  
General Manager, ICANN Istanbul Hub Office

---

## **Across ICANN**

[Issues Currently Open for Public Comment](#)

## **Across SO/ACs**

[GAC-GNSO Consultation Group: Issue Scoping Ready for Trial Run](#)

## **Address Supporting Organization (ASO)**

[LACNIC Public Policy Forum Chair Interview](#)

[Regional Internet Registries Number Resource Policy Discussions](#)

## **Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO)**

[ccNSO to Perform Internal Review of Rules and Guidelines](#)

[ccNSO Council Recommends Framework of Interpretation Implementation](#)

## **Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO)**

[Milestones and Important Dates for the GNSO Structural Review](#)

[GNSO Policy Development Pushes Forward with Key Issues](#)

## **At-Large**

[ALAC Submits Three Statements](#)

[RALO Round Up](#)

[Two New Accredited At-Large Structures](#)

[At-Large Website Revamp Enters Development Phase](#)

## **Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC)**

[GAC Prepares for ICANN 53](#)

[Next High-Level Government Meeting Scheduled for ICANN 55](#)

[GAC Input to the CCWG on ICANN Accountability](#)

## Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

[RSSAC Caucus Convened at IETF 92](#)

---

## Read in Your Preferred Language

ICANN's *Policy Update* is available in all six official languages of the United Nations. *Policy Update* is posted on ICANN's [website](#) 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: [policyinfo@icann.org](mailto:policyinfo@icann.org).

## Policy Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees

Address Supporting Organization	<a href="#">ASO</a>
Country Code Names Supporting Organization	<a href="#">ccNSO</a>
Generic Names Supporting Organization	<a href="#">GNSO</a>
At-Large Advisory Committee	<a href="#">ALAC</a>
Governmental Advisory Committee	<a href="#">GAC</a>
Root Server System Advisory Committee	<a href="#">RSSAC</a>
Security and Stability Advisory Committee	<a href="#">SSAC</a>

## Across ICANN

### Issues Currently Open for Public Comment

Several public comment proceedings are currently open on issues of interest to the ICANN community. Act now to share your views on the following topics:

#### [Reference Label Generation Rulesets \(LGRs\) for the Second Level](#)

This public comment proceeding requests community review on the effectiveness of the suggested process for the development of reference IDN tables in machine readable format, called Label Generation Rulesets (LGRs) for the second level, for use in Pre-Delegation Testing and the Registry Service Evaluation Process (RSEP).

**Comment Period Closes:** 19 April 2015, 23:59 UTC

#### [Internationalized Registration Data Expert Working Group Draft Final Report](#)

This public comment proceeding invites comments on the draft Final Report from the WHOIS Review Team Internationalized Registration Data Expert Working Group (IRD Working Group) recommending requirements for internationalized registration data. The Report proposes internationalization requirements for twelve categories of data elements currently outputted by the various gTLD registration data directory services.

**Comment Period Closes:** 21 April 2015, 23:59 UTC

#### [Rights Protection Mechanisms Review Draft Report](#)

This public comment proceeding asks for community input on a draft report to provide an initial assessment of the effectiveness of the rights protection safeguards put in place to mitigate potential issues in the New gTLD Program.

**Comment Period Closes:** 1 May 2015, 23:59 UTC

#### [ICANN Draft FY16 Operating Plan & Budget](#)

Focusing on ICANN's commitment to the multi-stakeholder model, the ICANN Draft FY16 Operating Plan & Budget is provided for community discussion and public comment. ICANN is seeking general feedback on this plan, which implements the first year of ICANN's Draft Five-Year Operating Plan, in support of the Five-Year Strategic Plan (approved by the Board in October 2014).

**Comment Period Closes:** 1 May 2015, 23:59 UTC

#### [Proposed Implementation of GNSO PDP Recommendations on Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy \(IRTP\) Part C](#)

The public comment proceeding seeks to obtain community input on the proposed implementation of the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Policy Development Process (PDP) recommendations on the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) Part C.

**Comment Period Closes:** 9 May 2015, 23:59 UTC

## [Release of Country and Territory Names within the .HONDA, .AXA, .EPSON, .HSBC, .XYZ and .COLLEGE TLDs](#)

This public comment period aims to gather community input on proposed amendments to the .HONDA, .AXA, .EPSON, .HSBC, .XYZ and .COLLEGE Registry Agreements.

**Comment Period Closes:** 13 May 2015, 23:59 UTC

At any time, the full list of issues open for public comment, plus recently closed and archived public comment proceedings can be found on the [Public Comment web page](#).

The staff also populates a web page to help preview potential “upcoming” public comment opportunities. This page – ["Public Comments - Upcoming" page](#) – provides information about potential future public comment opportunities. The page is updated after every ICANN Public Meeting to help individuals and the community to set priorities and plan their future workloads.

## Across SO/ACs

### GAC-GNSO Consultation Group Recommendations Concerning Issue Scoping Now Ready for Trial Run

#### At a Glance

The Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) and Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) have agreed to implement [the recommendations](#) of the GAC-GNSO Consultation Group on GAC early engagement in the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) concerning issue scoping on a trial basis. Among other things, the recommendations include the formation of a GAC Quick Look Committee to provide an early indication of whether or not an issue subject to GNSO policy development is expected to raise public policy concerns.

#### Recent Developments

The Consultation Group (CG) comprises equal numbers of representatives from each of the GAC and the GNSO for a total number of approximately 12 active members. The work is divided into two work streams, the first concentrating on Mechanisms for day to day co-operation and the second on the detail options for GAC engagement in the GNSO policy development process (PDP).

The CG developed a set of preliminary [recommendations](#) for issue scoping, which includes the formation of a GAC Quick Look Committee to provide an early indication of whether or not an issue subject to GNSO policy development is expected to raise public policy concerns which were reviewed by the GAC and GNSO during the ICANN52. Based on that review, the

GAC and GNSO have agreed to implement the recommendations on a trial basis for a minimum of 3 consecutive GNSO PDP's.

### **Next Steps**

Following the end of this trial period, the CG is expected to report back to the GAC and GNSO Council on the effectiveness of these recommendations. Furthermore, the CG is expected to make a recommendation whether or not the preliminary recommendations concerning the issue scoping phase of the PDP should be permanently implemented, either in their current form, or with possible modifications based on the further work of the CG (including experience gained during the trial).

### **Background**

The launch of the GAC-GNSO Consultation Group on Early Engagement was the result of discussions between the two entities at the ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires in 2013 and prior meetings, reflecting a joint desire to explore and enhance ways of early engagement on GNSO policy development activities. The issue was also specifically identified by both Accountability and Transparency Review Teams (ATRT).

The GAC plays a key role in providing advice to the ICANN Board 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 Public 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.

The GNSO is responsible for developing policies for generic Top-Level Domains (e.g., .com, .org, .biz). The GNSO strives to keep gTLDs operating in a fair, orderly fashion across one global Internet, while promoting innovation and competition. The GNSO uses the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) to develop policy recommendations which are submitted to the ICANN Board for its consideration.

### **More Information**

- PDP Issue Scoping Recommendations: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/gac-cg-issue-scoping-27jan15-en.pdf>
- Consultation Group Wiki: <https://community.icann.org/x/phPRAg>
- Mailing List Archives: <http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gac-gns0-cg/>
- Consultation Group Charter: <https://community.icann.org/x/PyLRAg>

### **Staff Contact**

[Marika Konings](#), Senior Policy Director and Team Leader for the GNSO

## Address Supporting Organization (ASO)

### LACNIC Public Policy Forum Chair: Internet Policies Require Greater Community Involvement



Since its creation, LACNIC has promoted a self-regulation model based on rules and mechanisms established and developed by the regional community through public, open, and transparent participation processes.

The policies in place for managing Internet resources in Latin America and the Caribbean have been determined by consensus. This openness and distribution of functions has been possible thanks to stakeholder participation in LACNIC's policy development process, a key element of the organization's current operation and success.

LACNIC's Public Policy Forum is one of the organization's most valuable tools in the search for consensus. In this interview, Carlos Plasencia, chair of the Public Policy Forum, highlights the community's active participation and calls for greater involvement of new members to add to the group of "regulars" who usually propose and discuss most of the policies.

#### More Information

- [Interview with Carlos Plasencia](#)

#### ICANN Staff Contact

[Carlos Reyes](#), Senior Policy Analyst

---

## Regional Internet Registries Number Resource Policy Discussions

### At a Glance

Each of the five Regional Internet Registries (RIRs) has a web page that lists any and all Internet number resource policy proposals that are under discussion. Policy discussions take

place on open policy mailing lists and at Public Policy Meetings (list and meeting information is provided below).

These are some examples of Internet number resource policy and other discussions that took place recently on the RIR policy mailing lists and/or at meetings.

## **AFRINIC**

Proposal page: <http://www.afrinic.net/en/community/policy-development/policy-proposals/>

A new number policy allowing organizations to request an IPv4 /24 to use for anycast has been adopted and implementation is pending.

On 27 March 2015, AFRINIC's Board of Directors officially announced the appointment of Mr. Alan Barrett as the new Chief Executive Officer (CEO). Mr. Barrett replaces AFRINIC's founding CEO, Adiel A. Akplogan, and will assume the role on 20 April 2015 for an initial three-year term.

Read more about it at: <http://www.afrinic.net/en/library/news/1351-announcement-alan-barrett-appointed-as-afrinic-ceo>

## **APNIC**

Proposal page: <http://www.apnic.net/community/policy/proposals>

APNIC 39 took place 24 February-6 March in Fukuoka, Japan. The following three proposals were presented and discussed at the meeting:

- prop-115 - Registration of detailed assignment information in Whois database
- prop-114 - Modification in the ASN eligibility criteria
- prop-113 - Modification in the IPv4 eligibility criteria

The above proposals will continue to be discussed on the APNIC policy list. The following proposal was abandoned:

- prop-112 - On demand expansion of IPv6 address allocation size in legacy IPv6 space

Read the full conference report here <https://conference.apnic.net/39/report>

## **ARIN**

Proposal page: <https://www.arin.net/policy/proposals/>

There was continued discussion of a recently revised version of ARIN Draft 2014-1 "Out of Region Use." There were statements for and against this proposal.



ARIN-2014-17 “Change Utilization Requirements from last-allocation to total-aggregate” was recommended for adoption and sent to the ARIN Board for ratification.

## LACNIC

Proposal page: <http://www.lacnic.net/en/web/lacnic/politicas>

The LACNIC Board ratified a new policy (LAC-2014-2) which will modify the text describing the requirements for Autonomous System (AS) Numbers distribution to make the language more simple and clear; already implemented.

## RIPE

Proposal page: <http://www.ripe.net/ripe/policies/current-proposals/current-policy-proposals>

The RIPE community accepted proposals to allow the transfer of IPv6 addresses and Autonomous System (AS) Numbers within the RIPE NCC service region (2014-12 and 2014-13). Also accepted was a proposal that removed the IPv6 requirement when requesting a final /22 IPv4 allocation from the RIPE NCC (2014-04). The inter-RIR transfer policy proposal (2014-05) was moved to Last Call.

In an article examining its membership growth, the RIPE NCC reported that since it reached its last /8 of IPv4 address space, new LIRs were joining in ever-increasing numbers while older LIRs were closing. These combined trends drove membership growth while altering the demographics of the membership. The article can be found here: <https://labs.ripe.net/Members/wilhelm/ripe-ncc-membership-statistics-2014>.

## Next Steps

- AFRINIC 22, AIS15, and AfNog15 will be held 24 May-5 June, 2015 in Tunis, Tunisia
- APNIC 40 will be held 3-10 September, 2015 in Mega Kuningan, Indonesia
- ARIN 35 will be held 12-15 April, 2015 in San Francisco, California
- LACNIC 23 will be held 3-8 May, 2015 in Lima, Peru
- RIPE 70 will be held 11-15 May, 2015 in Amsterdam, The Netherlands

## More Information

- AFRINIC (RPD): <http://www.afrinic.net/en/community/email-a-mailing-lists>
- APNIC (Policy SIG): <http://www.apnic.net/community/participate/join-discussions>
- ARIN (PPML): [http://www.arin.net/ mailing\\_lists/index.html](http://www.arin.net/ mailing_lists/index.html)
- LACNIC (politicas): <http://www.lacnic.net/web/lacnic/lista-de-discusion>

- RIPE (address-policy-wg): <http://www.ripe.net/ripe/mail/ripe-mailing-lists/address-policy-wg>

## ICANN Staff Contact

[Carlos Reyes](#), Senior Policy Analyst

# Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO)

## ccNSO to Perform Internal Review of Rules and Guidelines

### At a Glance

The ccNSO Guideline Review Committee (GRC) will review the ccNSO guidelines on defining working groups, work plans, and procedures for ccNSO responses or statements.

### Recent Developments

The ccNSO GRC commenced its work in March 2015. Its first activity was to devise a working order to review, and if considered necessary, update internal ccNSO Guidelines. To prioritize its activities the GRC agreed to use the same, simple criteria as used to prioritize the work of the ccNSO:

- What is considered to be of “relative highest importance”, which is for this effort interpreted as having potentially the highest impact on the ccNSO
- What is considered to be most “urgent”, which is interpreted as the guideline with the highest level of potential flaws, gaps or other issues

Using these criteria, the set of guidelines around organizing the activities of the ccNSO have the highest priority and will provide the most value for the members and broader community.

The GRC will therefore first review the following set of Guidelines:

- Guidelines for ccNSO Working Groups,
- ccNSO Response and Statement Procedure Guideline and related timeline,
- Guideline Maintaining, Updating and Reviewing ccNSO Work plan (includes the Triage Committee)

## Next Steps

The GRC will review the aforementioned guidelines. The review will include an analysis of whether the guidelines still reflect current practice, identify potential gaps and issues, and if need be, propose changes to the ccNSO.

## Background

The ccNSO GRC was created in December 2014 and was tasked to review the current guidelines and to ascertain whether they reflect current practices and working methods, identify potential gaps, and based on this analysis, propose changes to the current guidelines to the Council, which includes developing a set of principles for ccNSO Guidelines.

The following guidelines are out of scope:

- ccNSO Guideline for Voluntary Contribution of ccTLDs to ICANN (<http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/council-decision-cctld-contributions-20nov13-en.pdf>)
- ccNSO Accountability Framework Guidelines (<http://ccnso.icann.org/announcements/announcement-06jan06.htm>)

## More Information

- Charter of the Committee: <http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/charter-grc-12mar15-en.pdf>
- Committee Workspace: <http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/grc.htm>
- Overview of ccNSO Internal Rules and Guidelines: <http://ccnso.icann.org/about/guidelines.htm>

## Staff Contact

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

---

# ccNSO Council Recommends Framework of Interpretation Implementation

## At a Glance

The ccNSO Council recommends the ICANN Board of Directors implement the Framework of Interpretation.

## Recent Developments

Following the adoption of the Framework of Interpretation (Fol) at ICANN 52, the ccNSO Council asked its chair and the former chair of the Framework of Interpretation Working Group (Fol WG) to recommend the implementation of the Fol to the ICANN Board. The Fol contains interpretations of current policy and guidelines related to “Consent”, “Significantly Interested Parties” (formerly known as Local Internet Community or LIC) and "Revocation and Transfer," which used to be known as re-delegations undertaken without the consent of the ccTLD manager. With the adoption of the Fol, the Fol WG was closed as well.

## Next Steps

The ccNSO Council indicated that the ccNSO stands ready to assist ICANN staff with its work on the implementation of the Fol.

## Background

The Fol WG was created by the ccNSO Council following the second recommendations of the Delegation and Re-delegation Working Group (DRD WG):

*The DRD WG recommends that, as a first step, the ccNSO Council undertake the development of 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 interpretations of the current policies, guidelines and procedures relating to the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs.*

*The results of the use of such a Framework of Interpretation should be formally monitored and evaluated by the ccNSO Council after a pre-determined period. If the results of this evaluation indicate that the Framework of Interpretation failed to provide logical and predictable outcomes in ICANN decision-making, the ccNSO Council should then launch PDPs on the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs.*

The objective of the Fol WG was to develop and propose a "Framework of Interpretation" for the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs. This framework would provide a clear guide to the IANA functions manager and the ICANN Board on interpretation of the current Policy Statements. Before sent to the ICANN Board of Directors, both the ccNSO and GAC need to adopt the Framework.

## More Information

- The Framework of Interpretation is available at: The ccNSO Council resolution can be found here: <http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/foi-final-07oct14-en.pdf>
- The Council resolution is available at: <http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/foi-final-resolutions-11feb15-en.pdf>

- The letter from the chair of the ccNSO and former co-chair can be found here: <http://ccnso.icann.org/node/46895>
- [More information on the Fol WG](#)

### **Staff Contact**

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

## **Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO)**

### **Milestones and Important Dates for the GNSO Structural Review**

#### **At a Glance**

The independent examiner appointed by the ICANN Board's Structural Improvements Committee (SIC) to perform a review of the GNSO organizational structure is expected to deliver its Draft Report in late April. The report will build on community discussions at ICANN 52, where a working text was shared with the GNSO Working Party and the wider community, as well as more formal feedback received following ICANN 52 from the Working Party and various GNSO Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies.

#### **Recent Developments**

Following community discussion at ICANN 52, the independent examiner (Westlake Governance Limited) shared its working text with the GNSO Working Party, and a follow up meeting was held in early March. The GNSO community was invited to provide feedback on factual inaccuracies and gaps in Westlake's working text. Several GNSO Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies provided feedback, as did the Working Party. Their input is intended to allow Westlake to correct any errors and finalize the contents of their Draft Report.

#### **Next Steps**

Westlake is due to deliver the Draft Report to the GNSO Working Party and update the SIC in late April. Following additional working sessions with the Working Party to finalize the text, the Draft Report is expected to be posted for public comment by ICANN 53. Following the public comment proceeding, Westlake will prepare a Final Report incorporating the feedback received.

#### **Background**

A periodic review of ICANN's structures, including the GNSO, is mandated by the ICANN Bylaws. In April 2014, the SIC (the Board committee responsible for oversight of ICANN structures) issued a Request for Proposals for an independent examiner to conduct a review of the organizational effectiveness of the GNSO. Westlake Governance Limited was selected

and requested to assess the effectiveness of structural changes to the GNSO that took place as a result of the previous review cycle.

An important component to this exercise is the provision of accurate and useful data to Westlake. To this end, a 360 Assessment based on specific criteria developed for this review was utilized, along with interviews with selected community leaders and members as well as staff. It also included review of ICANN records and documentation concerning the GNSO Council, the House structure with the various Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies, past and current GNSO Working Groups and the existing GNSO Operating Procedures. Westlake also worked with the GNSO Working Party, a group comprised of representatives from every GNSO Stakeholder Group and Constituency, which helped in designing the framework, questions and testing parameters for the survey.

178 completed responses were received to the 360 Assessment online survey tool, a 60% completion rate. Responses were received from GNSO community members as well as participants from other ICANN SO/ACs, the Board and staff. 40 in-person interviews were conducted, and 15 meetings were held with the Working Party.

One or two additional working sessions between Westlake and the GNSO Working Party are expected after the release of Westlake's Draft Report. Following the Working Party's feedback, the Draft Report will be published for public comment. The GNSO community will have a further opportunity to review the work through its review of the public comments received, prior to Westlake's preparing its Final Report for delivery to the SIC.

### **More Information**

- [GNSO Review Workspace \(including links to timelines and relevant background documentation and updates\)](#)

### **Staff Contact**

[Mary Wong](#), Senior Policy Director

---

## **GNSO Policy Development Pushes Forward with Key Issues**

### **At a Glance**

Both the ongoing IANA Stewardship Transition and the related work on Enhancing ICANN's Accountability are very important efforts and many GNSO volunteers are active contributors to these efforts; nonetheless the GNSO continues to also develop policy recommendations on issues that may be less prominent but not necessarily less important. Ongoing Policy Development Processes (PDPs) include Privacy and Proxy Accreditation Services Issues, IGO/INGO Access to Curative Rights Mechanisms, and Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information. In addition, the GNSO is taking the necessary preparatory steps for the

launch of one or more PDPs on New gTLD Subsequent Rounds and is expected to proceed shortly on the Board-initiated PDP on the Purpose of gTLD Registration Data.

### **Privacy and Proxy Accreditation Services Issues PDP**

A Working Group (WG) is working towards finalizing preliminary conclusions for the issues on which it has yet to reach consensus, including the complex issue of disclosure of privacy / proxy customer information. Once these discussions are completed, the Initial Report will be published for public comment.

- More Info: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/ppsa>

### **IGO and INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms PDP**

A WG is focusing its work on IGOs, as it has reached a preliminary conclusion that there is no compelling legal basis on which to provide INGOs in general with additional protections. The WG has sent a set of proposed questions stemming from the GAC's Los Angeles *communiqué* to the GAC, to facilitate GAC early engagement in this PDP. Similarly, a set of questions was sent to various IGOs. A response from the IGOs was received in mid-January and feedback from the GAC is expected soon.

- More Info: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/igo-ingo-crp-access>

### **Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP**

A WG published its Initial Report for [Public Comment](#), containing six recommendations opposing mandatory translation and/or transliteration of domain registration contact information. The WG has completed the review of comments and is currently preparing a first draft of its Final Report. The WG is aiming to complete its work in time for ICANN 53.

- More Info: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/transliteration-contact>

### **New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Discussion Group**

Discussion Group members have prepared a list of different issues that they identified with regard to the most recent new gTLD round which will need to be addressed before a subsequent round can commence. The Discussion Group is making considerable progress in finalizing an issues / recommendations matrix to help establish the scope and approach with regard to the PDP that is expected to follow next.

- More Info: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/non-pdp-new-gtld>

### **Purpose of gTLD Registration Data PDP**

Following ICANN 50, a Board-GNSO Process Group was formed to work out a proposed approach for dealing with the [Expert Working Group's Report](#) on gTLD Directory Services. The Process Group has prepared a [proposed framework document that can guide the PDP](#). The

next step is now for the Board to reconfirm its request for a Preliminary Issue Report on this topic.

- More Info: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/rds>

### More Information

The GNSO is involved in a number of other efforts, including cross community working groups and non-PDP Working Groups. For a full overview please visit the GNSO Active Project page: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/active>.

- Follow the GNSO on Twitter: [@ICANN\\_GNSO](https://twitter.com/ICANN_GNSO)

### Staff Contact

[Lars Hoffmann](#), Policy Specialist

## At-Large / At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

### ALAC Submits Three Statements

#### At a Glance

During this period, the ALAC submitted three Statements in response to ICANN public comment requests.

#### Recent Developments

##### [Potential Change to Registrar Accreditation Insurance Requirement](#)

- The evolution of Domain Name Industry (DNI) programs should adhere to the following principles: Registrant and user rights and expectations must not be lowered in order to increase DNI penetration; education at all levels is key to increasing demand and local suppliers; requirements placed on registrars should be reasonable based on local cost-of-living and related financial constraints; the insurance required for registrars is a real concern for underserved regions; the second round of the New Generic Top Level Domains (New gTLDs) program should give preference, if not exclusivity, to applicants from underserved regions, with adequate outreach efforts.
- In response to the five questions posted in the current Public Comment: 1) Registrant rights must be secured through the commercial general liability (CGL) insurance or any other mechanism(s); 2) No opinion; 3) If ICANN determines that a permanent fund reserved by ICANN and provided by the registrars based on their transaction volumes for covering any harm caused to registrants is a "best practice," registrants using registrars that do not follow the practice must NOT be disadvantaged; 4) If the CGL



requirement is maintained, the \$500,000 limit should be lowered to an amount that the registrar can demonstrate that it would still provide registrants reasonable compensation to cover potential losses; 5) If ICANN decides to eliminate the CGL requirement, it should be applied to all registrars and another mechanism should be put in place to protect registrant and user rights.

- The elimination of the CGL requirement could be the best way to support underserved regions to participate in the DNI. Registrant rights must be secured by another mechanism.

#### [IDN TLDs - LGR Procedure Implementation - Maximal Starting Repertoire Version 2](#)

- The ALAC notes that the inclusion of the six scripts added in the Maximal Starting Repertoire Version 2 (MSR-2) is expected to benefit several million end-users of the Internet, particularly from Developing Countries. The ALAC also notes that while some of the GPs (Generation Panels) are seated and active, others have been less active or inactive.
- It is important that the Internationalized Domain Name (IDN) program is harmonized (in terms of parameters such as technology dissemination, capacity building and outreach) with the Universal Acceptance Initiative (UAI). The ALAC also recommends that the UAI be utilized to ensure better community participation for the IDN program.
- MSR-2 is based on Unicode 7, but is limited to the Unicode 6.3 subset. Given the fact that Unicode 8.0 is scheduled for release in 2015, there may be questions from the community on the stability of the contents of MSR-2, particularly if the Generation Panels are to immediately commence their work based on MSR-2. The ALAC recommends that ICANN clarify the likely impact, if any, of changes to the underlying Unicode standard on MSR-2.
- Once MSR-2 becomes operational and provides the basis of Label Generation Rules Version 1 (LGR-1), and once IDNs start getting registered, it would not be possible to change the once-registered names (or add more protocol valid [PVALID] code-points to the MSR) without causing serious erosion of trust in the global Internet in general and IDNs in particular. The ALAC recommends extensive consultations with end-user and language communities to discuss the MSR-2 recommendations, as these have long-term ramifications.
- The ALAC assures its support to the IDN team in stimulating participation of end-user communities. The ALAC would welcome joint activities that involve At-Large Structures in relevant geographies.

#### [GNSO Policy & Implementation Initial Recommendations Report](#)

- The ALAC generally supports the proposed principles, particularly that they must be based on the ICANN Multistakeholder Model and that the policy development processes must function in a bottom up manner. ALAC particularly supports the recognition that implementation is an integral and continuing part of the policy process that should allow for on-going dialogue and collaboration with all stakeholders particularly including users.
- The one concern of the ALAC is with the principles that apply to Policy and Implementation, specifically when new or additional policy issues are introduced in the implementation process. Those issues should rightly be referred back to the Chartering Organization. But because those new issues may well include policy issues that involve public interest issues, resolution of the new issues must involve all impacted stakeholders, including those who can represent public interest aspects of the issue. However, the ALAC does have concerns about the ability of the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) to effectively address such issues where the desired outcomes of contracted parties are in direct conflict with those that support the public interest and Internet users.
- The ALAC generally supports the introduction of new processes that may be able to deal with some matters in a more appropriate way. However, in more complex implementation processes, reference of issues back to the GNSO may have the overall effect of creating a very long implementation period. ALAC suggests, therefore, stress testing to better understand the effect of the changes, and that the changes should be reviewed within a reasonably short space of time to ensure they have achieved their goal of better, and potentially speedier, responses to issues.

### **Next Steps**

- [Draft Report: Rights Protection Mechanisms Review](#) – ALAC drafting a Statement
- [Internationalized Registration Data Expert Working Group Draft Final Report](#) – ALAC considering drafting a Statement
- [ICANN Draft FY16 Operating Plan & Budget](#) – ALAC considering drafting a Statement
- [Proposed Implementation of GNSO PDP Recommendations on Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy \(IRTP\) Part C](#) – ALAC considering drafting a Statement

### **More Information**

- [At-Large Policy Development page](#)

### **Staff Contact**

[Xinyue \(Ariel\) Liang](#), At-Large Policy Coordinator

---

## RALO Round Up

### At a Glance

The five Regional At-Large Organizations (RALOs) have been increasingly working on some common activities. Among them are the At-Large Review and regional surveys of their At-Large Structures (ALSes).

The At-Large Review process, an integral part of the SO/AC organizational development, has started. The At-Large Review will focus primarily on the RALOs and ALSes as well as the status of the ALAC/At-Large Improvements that were derived from the previous ALAC Review. The [At-Large Review Working Party](#) was formed and the first step is developing survey questions for the 360 Review.

- For further details see [Workspace](#).

The RALOs completed the professional capabilities survey in compliance with [ATLAS II Recommendation 28](#). "The ALAC should work with all RALOs and ALSes to map the current expertise and interests in their membership, to identify Subject Matter Experts and facilitate policy communication".

- See [Workspace](#) for details. The RALOs Secretariats will hold a teleconference to analyze the data gathered to discuss next steps. They will present the results during ICANN 53.

### Recent RALO Developments

#### AFRALO

AFRALO held its monthly teleconference on 1 April 2015. Items discussed included the [IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group \(ICG\)](#), [Cross-Community Working Group to Develop an IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal on Naming Related Functions \(CWG-Stewardship\)](#); the [Cross-Community Working Group on ICANN Accountability \(CCWG-Accountability\)](#); and the Discussion Group on New gTLDs and future rounds among other issues. See [Agenda](#) for details.

AFRALO's Taskforce: "[Outreach for more African representation in ICANN leadership positions](#)" met on [06 April 2015](#). The Taskforce agreed to prepare a final report on achievements of this WG, which will be presented to AFRALO members with recommendations moving forward. Among the recommendations is a proposal to create a permanent working group on this topic.

#### APRALO

APRALO members continue carrying out activities under the [APAC Hub-APRALO Framework](#) being implemented in collaboration and with full synergy between APRALO-APAC Hub and ICANN staff supporting both groups. The first Webinar

APRALO-APAC Hub Webinar on the topic of: *What are IDNs and what does it mean to you?* was held 9 April 2015 and was the start for the APRALO Capacity Building Webinar Series. The webinar was held in an interactive fashion, with a Q&A session and a survey distributed to evaluate its results and provide feedback.

## EURALO

Several EURALO members are involved in the planning process for the [EuroDIG 2015, “Shaping the Internet Together”](#), in Sofia, Bulgaria, in June. EURALO decided to request funding under the CROPP program for five members to attend EURODIG.

## LACRALO

[The Buenos Aires Showcase working group](#) has started preparations for the LACRALO Showcase at ICANN 53. Members are looking for sponsors to fund some of the expenses.

LACRALO leaders have submitted a CROPP proposal for two members to attend a conference, “Forum for Entrepreneurs and Information Technology leaders” in Cuba in May 2015. The draft proposal can be found at <https://community.icann.org/display/croppfy15/LACRALO+Trip+Proposal+1+DRAFT>. FELTI website is <http://www.felti.org/>

## NARALO

Two NARALO members received CROPP funding to attend the Non-Profit Technology Conference (NTEN) from 3-6 March, 2015 in Austin, Texas. NTEN is the world's largest gathering of technologists working in the non-profit sector, a prime target for people who both would understand ICANN and the benefits of participation/advocacy. The objective of NARALO’s participation was to encourage technologists attending NTEN to participate in ICANN and for NARALO to obtain materials and knowledge useful in capacity building for NARALO and ALSes. Web Accessibility sessions were among the sessions attended. NARALO members engaged with dozens of vendors and hundreds of participants during sessions and socials events. See [the workspace](#) for further details.

## More Information

- [Regional At-Large Organizations](#)

## Staff Contact

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

---

## Two New At-Large Structures Accredited

### At a Glance

As of 7 April 2015, 185 At-Large Structures (ALSes) make up the backbone of the At-Large community and more specifically of the Regional At-Large Organizations (RALOs). We continue to observe an increase in demands for At-Large Structures, triggered by last year's Second At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) events and by efficient community/ staff collaboration towards effective outreach.

### Recent Developments

Over the past two months, two new organizations became accredited ALSes.

- [ISOC Delhi](#) became part of Asian, Australasian and Pacific Islands Regional At-Large Organization (APRALO) on 6 March 2015. It is a non-profit, user-focused, membership-driven organization providing leadership in Internet-related standards, education and policy. Membership is diverse and includes people from academic, business/professional, technical, civil society and government backgrounds in addition to private end-users.
- [ISOC Palestine](#) also became part of APRALO in early March. One of the organization's main aims is to enhance cooperation with ICANN and provide more evidence to ICANN in Palestine, especially in universities and governmental/nongovernmental organizations.

### Next Steps

Many potential ALSes are currently in the accreditation pipeline, either undergoing due diligence (High Tech Centre for Nigerian Women and Youths and IEEE Nicaragua), or being discussed by RALO leadership who will provide positive or negative regional advice regarding the application (ISOC TRV and ISOC Korea – APRALO; ISOC Russia – EURALO and Association Haitienne des Internautes- LACRALO).

### Background

One of the main focuses of the RALOs is, and always has been, outreach. RALO leaders and staff work collaboratively to ensure that organizations or associations across the world with similar goals to those of the ICANN community know about At-Large and are motivated to be part of it. In order to manage this, they need to gain the accredited At-Large Structure status.

### More Information

- [Status of At-Large Structure applications](#)
- [Why register as an At-Large Structure?](#)

## Staff Contact

[Nathalie Peregrine](#), Secretariat Operations Coordinator, At-Large & GNSO

---

## At-Large Website Revamp Enters Development Phase

### At a Glance

The At-Large Website Revamp project just entered the development phase. During ICANN 52, the At-Large community was given a flavor of the new site through a review of several HTML pages prepared by ICANN staff. Currently, ICANN staff members are working to map out the development of additional HTML pages. At the same time, ICANN's technical experts are building a new Content Management System (CMS) that allows future users of the website to create and update content.

### Recent Developments

In the run up to ICANN 52, ICANN staff, in consultation with the At-Large Revamp Website Taskforce, developed the framework for the At-Large website. During ICANN 52 ICANN staff leading the At-Large Website Revamp project presented several [HTML pages](#) of the future website to the community. In addition to offering positive feedback, community members commented on the information accessibility, responsiveness, and other functionality of the site. The HTML pages, as well as other key deliverables including wireframes and a style guide have been published on the [At-Large Website Revamp Taskforce wiki workspace](#) and are open for community input.

The ICANN Communications staff also recently filmed six At-Large community leaders who spoke about ICANN policy issues, ranging from internationalized domain names to the IANA Stewardship Transition. Those videos will be published on the "[Topic](#)" page of the revamped At-Large website to complement the written background text that helps introduce newcomers to those issues.

Following ICANN 52, At-Large staff worked collaboratively with ICANN's web product team to develop a user story map that outlines the system features, content needs, and admin requirements for each main page. Developers will continue building new HTML pages based on the prioritization of those items. Concurrently, the web product team is in the process of identifying an effective Content Management System (CMS) that meets those features, needs, and requirements.

### Next Steps

The At-Large Website Revamp Taskforce aims to meet again this month to review the recent development of the website. Later in April, a community-wide webinar will be held to solicit further feedback.

The timetable for rolling out the Beta Prototype and launching the official public website will be largely determined by the progress on the CMS. One goal is to present the “pre-alpha” version of the new At-Large website at ICANN 53.

### **Staff Contact**

[Xinyue \(Ariel\) Liang](#), At-Large Policy Coordinator

## **Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC)**

### **GAC Prepares for ICANN 53**

#### **At a Glance**

For its next face-to-face meeting at ICANN 53, the GAC is prioritizing IANA Stewardship Transition and Enhancing ICANN Accountability matters, while also planning to address topics brought up by GAC Working Groups, internal matters and residual issues as well as future aspects regarding new gTLDs.

#### **Recent Developments**

Following the recent CCWG-Accountability and CWG-Stewardship meetings in Istanbul, the GAC has continued ongoing discussions about developments and the way forward for the IANA Stewardship Transition and ICANN Accountability processes. For details on the GAC’s involvement in the Accountability process, please [see article below](#). This is clearly identified as a high-priority matter for ICANN 53.

#### **Next Steps**

The GAC is currently working on finalizing the agenda for its face-to-face meeting at ICANN 53.

In addition to the highly prioritized IANA Stewardship Transition and Enhancing ICANN Accountability processes, the GAC will also be focusing on the activities of its Working Groups such as the Working Groups on Human Rights and International Law, on Underserved Regions, and on Public Safety.

GAC internal matters on the foreseen agenda include a review of the GAC Operating Principles, implementation of GAC-related ATRT2 recommendations, preparations for adapting to the new ICANN meeting structure and planning for the Dublin meeting in October 2015, including a call for candidates for the election of GAC Vice-Chairs in Dublin.

#### **More Information**

- [GAC website](#)

## Staff Contact

[Olof Nordling](#), Senior Director, GAC Relations

[Karine Perset](#), GAC Relations Advisor

[Julia Charvolen](#), Coordinator, GAC Services

---

## Next High-Level Government Meeting Scheduled for ICANN 55

### At a Glance

The Moroccan government will host a High-Level Government Meeting (HLGM) at ICANN 55. This will be the first time such a meeting is organized in Africa. Internet development in Africa and related public policies are topics likely to be included in the agenda.

### Recent Developments

In February 2016, the Kingdom of Morocco will host an HLGM during ICANN 55 in Marrakech. As to potential themes for the meeting, early discussions have brought up training, capacity building and how to encourage African engagement in ICANN and on Internet issues in general.

This will be the third such meeting in ICANN's history and the first on the African continent. Previous HLGMs have been hosted by Canada in 2012 and the United Kingdom in 2014. The second Accountability and Transparency Team (ATRT2) recommended that HLGMs be organized every two years in order to engage governments in the public policy aspects of ICANN's work and to familiarize high-level officials with current opportunities and challenges as well as with ICANN's role in the Internet ecosystem. Also governments from countries that are not yet GAC Members are invited to each HLGM, an aspect that has usefully contributed to an increase in GAC membership.

### Next Steps

The GAC is starting to plan activities that will feed into the agenda and outcomes of the HLGM, with a first discussion on the agenda for the next GAC meeting at ICANN 53. Leading up to ICANN 55, ICANN is concurrently stepping up its engagement in Africa with increased participation in African regional and continental ICT meetings and a workshop for African telecom regulators at ICANN 55 (the "NewGen Program").

### More Information

- [GAC Guidelines for High Level Government Meetings](#)
- [ICANN African Community](#)



- [Communauté Africaine de Icann](#) (en français)
- [GAC website](#)

### **Staff Contact**

[Olof Nordling](#), Senior Director, GAC Relations

[Karine Perset](#), GAC Relations Advisor

[Julia Charvolen](#), Coordinator, GAC Services

---

## **GAC Input to the CCWG on ICANN Accountability**

### **At a Glance**

Since ICANN 52, the GAC has developed a set of high-level principles to help guide the work of the CCWG-Accountability. This set was provided as input to the CCWG-Accountability meeting in Istanbul in March.

### **Recent Developments**

Some principles that the GAC articulated for ICANN's accountability include:

- The need for ICANN to have a concise and limited mandate;
- To enhance Internet security, stability, reliability and global interoperability; and
- To guarantee transparent multistakeholder policy development processes.

The GAC also highlighted the need for ICANN to have appropriate checks and balances, and to commit to the global public interest and to respect principles of international law, human rights, and national laws. The GAC further emphasized the importance of ICANN continuously seeking to improve its review, reconsideration and redress mechanisms, and of considering the implications of differences in jurisdictions among the actors involved.

A number of GAC members participated in the meeting of the CCWG-Accountability in Istanbul in late March, where a draft proposal was advanced. An aspect of the proposal that the GAC is likely to closely consider is the role of governments as part of an empowered community. As the CCWG-Accountability proposes to strengthen ICANN's independent reviews by incorporating them into ICANN's bylaws, another important question for the GAC will be governments' role in appointing review team members.

Two of the stress tests foreseen are also most relevant to the GAC, notably what would happen if the GAC were to modify its current consensus definition and whether ICANN could

resist government requests that deviate from established policies, for example regarding ccTLD delegation matters. Accountability measures have been brought up to address the latter scenario, for example an Independent Appeals Process.

### Next Steps

As one of the Chartering Organizations for the CCWG-Accountability, the GAC is considering the substance of the draft proposal to enhance ICANN's accountability as well as how it may participate in new accountability mechanisms proposed.

### More Information

- [Letter from Thomas Schneider, GAC Chair, to CCWG Co-Chairs \(23 March 2015\)](#)
- [CCWG on Enhancing ICANN Accountability](#)
- [Stress Tests Work Party draft documents](#)
- [Statement from the CCWG Co-Chairs following the Istanbul meeting](#)

### Staff Contact

[Olof Nordling](#), Senior Director, GAC Relations

[Karine Perset](#), GAC Relations Advisor

[Julia Charvolen](#), Coordinator, GAC Services

## Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

### RSSAC Caucus Convenes at IETF 92

The RSSAC Caucus held a meeting at IETF 92 in Dallas, Texas on 22 March 2015. RSSAC Co-Chair Lars-Johan Liman (I-Root) presided over the meeting of about 50 DNS experts from around the world.

Kevin Jones (E-Root) provided an overview of the recent RSSAC restructure while Terry Manderson (L-Root) reviewed “RSSAC 001: Service Expectations of Root Servers,” and Jim Martin (F-Root) reviewed “RSSAC 002: Measurements of the Root Server System,” providing an update on implementation of the recommendations.

Duane Wessels (Root Zone Maintainer Liaison) briefed the Caucus on the activities and remaining tasks for the TTL Work Party. Finally, the Caucus also discussed future work items for the group as proposed by various members.

The Caucus continues to accept new members and will remain engaged in the ICANN community as it identifies and evaluates projects and priorities with the RSSAC.

### **More Information**

- [RSSAC Caucus](#)
- [RSSAC Publications](#)

### **Staff Contact**

[Carlos Reyes](#), Senior Policy Analyst

###