



**POLICY UPDATE**

**Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers**

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

**Volume 09, Issue 08 – August 2009**

## **Across ICANN**

[Policy-Related Issues Currently Open for Public Comment](#)

## **ccNSO**

[ccTLD Delegation / Redelegation Working Group Launches](#)

[Cocos Islands Arrive as Member 95](#)

[Last Call Issued for DNSSEC Survey](#)

## **GNSO**

[Board Approves GNSO Stakeholder Group Charters,  
Looks toward Seating New Council in Seoul](#)

[GNSO Council Charters New Working Group on  
Inter-Registrar Transfer Policies](#)

[Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery Working Group Begins  
Deliberations](#)

[Registration Abuse Policies Group Defines the Problem](#)

[Fast Flux Group Publishes Final Report](#)

## **ASO**

[RIRs Progress on Global Policy Proposal for Recovered IPv4  
Addresses](#)

## Joint Efforts

[Cross-Community Geographic Regions Review Publishes Initial Report for Public Input](#)

[New GNSO/SSAC Group to Explore Feasibility of Internationalized Whois](#)

[Joint GNSO/ALAC Working Group to Draft Registrant Rights](#)

## SSAC

[SSAC Recommends Measures to Protect Domain Registration Services from Misuse](#)

## At-Large

[At-Large Annual Elections Are Underway](#)

[At-Large Continues Analyzing, Advising on Record Number of Policy Issues](#)

---

## Read *Policy Update* in Your Preferred Language

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

### [ICANN Policy Update statement of purpose](#)

Send questions, comments and suggestions to: [policy-staff@icann.org](mailto:policy-staff@icann.org).

## What's on the Calendar for Today?

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

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

## Across ICANN

---

### Policy Issues Currently Open for Comment

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

- [Initial Report of Geographic Regions Review Working Group](#). The ICANN Bylaws currently define five geographic regions. Are the criteria for assigning geopolitical entities to an ICANN Geographic Region resulting in fair, consistent, yet appropriately diverse representation in ICANN? Comment period closes on 4 September 2009.
- [Proposed Bylaw Changes to Improve Accountability](#). The latest step in the Improving Institutional Confidence process. Comment period closes 25 September 2009.

### More Information

For the full list of issues open for public comment, as well as a list of recently closed and archived public comment forums, refer to the [Public Comments](#) page.

---

## ccTLD Delegation / Redelegation Working Group Launches

### At a Glance

*The country code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO) created a new working group to advise them on launching a policy development process on the delegation, re-delegation and retirement of ccTLDs.*

### Recent Developments

The ccNSO has officially chartered a working group to consider these issues. The group is in its beginning stages, but you can read its charter and see the names of members (and in the near future, find updated material) on the working group's [wiki page](#).

### Next Steps

The working group will begin their deliberations.

### Background

Currently, the ICANN policy and practices for delegation and re-delegation are reflected in established [IANA](#) processes. In carrying out these processes, IANA follows the [ISO 3166-1 list of country-codes published by the ISO 3166 Maintenance Agency](#). For more information about establishing new ccTLDs, see the IANA's Procedures for Establishing ccTLDs and [IANA's delegation reports](#).

*Re-delegation* of ccTLDs refers to the process of changing the designated manager(s) of a ccTLD. This process is conducted according to the principles described in [ICP-1](#) and [RFC 1591](#). The policy and process are also reflected in IANA reports that illustrate many of the considerations made in deciding whether or not to re-delegate.

In light of the changed environment and circumstances since RFC 1591 was last revised in 1999, the ccNSO considered it time to review the current policies. The ccNSO wants a better understanding of any issues relating to the current policies, before taking possible further steps.

### More Information

<http://www.ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/drwdwg.htm>

## Staff Contact

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

---

## Cocos Islands Arrive as Member 95

### At a Glance

*The country code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO) welcomes a new member.*

### Recent Developments

The Cocos (Keeling) Islands, using the country code .cc, applied to join the ccNSO. The ccNSO Council approved the application at their meeting on 24 August, making Cocos Islands the 95<sup>th</sup> [member of the ccNSO](#).

### More information

- List of all ccNSO members: <http://ccnso.icann.org/about/members.htm>
- Application Archives: <http://ccnso.icann.org/applications/summary-date.shtml>
- Application Form: <http://ccnso.icann.org/applications/form.htm>

## Staff Contact

[Gabriella Schitteck](#), ccNSO Secretariat

---

## Last Call Issued for DNSSEC Survey

### At a Glance

*DNSSEC could make a major difference to the security and stability of the Internet. But does the Internet community understand and embrace what DNSSEC offers? To answer this question, the ccNSO Council re-launched a ccNSO DNSSEC Survey first conducted in 2007.*

### Recent Developments

This survey of country code registries will close just days from now (in early September), so appropriate parties are encouraged to [take the survey](#).

Results will be compared to the survey findings from 2007, which indicated that merely 7% of country code registries had implemented DNSSEC at that time. In the same survey, 85% of participants said that they planned to implement DNSSEC. The new survey will reveal how many have done so in the intervening two years.

## Background

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

## More Information

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

## Staff Contact

[Gabriella Schitteck](#), ccNSO Secretariat

# GNSO

---

## Board Approves GNSO Stakeholder Group Charters

### Looks toward Seating New Council in Seoul

#### At a Glance

*The Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) community is working to implement a comprehensive series of organizational and structural changes designed to improve the efficiency, effectiveness and accessibility of the organization. To become familiar with the GNSO's new structure and organization, please see the discussion and diagrams on the [GNSO Improvements webpage](#).*

#### Recent Developments

*New Stakeholder Groups Approved.* At its 30 July meeting, the ICANN Board passed an important milestone toward seating a new GNSO Council. The Board approved four new Stakeholder Group charters for the Registries Stakeholder Group, the Registrars Stakeholder Group, the Commercial Stakeholders Group (CSG) and the Non Commercial Stakeholders Group (NCSG). The charters for the CSG and the NCSG are transitional and will be subject to further community

review and discussion over the coming year as those groups transition to permanent structures.

*New GNSO Constituencies Discussed.* All four of the proposed new GNSO Constituency charters (CyberSafety, Consumers, City TLDs and IDNgTLD) have now been subject to full 30-day public comment forums. The Board discussed the proposals at its 30 July meeting and has asked Staff to conduct follow-up discussions with the various Constituency proponents to learn more about the various proposals.

*ICANN Bylaw Amendments Reviewed.* A 30-day Public Comment Forum on the recommended Bylaws Amendments necessary to implement the GNSO Restructuring concluded shortly before the 30 July Board meeting. A second 21-day Public Comment Forum on a revised package of amendments was initiated shortly after the Board meeting. [Community comments](#) on this second comprehensive package concluded on 24 August.

*New Process for Electing GNSO Board Seats #13 and #14 Approved.* At its 30 July meeting, the Board approved the original recommendation of the Working Group on GNSO Council Restructuring with respect to the election of Board seats #13 and #14. The Contracted Party House of the GNSO Council will nominate candidates for Board Seat #13 and select a Board member candidate by a 60% majority of that voting house. The Non-Contracted Party House will nominate candidates for Board Seat #14 and select a Board member candidate by a 60% majority of that voting house.

*Council and Work Team Implementation Efforts.* The Operations Steering Committee (OSC) and Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC), which were created by the GNSO Council, established five Work Teams that are staffed by volunteers from the GNSO and ALAC communities to develop specific proposals, processes and mechanisms for implementing the GNSO Improvement Recommendations endorsed and adopted by the Board. These Recommendations include improving the Policy Development Process (PDP); standardizing the Working Group model for GNSO Policy development; revising GNSO Council, Stakeholder Group, and Constituency processes and operations; and improving the various communications functions in the GNSO community to increase participation in policy development activities. Since March 2009 these five Work Teams have made significant progress on the following activities:

**Policy Process Efforts:**

1. [PDP Team](#)

The GNSO's PDP Work Team is developing a new policy development process (PDP) (including a report of proposed new bylaws, rules and procedures) that is better aligned with the contractual requirements of ICANN's consensus policies, expands early issue scoping and fact-finding prior to launch of a PDP, is more flexible and effective, and includes a

post-PDP assessment process to measure the effectiveness of policy recommendations. The team is meeting weekly and currently is discussing the 'proposal review and voting threshold' stage (stage two out of five policy development stages) and is expected to review shortly a first draft of the recommendations for the 'planning and initiation' stage (stage one out of five).

2. [Working Group Team](#)

The GNSO's Working Group Model Work Team is developing two new guidebooks that are targeted to separate audiences, as follows: 1) "Working Group Implementation and Charter Drafting Guidelines" is intended for sponsoring organizations such as the GNSO Council and will contain a comprehensive set of elements to be considered in creating, purposing, funding, staffing, and instructing a WG to accomplish the desired outcome. 2) "Working Group Operating Model Guidebook" is intended for leaders of working groups and will provide guidance on such elements as structuring, tasking, reporting, and delivering the outcome(s) as chartered. As of 6 July, both outlines have been completed and drafting has begun on both documents.

**Operations Efforts:**

1. The [GNSO Operations Work Team](#) completed a key task in July. It produced a document containing ideas for a revised GNSO Council structure relating to the Board recommendation to establish the Council as a "strategic manager of the policy process." At the end of July the team distributed the document to the Constituencies for comment. In addition, the Work Team has produced a draft "Statement of Interest"/"Declaration of Interest" policy document, currently under review by ICANN legal staff. Most importantly, however, the Work Team began developing a revised version of the GNSO Council Operating Procedures to reflect the ICANN Board's GNSO Improvement recommendations and incorporate draft amendments to the ICANN Bylaws. The Work Team agreed to revisions relating to key provisions, including the definition of a quorum and voting. The Work Team has decided to meet weekly during the month of August in order to finalize recommendations relating to the procedures as quickly as possible.
2. The GNSO [Constituency & Stakeholder Group Operations Work Team](#) is meeting biweekly and has established three Sub Teams to determine recommendations for best practices in the following areas: a framework for participation in any ICANN Constituency that is objective, standardized, and clearly stated; operating principles that are representative, open, transparent, and democratic; and creating and maintaining a database of all constituency members and others not formally a part of any constituency that is up-to-date and publicly accessible. In addition, the



Team is developing recommendations relating to the Board Recommendation for a “tool kit” of basic administrative, operational and technical services that could be made available to all Constituencies.

3. The GNSO [Communications Work Team](#) has drafted a set of Business Requirements to improve the GNSO website and, in a phased approach, address basic collaboration as well as limited document management capabilities that were identified as deficient in the Board’s Report on GNSO Improvements. The Work Team has submitted this document for review by the Operations Steering Committee. In addition, the team has made significant progress on back-end improvements to the GNSO website, including completing plans to migrate gns0.icann.org from a static design to a database/Drupal design that will be much more dynamic and adaptable. In addition, ICANN staff — in coordination with the Work Team — invited GNSO “power users” to be interviewed re: GNSO user experience with the goal to interview one dozen users in order to have a real-world basis for design decisions. The Work Team also is working on recommendations to enhance the GNSO’s ability to solicit meaningful community feedback. In addition, the Work Team is considering the current ICANN translation process for documents associated with policy development and recommendations to improve GNSO’s coordination with other ICANN structures.

### **Next Steps**

The Board, GNSO Council and community Work Teams are collectively resolving the critical path issues necessary to seat the newly structured GNSO Council at the Seoul, South Korea ICANN meeting in October 2009.

The Board is expected to discuss and resolve the Bylaws amendments to implement the GNSO Council restructuring at its 27 August meeting. In the meantime, the GNSO Council will work to complete its planning to ensure a smooth transition in Seoul. That work will include developing new Council operating procedures currently being reviewed by the GNSO Council Operations Work Team. Additional work will likely focus on the review of existing GNSO Constituency charters and dialogue with the proponents of the potential new GNSO Constituencies.

### **Background**

Through a series of decisions at its February, June, August and October 2008 meetings, the ICANN Board has endorsed a series of goals for improving several aspects of the GNSO’s structure and operations. These decisions are a culmination of a two-year effort of independent review, community input and Board deliberations. [Click here](#) for background details.

## More Information

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

## Staff Contact

[Robert Hoggarth, Senior Policy Director](#)

---

## GNSO Council Charters New Working Group on Inter-Registrar Transfer Policies

### At a Glance

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

### Recent Developments

As expected, at its meeting on 23 July, the GNSO Council chartered an IRTP Part B Working Group with the task of considering the following questions (as outlined in the issues report) and making recommendations to the GNSO Council:

- Whether a process for urgent return/resolution of a domain name should be developed, as discussed within the SSAC hijacking report ([PDF](#); see also <http://www.icann.org/correspondence/cole-to-tonkin-14mar05.htm>);
- Whether additional provisions on undoing inappropriate transfers are needed, especially with regard to disputes between a Registrant and Admin Contact (AC).;
- Whether special provisions are needed for a change of registrant when it occurs near the time of a change of registrar. The policy does not currently deal with change of registrant, which often figures in hijacking cases;
- Whether standards or best practices should be implemented regarding use of a Registrar Lock status (e.g. when it may/may not, should/should not be applied);
- Whether, and if so, how best to clarify denial reason #7: A domain name was already in 'lock status' provided that the Registrar provides a readily

accessible and reasonable means for the Registered Name Holder to remove the lock status.

The Council expects the Working Group to pursue the availability of further information from ICANN compliance Staff to understand how relevant elements of the existing Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy are enforced. The WG should also request compliance Staff to review any policy recommendations it develops and provide advice on how the recommendations may best be structured to ensure clarity and enforceability.

Following the adoption of the charter, a call for volunteers was launched (see the announcement's [PDF](#)).

### Next Steps

A first meeting of the IRTP Part B Working Group is expected to be held shortly. For further information, please consult the IRTP Part B Working Group Workspace on [https://st.icann.org/irtp-partb/index.cgi?irtp\\_part\\_b](https://st.icann.org/irtp-partb/index.cgi?irtp_part_b).

### Background

As part of a broader review of the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy, the first in a set of five distinct policy development processes (PDPs) has now been completed and a second one has begun. Click [here](#) for background details.

### More Information

- Public comment period  
<http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-2-09jan09-en.htm>
- Draft Advisory on how IRTP requirements apply to registrars  
<http://gns0.icann.org/issues/transfers/gns0-draft-transfer-advisory-14nov07.pdf>
- PDP Recommendations  
<http://gns0.icann.org/drafts/transfer-wg-recommendations-pdp-groupings-19mar08.pdf>
- Issues Report, Set A  
<http://gns0.icann.org/issues/transfers/transfer-issues-report-set-a-23may08.pdf>
- Charter Inter Registrar Transfer Policy -- Part A PDP Working Group  
[https://st.icann.org/gns0-council/index.cgi?irtp\\_pdp\\_a\\_wg\\_charter](https://st.icann.org/gns0-council/index.cgi?irtp_pdp_a_wg_charter)
- Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy  
<http://www.icann.org/en/transfers/>
- IRTP Part B Issues Report  
<http://gns0.icann.org/issues/transfers/irtp-report-b-15may09.pdf>

## Staff Contact

[Marika Konings](#), Policy Director

---

# GNSO's Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery Working Group Begins Deliberations

## At a Glance

*To what extent should registrants be able to reclaim their domain names after they expire? At issue is whether the current policies of registrars on the renewal, transfer and deletion of expired domain names are adequate.*

## Recent Developments

The GNSO Council adopted a charter for a Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery Working Group (PEDNR WG) at its meeting on 24 June in Sydney. Following the adoption of the charter, a call for volunteers was launched ([PDF](#)). In addition, a PEDNR workshop was held at the ICANN meeting in Sydney, enabling a first exchange of views with the broader ICANN community on the issues outlined in the charter above. (For a transcript and audio recording of the workshop, please see <http://syd.icann.org/node/3869>.)

## Next Steps

The Working Group has begun meeting and will continue meeting on a bi-weekly basis to discuss and address the questions outlined in its [charter](#). The Working Group is expected to organize an issue update / workshop at the Seoul meeting, in addition to providing an update to the GNSO Council. The Working Group should consider recommendations for best practices as well as -- or instead of -- recommendations for Consensus Policy.

## Background

During the ICANN meeting in Cairo, the ALAC voted to request an Issues Report on the subject of registrants being able to recover domain names after their formal expiration date. The ALAC request was submitted to the GNSO Council on 20 November 2008. ICANN Staff prepared the Issues Report on post-expiration domain name recovery and submitted it to the GNSO Council on 5 December 2008. ICANN Staff provided the GNSO Council with clarifications on the questions raised in a motion that was adopted at its 18 December meeting. The GNSO Council reviewed these clarifications during its meeting on 29 January and agreed to create a Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery drafting team to eventually propose a charter and to provide recommendations answering certain [questions](#).

## More Information

- GNSO Issues Report on Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery  
<http://gns0.icann.org/issues/post-expiration-recovery/report-05dec08.pdf>
- Translations of the GNSO Issues Report on Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery: <http://gns0.icann.org/policies/>
- ICANN Staff response to GNSO request for clarifications:  
<http://gns0.icann.org/mailling-lists/archives/council/msg06162.html>

## Staff Contact

[Marika Konings](#), Policy Director

---

# Registration Abuse Policies Group Defines the Problem

## At a Glance

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

## Recent Developments and Next Steps

The RAP Working Group is meeting on a bi-weekly basis to address the issues outlined in its charter, such as: the difference between registration abuse and domain name use abuse; the effectiveness of existing registration abuse policies; and which areas, if any, would be suitable for GNSO policy development to address registration abuse. Most recently, they have generated (and are reviewing) a document that provides working definitions of types and categories of abuse, and cites the primary target for each abuse type.

## Background

Click [here](#) for more details.

## More Information

- Registration Abuse Policies Issues Report, 29 October 2008:  
<http://gns0.icann.org/issues/registration-abuse/gns0-issues-report-registration-abuse-policies-29oct08.pdf>
- Translations of the Executive Summary of the Issues report:  
<http://gns0.icann.org/policies/>

- Registration Abuse Policies WG Charter:  
[https://st.icann.org/reg-abuse-wg/index.cgi?action=display\\_html;page\\_name=registration\\_abuse\\_policies\\_working\\_group](https://st.icann.org/reg-abuse-wg/index.cgi?action=display_html;page_name=registration_abuse_policies_working_group)
- Registration Abuse Policies Mexico City Workshop Transcript:  
<http://mex.icann.org/files/meetings/mexico2009/transcript-gnso-registration-abuse-policies-workshop-03mar09-en.txt>
- Registration Abuse Policies Working Group Workspace (Wiki):  
[https://st.icann.org/reg-abuse-wg/index.cgi?registration\\_abuse\\_policies\\_working\\_group](https://st.icann.org/reg-abuse-wg/index.cgi?registration_abuse_policies_working_group)
- Registration Abuse Policies WG Status Update -  
<http://gnso.icann.org/issues/registration-abuse/rap-wg-status-update-02jun09.pdf>

### Staff Contacts

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

---

## Fast Flux Group Publishes Final Report

### At a Glance

*Fast flux attacks refer to techniques used by cybercriminals to evade detection by rapidly modifying IP addresses and/or name servers. Though fast flux is notorious as a technique used maliciously, it also has legitimate uses. The GNSO is exploring appropriate action.*

### Recent Developments

The Fast Flux Hosting Working Group has now submitted its final report ([PDF](#)) providing answers to the questions posed by the GNSO Council. The group also developed a definition of fast flux attacks, to distinguish these from legitimate uses of fast flux; and compiled fast flux metrics, also in the report.

The Fast Flux Hosting Working Group has not made any recommendations for new consensus policy, nor changes to existing policy, but it has provided a number of ideas for next steps. These ideas include:

- Highlight which solutions / recommendations could be addressed by policy development, best practices and/or industry solutions
- Consider whether registration abuse policy provisions could address fast flux by empowering registries / registrars to take down a domain name involved in malicious or illegal fast flux

- Explore the development of a Fast Flux Data Reporting System
- Explore the possibility of ICANN as a best practices facilitator
- Explore the possibility to involve other stakeholders in the fast flux policy development process
- Redefine the issue and scope.

## Next Steps

The report will now be reviewed and discussed by the GNSO Council, which will decide on the next steps.

## Background

Following a SSAC Advisory on Fast Flux Hosting and an Issues Report, the GNSO Council launched a Policy Development Process (PDP) on Fast Flux Hosting in May 2008. The Working Group published its Initial Report in January 2009, which discusses a series of questions about fast flux hosting and the range of possible answers developed by Working Group members. The Report also outlines potential next steps for Council deliberation. These next steps may include further work items for the Working Group or policy recommendations for constituency and community review and comment, and for Council deliberation. For more details, see "[Background on Fast Flux Hosting](#)."

## More Information

- Fast Flux Hosting Final Report  
<http://gns0.icann.org/issues/fast-flux-hosting/fast-flux-final-report-06aug09-en.pdf>
- SSAC Report 025 on Fast Flux Hosting, January 2008  
<http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/ssac-documents.htm>
- Issues Report on Fast Flux Hosting, corrected 31 March 2008  
<http://gns0.icann.org/issues/fast-flux-hosting/gns0-issues-report-fast-flux-25mar08.pdf>
- Limited translations of the Issues Report on Fast Flux Hosting  
<http://gns0.icann.org/issues/>
- Fast Flux Hosting Initial Report  
<http://gns0.icann.org/issues/fast-flux-hosting/fast-flux-initial-report-26jan09.pdf>
- Limited translations of the Executive Summary of the Initial Report on Fast Flux Hosting  
<http://gns0.icann.org/issues/>
- Fast Flux Public Comment Forum  
<http://forum.icann.org/lists/fast-flux-initial-report/>

- Fast Flux Workspace (Wiki)  
[https://st.icann.org/pdp-wg-ff/index.cgi?fast\\_flux\\_pdp\\_wg](https://st.icann.org/pdp-wg-ff/index.cgi?fast_flux_pdp_wg)

## Staff Contact

[Marika Konings](#), Policy Director

# ASO

---

## RIRs Progress on Global Policy Proposal for Recovered IPv4 Addresses

### At a Glance

*Regional Internet Registries (RIRs) are currently discussing a proposed global policy for handling IPv4 address space returned from the RIRs to IANA. According to the proposal, IANA should act as a repository of returned address space and allocate such space to the RIRs in smaller blocks than it currently does, once the free pool of IANA IPv4 address space has been depleted.*

### Recent Developments

The RIRs discussed the proposal at their most recent meetings. APNIC has adopted the proposal, which has passed final call in AfriNIC and LACNIC. The proposal remains in the discussion stage in ARIN and RIPE.

### Next Steps

If adopted by all RIRs, the Number Resource Organization Executive Committee and the Address Supporting Organization Address Council (ASO AC) will review the proposal and then forward it to the ICANN Board for ratification and implementation by IANA.

A third update of the Background Report on recovered IPv4 addresses will be announced in September on the ICANN web site.

### Background

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



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

For more details, see "[Global Policy Proposal for Handling Recovered IPv4.](#)"

### **Next Steps**

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

### **More Information**

Background Report, updated 11 June 2009

<http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-12may09-en.htm>

### **Staff Contact**

[Olof Nordling, Director Services Relations](#)

## **Joint Groups**

---

### **Cross-Community Geographic Regions Review Publishes Initial Report for Community Input**

#### **At a Glance**

*The Geographic Regions Review Working Group has published its Initial Report for community review and comment.*

#### **Recent Developments**

After several months of dialogue between the Board and the Geographic Regions Working Group, the Board approved the group's proposed charter of work at its 26 June meeting in Sydney, Australia.

The Charter outlines a three-part process in which the working group first prepares an Initial Report outlining the current applications of ICANN's geographic regions in various ICANN structures and processes and confirming the issues to be addressed by the working group during its deliberations.

The Working Group completed its Initial report and it has been published in all six UN languages for community review and comment. A 35-day [public comment forum is now open](#) through 4 September 2009.

## Next Steps

At the end of this public comment period, the ICANN Staff will provide a summary and analysis of the comments submitted regarding the proposed charter document. That summary/analysis will be shared with the community and the Working Group.

According to the Charter, the Initial Report will be followed by an “Intermediate Report,” currently scheduled to be drafted and prepared by the October 2009 Seoul ICANN meeting. A third “Final Report” that will include the working group’s recommendations (if any) is currently scheduled to be published early next year. The Working Group will review the community input on the Initial Report to guide its deliberations and future work on the Intermediate Report and Final Report documents.

## Background

[“Background on Geographic Regions Working Group”](#)

## More Information

- ccNSO Working Group Final Report and Recommendations  
<http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/ccnso-final-report-regions-wg-240907.pdf>
- ICANN Board Resolutions: November 2007  
<http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-02nov07.htm>
- ICANN Board Resolutions; November 2008  
<http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-07nov08.htm>
- Approval of Geographic Regions WG Charter  
<http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-26jun09.htm - 1.2>
- Public Comment Forum on Initial Report of Working Group  
<http://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/public-comment-200909.html#geo-regions-review>

## Staff Contact

[Robert Hoggarth](#), Senior Policy Director

---

## New GNSO/SSAC Group to Explore Feasibility of Internationalized Whois

### At a Glance

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

### Recent Developments

From public comments and from the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC), suggestions in 2008 outlined two dozen areas worthy of study. These “hypotheses” have since been grouped into broad areas.

The first three study areas are: Whois Misuse; Whois data representation; and Whois proxy and privacy services. Staff is currently managing the preparation of RFPs so that research firms can quote the cost and feasibility of studying these areas. Part of the ongoing effort requires defining Terms of Reference (TOR), which are being prepared now. The goal is to post RFPs on the ICANN web site in time for the October international meeting in Seoul.

During June’s international meeting in Sydney, the ICANN Board passed a resolution asking the GNSO and the SSAC to form a joint Working Group, which would look at the feasibility of introducing display specifications so that the introduction of internationalized domain names (IDNs) and related non-ASCII registration data does not corrupt the accuracy of Whois. The community is in the early stages of convening this technical Working Group. The group will be soliciting input from other SOs and ACs, especially the GAC and ccNSO. The findings and output of this group may make further work unnecessary in the fourth broad area of study, the impact on Whois accuracy/readability of international characters (non-ASCII).

The fifth important study area, separately requested by the GNSO in May, would compile a list of Whois service requirements, based on previous policy discussions. Expect to see a study plan outlined in Seoul.

Staff intends to release study assessment information serially (as specific analyses on the individual study areas are complete). However, this work is an ongoing effort in which the initial feasibility assessments and cost determinations will take several months to complete. Staff will keep the GNSO Council informed of progress, so that the GNSO can then consider next steps.

## Background

The GNSO Council specified study areas related to Whois, involving data misuse, use of non-ASCII character sets, proxy and privacy services, and the provision of inaccurate information. [Click here](#) for background details.

## More Information

- SSAC 027: Comment to GNSO Regarding WHOIS Studies  
<http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac027.pdf>
- SSAC 033: Domain Name Registration and Information Services  
<http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac033.pdf>
- SSAC 038: Registrar Abuse Point of Contact  
<http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac038.pdf>
- GNSO WHOIS policy development page  
<http://gnso.icann.org/issues/whois/>
- IRTP Working Group A Final Report:  
<http://gnso.icann.org/issues/transfers/irtp-final-report-a-19mar09.pdf>
- GAC WHOIS study suggestions, 16 April 2008:  
<http://www.icann.org/correspondence/karlins-to-thrush-16apr08.pdf>
- WHOIS Study Hypothesis Report, 26 August 2008:  
<http://gnso.icann.org/issues/whois/whois-study-hypothesis-group-report-to-council-26aug08.pdf>
- The GNSO Council Motion in Mexico City, March 2009:  
[https://st.icann.org/gnso-council/index.cgi?04\\_mar\\_2009\\_motions](https://st.icann.org/gnso-council/index.cgi?04_mar_2009_motions)
- Motion on WHOIS Service Tools:  
[https://st.icann.org/gnso-council/index.cgi?07\\_may\\_motions](https://st.icann.org/gnso-council/index.cgi?07_may_motions)
- ICANN Board Resolution regarding display and usage of internationalized registration data, approved in Sydney, 26 June 2009:  
<http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-26jun09.htm#6>

## Staff Contact

[Liz Gasster](#), Senior Policy Counselor

---

## Joint GNSO/ALAC Working Group to Draft Registrant Rights

### At a Glance

*In order to be accredited by ICANN, registrars sign a Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) that commits them to certain performance standards. ICANN*

*community groups are drafting a charter identifying registrant rights and discussing amendments to the RAA.*

## **Recent Developments**

On 21 May 2009, the ICANN Board approved a new form of a Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) to be applicable to all registrars. The revised RAA, widely recognized by the Community as an improvement over the existing version of RAA, provides ICANN with additional compliance tools and provides registrants some extra protections. The RAA amendments received broad support among registrars in Sydney, where many registrars participated in a signing ceremony displaying their commitment to the new agreement.

## **Next Steps**

The GNSO is undertaking a further review of the RAA to identify even more amendments. To accomplish this review, a joint working group has been created with ALAC. This joint Working Group is expected to draft a Registrant Rights Charter, discuss further amendments to the RAA, and identify those on which further action may be desirable.

## **Background**

To learn more about this RAA-related working group, please see: <http://www.icann.org/en/topics/raa/>.

## **More Information**

The joint Working Group has just started, but when they post information, it will be on their [wiki page](#).

## **Staff Contacts**

[Margie Milam](#), Senior Policy Counselor

# SSAC

---

## **SSAC Recommends Measures to Protect Domain Registration Services from Misuse**

### **At a Glance**

*The Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) has numerous initiatives underway or recently completed, all intended to assure the security and stability of the Internet.*

## Recent Developments

SSAC has concluded its work on SAC040, Measures to Protect Domain Registration Services from Exploitation or Misuse. The report details major episodes of unauthorized access to domain accounts and malicious alteration of registration data to identify exploitable areas in current registration service models. It also describes measures that e-merchants, financial bodies, and enterprise intranets apply to mitigate certain exploits. Some GNSO Registrar Constituency (RC) members worked collaboratively with SSAC on this important issue, providing insightful and constructive comments to SAC040. The report will be issued later this month.

## Next Steps

On a separate issue -- SSAC and ICANN Staff are working in response to the Board of Director's resolution calling for the formation of a working group on internationalizing registration data. An SSAC member is preparing and will host a webinar to present the issues identified in [SAC037](#), "Display and Usage of Internationalized Registration Data," to all interested parties in September. With the community at large, members are also studying alternatives for collecting, storing and enabling display of registration data in local scripts.

## Background

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

## More Information

- Internationalizing Registration Information (Whois Data)  
<http://syd.icann.org/node/4159>
- SSAC Reports and Advisories  
<http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/ssac-documents.htm>

## Staff Contact

[Dave Piscitello](#) Senior Technology Specialist

# At-Large

---

## At-Large Annual Elections Are Underway

### At a Glance

*Each year around this time, the At-Large community elects its leaders for the forthcoming year, and appoints voting delegates to the ICANN Board's Nominating Committee. This process has an impact on the whole ICANN community.*

### Recent Developments

From August to the beginning of October, the At-Large community is engaging in a series of elections. Each of the five Regional At-Large Organizations (RALOs) is:

- Recommending nominees for the ALAC to consider for appointment to voting positions on the Nominating Committee (NomComm);
- Electing one member of the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC);
- Electing RALO Officers (Secretariat and in some regions a Chair and Vice-Chair);
- Proposing candidates for ALAC Board Liaison.

The ALAC will then vote on the slate of all candidates proposed by all RALOs. The ALAC also is:

- Appointing five Delegates (voting members) of the NomCom;
- Appointing the ALAC Liaison to the ICANN Board, from the list of candidates provided by the RALOs;
- Electing its Chair, two Vice-Chairs, and Rapporteur;
- Electing liaisons to the GNSO Council, ccNSO Council, IDN Policy, NCUC, and the SSAC.

### More Information

Complete information may be found at the [At-Large Elections 2009](#) page.

### Staff Contact

At-Large Secretariat at [staff@atlarge.icann.org](mailto:staff@atlarge.icann.org).

---

## At-Large Continues Analyzing, Advising on Record Number of Policy Issues

### At a Glance

*At-Large continues providing input on behalf of the individual Internet user community on a diverse range of issues. Thus far in 2009 they have already weighed in on an unprecedented number of issues.*

### Recent Developments

At-Large provided their official input into public consultations, referred to as Advisories to the Board of ICANN, on the following subjects in July and early August:

- Second Report of the Board Review Working Group
- IRT Working Group Final Report
- IDN Fast Track Implementation Plan v3
- Root Server System Scaling Study
- Bylaw Amendment related to Organizational Review Cycles and the Organizational Reviews Process

All official At-Large statements, including those above, may be found at <http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence>.

At-Large work also is underway on the following subjects:

- “Improving Institutional Confidence: The Way Forward” documents posted by the ICANN Staff; and the Bylaw Amendment Proposals related to the same.
- At-Large proposals for Improvements to the Public Consultation Process
- Initial Report of the Geographic Regions Working Group
- Proposed Meeting Dates for 2011-2013

### More Information

Complete information on the policy advice development schedule in At-Large, including links to draft statements, is always available in one place: <http://www.atlarge.icann.org/policycalendar>.

### Staff Contact

At-Large Secretariat at <mailto:staff@atlarge.icann.org>