

## **Pre-Buenos Aires Policy Update Webinar Thursday 11 June 2015 19:00 UTC**

Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

David Olive: Welcome, everybody, to the pre- ICANN 53 policy update Webinar. My name is David Olive, and I'm Vice President for police development supported ICANN, and General Manager of the ICANN regional headquarter hub in Istanbul, where I'm speaking to you today. The purpose of Webinar is to provide an update to you on policy and advisory developments and activities expected at ICANN 53 in Buenos Aires.

Members of the policy development support team will be presenting each update relating to the various community groups which they serve. And you may know many of them with you activities at ICANN and in policy development.

This Webinar will be recorded and transcribed. The link will be provided to you at the end of this presentation. So, you can refer back to the information that we have given you. As for questions, please type them in the chat during the presentation, and we'll try to answer them in real time; or at the end, we'll un-mute the phone so that you can ask your questions of us. In terms of the highlights for ICANN 53, I would just like to point out some of the days of interest.

On Monday, of course, the welcoming session. And at that session, the people who are going to be awarded the Ethos Award for our community service, will be honored at that session. Also in the afternoon, the community leaders are having a session on high interest topics. The topic is a framework of discussion for our best to use the proceeds from the new GTLD program. On Tuesday, of course, the stakeholders in constituency. They're busy in their various meetings.

And on that day, they also meet with the Board of Directors. Wednesday is the counsel day when many of the governing bodies of the groups have their formal meetings after many days of sessions in advance. And the GNSO, ccNSO and others will be doing that. We'll also have a (Lack Roulo) showcase on that day. And Thursday, they'll have a session on the CEO of succession process, the ICANN public forum, and then culminated by the ICANN public Board meeting. The primary role of ICANN, of course, is to coordinate policy development related to the global internet system of unique identifiers.

ICANN's open and transparent policy development mechanisms promote well informed decisions based on expert advice from a diversity of views from all out stakeholders, like you here participating today on our call. The role of the policy development team, of course, is to assist you in this work, to support you with information and briefings, and a Webinar such as this, as we manage the process for providing policy or advisory recommendations to our Board of Directors. Volunteer policy working groups form around these issues, consider them from many angles, making decisions by consensus whenever possible.

These working groups are open to everyone in the ICANN community, and all the discussions are documented so the public has a full access to the discussions and the debates. Of course, public comment is sought at several stages in the development process, to let interested community members provide their views on policy proposals, and to ensure that the policy

recommendations reflect the concerns and perspectives of the broader internet community.

Of course, who does all this? These are the supporting organizations, the address support organization, the country code name supporting organization, and the generic name supporting organization, begin the policy development process. And they are influenced by the advisory groups with their inputs and opinions. And these are, of course, the at-large advisory group, the governmental affairs, governmental advisory groups, excuse me, the group server system advisory committee, and the security and stability advisory committee. All of these are, of course, part of our official process and volunteers in the ICANN activities.

I would just like to point out that today was also a day for Webinars. And there were two Webinars held on the cross community working group on stewardship proposal, an update by the chairs. And I just would like to bring this to your attention, while they have taken place already, you can access their slides and the discussion at the information here on the slide. And that is also something that we'll be talking more about, obviously, in Buenos Aires as the various support organizations and advisory committees give their opinions, and talk about this important proposal.

With that, I will turn it over to members of the policy team to give you briefings about the activities expected at ICANN 53. And for the first one, I'll turn it over to Marika Konings, to talk about the generic name supporting organization.

Marika?

Marika Konings: Thank you very much, David. And hello everyone. Thank you for joining us today. So, my name is Marika Konings. I'm basically ICANN office in Brussels, and I'm a senior in policy development and team leader for the generic name supporting organization, also known as GNSO. So, a vision to the work that's ongoing in relation to the IANA stewardship transition proposal

that David was just speaking about, as well as enhancing ICANN accountability.

And there are also a number of other projects that the GNSO is working on, including over ten policy development processes, or PDPs in the various stages of their work. And it's not possible to cover all of these projects in the time that we've allocated for this Webinar. And our contribution will focus on those efforts that have reason to be achieved an important milestone, or for which decisions or next steps are expected to be considered during the ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires. So, for the first one of those, I'll hand it over to my colleague, Mary Wong. Mary?

Mary Wong: Thank you, Marika. And hello everybody, welcome to our Webinar. And as Marika says, we're going to focus on the milestones that some of our policy development processes and working groups have achieved. And the first concern is the privacy and proxy services accreditation issues PDP working group. And I'm happy to see a couple of our working group members here, who will no doubt keep me in line. But, I'm happy also to report that we have reached a milestone.

As you see the timeline here, that just a month ago, the group published its initial report after over 16 meetings, both by teleconference and in person, and published it for public comment, which will run through the ICANN Buenos Aires meeting, and close on the seventh of July. As everyone knows, I think, public comment is a very important part of the ICANN multi-stakeholder model. And in the GNSO PDP in particular, it does inform the working groups' deliberations. And in this particular working group, because we are in the initial report phase, we will be required to review all public comments received in preparing the final report.

And therefore, certain recommendations may well be updated or modified as a result of community input. The aim is to present the GNSO counsel with the final report before the Dublin meeting after the council takes a vote, assuming

that is adopted. Then, it will make its way to the Board for their review and adoption. So, I do encourage you in your groups to take a look at the initial report, and if possible, provide us with public comment. This is particularly because this topic has been of longstanding concern in the ICANN community.

The working group was actually chartered to develop policy recommendations on this topic, because this was a topic that, although it was identified as a topic during the last round of negotiations for the registrar accreditation agreement, this was not actually addressed in that set of negotiations, and was considered suitable for a PDP by the ICANN Board. IN this particular case, the working group has reached a number of very key preliminary recommendations on this topic of long standing concern.

Before I go into some of those, I would just like to remind those who may not have followed the work of either the negotiations on the RAA, which is of course the contract that binds ICANN and all our accredited registrars, or indeed the work of this working group.

That privacy and proxy service essentially provide a service where if you register a domain name, some or all of your contact details can be masked or hidden from what would otherwise be publicly available through the publicly accessible, who is GTLD directory. So, there are some of the key preliminary recommendations. And rather than go into all of them, as David noted earlier, these slides will be made available to everyone. And of course in our normal fashion, we have links on this slide deck to, in this case, the public comment forum, as well as the initial report itself.

I'll just highlight a couple of the points in this slide, in that the working group has made a number of recommendations that would apply to both privacy and proxy services, where there are some key differences in their functionality. But, the working group believes that for purposes of accreditation, by and large, they can be treated more or less alike. In the area

of contactability of a provider, this has been an issue that's been raised by some in the community, as needing to be addressed. Similarly on the other side, once you contact a provider, its responsiveness is important as well.

And these two perspectives obviously would come into play if someone wanted to report abuse of a registrar or holder of a domain name. So, there's been a set of recommendations formed around these concerns as well. And the third and fourth points I have on this slide concern two issues that is, you've been involved in the GNSO and ICANN for some time, you'll know that it's been under discussion for quite a while. And I'm pleased to report that the working group has made significant progress in proffering what I'd hope is a uniform set of principles, including a uniform set of definitions for some of the terms that are used in this context.

So for example, when there's a request to a privacy or a proxy service provider, that its customer identity or its customer contact details be revealed. The working group has tried to clarify what this means, and has asked for certain terms to be particularly published in the terms of service, to make it clear to both requestors as well as to customers, what the consequences might be. Similarly for relay, there is now a set of uniform recommendations concerning at least the initial forwarding of communications that are received electronically by a service provider to its customer. The last point that I want to raise on this slide is really the last bullet point, and it goes back to the question of disclosure of a customer's identity.

For the first time, there's a proposal that there be a framework that documents step by step, a process for a service provider to deal with the submission, the handling, and the response to a request for disclosure. Not from every single conceivable person or third-party. But, in this particular case, the framework is illustrative, and it's meant to apply to intellectual property rights holders, primarily trade mark and copyright owners. And like I said, this is the first time that a framework like this has been unveiled, and one open question remains, whether and how such a framework or these

types of suggestions might be applicable to other requestors for customer identity and contact details.

And on that note, it brings me to my next slide, where there are a number of open questions and issues on which the working group has yet to reach consensus. And as such, the working group will very much welcome your and your community's input. I've already noted one of them, which is the question of handling disclosure requests from different types of third parties. That's the last point on this slide. You'll see that the other two open issues, including the use of a privacy or proxy service, when it is a domain name that's associated with certain types of commercial activity.

And also, while the working group has developed a set of recommendations, as I noted, for the initial forwarding or relaying of a request by a provider to its customer, it has yet to reach consensus on what might need to happen next, if that request might need to be escalated. As I noted, there's some links here for further information. And I hope that you remember that the public comment period is open until the 7 of July. It might be useful to note that the working group will have a meeting and an open session in Buenos Aires, where as usual, remote participation facilities will be available. That's on Wednesday afternoon, local Argentina time.

You may also wish to note that in this public comment forum, because the initial report is fairly lengthy and there is quite a long number of recommendations, the working group has developed a template so that if it would make it easier for you to respond in template form, that's also been included in the public comment forum. So on that note and on that milestone, I'm going to hand you off to my colleagues, Julie Hedlund and Lars Hoffman, who will speak to you of a milestone reached by yet another of our PDP working groups. Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you so much, Mary. And thank you everyone for joining us. This is Julie Hedlund. And I'm going to talk briefly to you about the translation and

transliteration of contact information. PDP and in particular, as Mary noted, this group is winding down, and will shortly release its final report. And here, you can see on the next slide the charter questions.

And as you see, we are at the end of the time table. The charter questions are whether it's desirable to translate or transliterate contact information into a single common language. And who should decide who should bear the burden, transforming contact information to a single language?

You'll note that we are not in June of 2015, and the working group is going to shortly publish its final report, which will then go to the GNSO counsel for a vote. And in particular, I'll note that the working group has come to consensus on the it. And I will be shortly sending it in time for counsel consideration in Buenos Aires. Just some arguments opposing mandatory transformation that you see here. And I won't go over all of them. But, there are issues concerning accuracy and consistency, particularly in transforming scripts and languages.

And also, if you do want accurate translation, that may need to be done manually. There is also the issue of financial burden, and the possible negative impact on less developed regions that do not use Latin script. And then, the usability of transform data can be questionable. Some of the key recommendations in this final report. Number 1, that there should be no mandatory transformation. The working group recommends that it's not desirable to make transformation of contact information mandatory. And that any parties requiring transformation are free to do it ad hoc.

There are recommendations concerning the new RDS and identification script and language in line with the EWG on internationalized registration data. And the RDS is registration directory service database, and these should be capable of receiving input in the form of non-Latin script contact information. And the requesting data should be able to determine which script language it was submitted in. And Number 3, that data should be able to submitted in



language script, to used by the registrar. And that the registrars would determine which language is in scripts they support. And any of those can be used by registrars to submit their data.

This is important, as the burden of data verification remains with the registrars in line with the RAA, addition who is information policy, and all relevant consensus policy. For more information, you can see the links here on the slide. And the slides, as Mary noted, are also going to be available to all of you, so that you can gather more information is you like. And at this point, I'd like to turn things over to my colleague, Steve Chan. And he'll talk to you about new GTLD subscript procedures discussion group. Thank you.

Steve Chan: Thank you, Julie. My name is Steve Chan. I am based in the Los Angeles hub office. And I'm going to talk to you about the new GTLD subscript procedures discussion group. So, what triggered the initiation of this group? With the 2012 round well on its way towards completion with application submission process, the evaluation process, and the contention resolution largely complete, and with also over 600 TLDs already delegated, the communities felt that the analysis, and discussion, and review of the 2012 round and should begin immediately.

So, in June of 2014, the GNSO council adopted a resolution to create the new GTLD subsequent procedures discussion group. A group that is intended to discuss, debate, analyze, the 2012 round, and identify issues or subjects for a possible future issue report. And then subsequently, a future possible PDP, which could result in change or adjustments for subsequent procedures. And lastly, for the slide, I just wanted to note that there was broad participation across the supporting organization. Advisory committees, stakeholder groups, constituencies, which is invaluable in allowing all of these different groups to lend their respective and unique insights and experiences to the group.

So, the current status of this group, I'm happy to report that the discussion we had is finalized, it's set of deliverables. The set of three deliverables includes firstly an executive summary, which provides a couple brief sections on both the background and current program status. But more important, it also has a narrative explaining the deliberations of the group. The second document takes the issues that were identified by the discussion group members, and it attempts to assign or associate those issues, identified with principles, recommendations, or implementation guidance from the 2007 new GTLD final report.

And that's where applicable, because in some cases, they were unable to actually associate the issue with any of those groupings, which is actually a sign that possible it's an area for new policy work. And so, the reason for doing that mapping was to help determine whether the principle's recommendations or implementation guidance may need to be amended, or additional detail added to provide more clarity, to help determine if they were sufficient as written, or possibly that they're even no longer relevant.

Lastly, the discussion group prepared a draft charter, which is really to propose a minimum set of subjects or issues of further analysis in the issue report, and as well as during a possible PDP effort. And in addition to identifying the subjects, the discussion group also provided provisional groupings of the subjects that they logically thought could be grouped together, and help to work them through the process. So, in terms of next steps, these finalized deliverables will be submitted to the GNSO counsel, along with their quest for a single issue report, as well as a notion for the counsel to be able to take action, if they so choose.

So, the discussion group is recommending that a single issue report is the best path forward, utilizing the matrix and the draft charter that they've prepared, as a basis for the issue report. But, they realize and note that it's ultimately up to the GNSO counsel to determine the best path forward. Finally, I just wanted to note that there is a face-to-face session in Buenos

Aires. It's Wednesday the 24 of June, and it's from 11 to 12 local time. And there's also links to the online resources, where these deliverables will. So, they're actually available on the Wiki, but they will also be shared on the GNSO page as well. That's all I had, and I am passing over to Marika to talk about pulsing implantation. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much, Steve. And like Mary said, I also see that there's several members of this GNSO working group on the Webinar. So, I'm sure as well that they will chime in or correct me if I'm getting out of line here. So, I'll briefly give you an update on the status of the policy implementation of working group.

I think as many of you know, there has been an increased focus over the last couple of years on how to deal with policy implementation related questions such as, "What happens if a policy issue is identified during the implementation phase? Who decides whether something is policy or implementation? And do we actually have efficient processes in place to deal with these kind of questions?" As a result of those conversations, the GNSO counsel formed a working group to focus on a number of questions that specifically related to policy implementation, in the context of the GNSO.

And the working group published its initial recommendations report for public comment in January of this year, and has since worked on reviewing those comments and finalizing its report, which was actually delivered to the GNSO counsel for consideration earlier this month, on the second of June. In short, the working group is putting forward the following recommendations for GNSO counsel consideration. In response to charter question one, which asks for recommendations concerning a set of principles that would underpin any GNSO policy and implementation related discussions. The working group is recommending adhering to the principles and requirements, and as they've developed and outlined in Section 4 of the final recommendations report.

And these need to be respected when policy implementation related issues arrive in the implementation phase. These principles cover both principles and requirements that apply to policy and implementation. Those are primarily applied to policy. And also, those that apply primarily to implementation. Furthermore, in addition to the only formal process the GNSO currently has, which has been the policy development process, or PDP. The working group is also proposing three new standardized processes for GNSO deliberations. And namely, a GNSO input process, which is to be used to those instances for which the GNSO counsel intends to provide non-binding advice, which is expected to typically concerned topics that are non-GTLD specific, for which no policy recommendations have been developed to date. Non-binding advice in this context means advice that has no binding force in the party it's provided to.

For example, such a process could be used to provide input on the ICANN strategic plan, or recommendations from an accountability and transparency review team. It's the expectation that such input would be treated in a similar manner, as public comments are currently considered today by the entity to which the input is being provided.

And secondly, there is the GNSO guidance process, which is to use in those instances for which a GNSO counsel intends to provide guidance that is required to be considered by the ICANN Board, but which is not expected to result in new contractual obligations for contracted parties. Hence the terms, DTLD registries and DTLD registrars. Guidance developed through a GGP and needs advice that has a binding force on the ICANN Board to consider the guidance. And it can only be rejected by the ICANN Board by a vote of more than two-thirds of the Board members. But, only the Board can determine that this guidance is not in the best interest of the ICANN community or ICANN.

The expectation that such a process would typically involve clarification of, or ties on existing GTLD policy recommendations. This could, for example, be in

response to specific requests from the ICANN Board. But, it could also be at the initiative of the GNSO counsel, to an issue that is has identified. For example, one could imagine that such a process could have been used in information to the request from the ICANN Board to provide input on the DOT band registry agreement, or our specification 13, which occurred a while ago. And third, the group is recommending a GNSO expedited policy development process.

And that is to be used in those instances in which the GNSO counsel intends to develop recommendations that would result in new contractual obligations for contracted parties that meet the criteria for consensus policy, but also the qualifying criteria that the group has identified, to initiate such an expedited PDP. Which, as in its name says, it's the idea that it could be done in a shorter time frame than the traditional policy development process.

Those qualifying criteria are, for one that it needs to address a nary defined policy issue that was identified and scoped after either the adoption of the policy recommendations by the ICANN Board, or the implementation of such an adopted recommendation. Or two, it's to provide new additional policy recommendations on a specific policy issue that has been substantially scoped previously, such that extensive background information already exists.

For example, in those cases where there has already been an issue report for a policy development process, but the actual PDP was not initiated, or was part of a previous PDP that was not completed, or through other projects such as the previously mentioned, GDP. So further details on each of these processes can be found in the final recommendations report.

And it's important to point out, though, that the working group is very clear that none of these new processes should be used to take a second bite of the apple. So, only if circumstances have changed, and or new information is available, should the counsel consider using these processes for an issue

that had already been dealt with on a previous occasion through a different kind of process.

And as a result of its deliberations on three implementation related charter questions, the working group recommends that the policy development process manual, which outlines all the rules and processes around a PDP, that it be modified to require the creation of an implementation review team, which would consist of community members, to guide and assist ICANN staff in the implementation of policy recommendations. Following the adoption of PDP recommendations by the ICANN Board. But also, to allow the GNSO counsel the flexibility to not create such an IRT in exceptional circumstances. For example, if another IRT would already be in place, it could deal with the PDP recommendations.

It also recommends the adoption of the implementation review team principles, as has been outline in the final report, and that these are followed as part of the creation as well as the operation of implementation review teams.

Next, the GNSO counsel will now consider the final recommendations report for adoption during its meeting in Buenos Aires, provided that the GNSO counsel adopt these recommendation, expectation that a public comment forum will be opened, specifically for those recommendations that will require changes to the ICANN bylaws, such as the proposed new GNSO processes that I spoke about just before.

And with that, will be followed by consideration by the ICANN Board. And if you're interested to hear more about those efforts, here's links to the final recommendations report, as well as the link to the GNSO council meeting that's taking place on Wednesday the 24th of June during which this issue will be further discussed. So in addition to the projects mentioned in the previous slides, we also wanted to briefly mention three other projects, two of which have meetings in Buenos Aires, and one from which you can expect a

public comment forum to open shortly after the Buenos Aires. So, the first one is the INGO access security rights protection and mechanism policy development process, which is considering whether existing dispute resolution processes should be amended, or whether a new process should be developed, to address the specific and concerns that have been expressed by IGOs and INGOs.

And the working group is meeting in Buenos Aires on Wednesday the 24th of June from 10 to 11:30 local time, and the meeting is open for anyone interested to attend. And the working group aims to deliver its initial report for public comment at the end of this year, or towards the end of this years. And secondly, the Board recently reconfirmed its request for an issue report, such as the first step in the policy development process on defining the purpose of collecting, and maintaining, and providing access to GTLD registration data, and considering safeguards for protecting data, and using the recommendations of the expert working group as an input to, and if deemed appropriate, as your foundation for a new GTLD policy.

The preliminary issue report that is being prepared by ICANN staff is expected to be published for public comment very shortly after the ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires. Last but not least is the data and metrics for a policy making working group. This working group has been tasked to establish a framework to informed fact based policy development.

The working group has now completed a draft data request guidelines and templates to support the framework, as well as a draft preliminary initial report, which it hopes to finalize and publish for public comments in Q3 of 2015. This working group is also meeting in Buenos Aires on Thursday 25 of June from 7 to 8 in the morning local time. And also, this meeting is open for anyone interested to attend and provide input to.

For further information about the GNSO activities, and to prepare yourselves for the ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires, the GNSO team has put together a

dedicated Web page which includes all the essential information that we recommend you review and read in preparation for your attendance, whether it's in person or remotely. So, in addition to the GNSO projects we've spoken about, there are also a number of cross community working groups, in which several of the ICANN supporting organizations and advisory committees participate.

We mentioned earlier the cross community working groups on the IANA stewardship transition, as well as the enhancing ICANN accountability cross community working group. But, we also briefly wanted to update you on two other cross community working groups. And for that, I will hand it back to Lars.

Lars Hoffman: Thank you very much, Marika. With Marika and (unintelligible), we support the cross community working group on the use of country and total names as domains. This CWG was chartered by the ccNSO and the GNSO to establish harmonized frameworks for the use of country and territory names, and to just emphasis (unintelligible). And the group does not concern itself with lower level domains, but only the top level domains.

The working group, or cross community working group, has identified three broad issues around which to structure its work. Those are two letter codes, three letter codes, and full length country and territory names. In addition, the group also realized it would be very helpful to draft a list of definitions about key terms surround country territory names. And it has proceeded to do so, and has a preferred staff that produced. And there's also been some potential discussion since Singapore on two letter codes. And the group will produce shortly after Buenos Aires a progress report.

In addition, the group that's trying to maintain close relations with the GAC working group on the protection of geographic names in the GTLD face. And to ensure that there is complimentary policies and development wherever possible.



And as you can see here, the group is meeting face-to-face on Monday the 22nd of June at 1:00 pm local time. And everybody is welcome to join, and in fact encourages to join the discussions. Thank you very much, and I'm passing it over to Mary, I believe.

Mary Wong: Yes you are, Lars. Thank you very much. And hello again everybody. This is Mary. And together with Bart and Steve Chan, I support this next working group, which has rather affectionately come to be known amongst the community as you see on this slide, as CWG squared, because this is the CWG that has been tasked by the ccNSO and GNSO council as a joint charter to develop a uniform framework of principles that can apply to future cross community working groups.

And I don't think I need to emphasis how increasing reliant the ICANN community has come to be on CWGs, at least on issues of mutual interest. So, the ccNSO and GNSO councils believe that it would be very helpful to have a uniform set of principles that could be used to govern the initiation, the chartering, their operations, closure, and like matters. The milestone for this group is the Buenos Aires meeting, where the coaches -- and we have one coach here from the GNSO and one from the ccNSO -- hope to have a draft framework for discussion with the community.

So, as such, the CWG squared and its co-chairs, as well as of course the support staff, hope that you will be able to participate either remotely on person at the Buenos Aires discussion on Wednesday 24th June, because this would affect almost all sectors and individuals across the whole of ICANN, it will be important to get the feedback before the draft is turned into a more finalized form. So, that's it from this group for now. We'll see you in Buenos Aires. And I will not turn it over to Bart for the ccNSO update. Bart?

Hi, everybody, this is Mary still. And Bart is on the call, but I think we're having some slight technical issues.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you, Mary. I was already going off, but I forgot to un-mute my telephone. So, let me start again. So, to focal, the core of the presentation is around the focal points of discussion at the ccNSO meeting days in Buenos Aires. The ccNSO will meet two days, on Tuesday and Wednesday, ending in the ccNSO council meeting on Wednesday afternoon. So, the focal points are, as you might expect under ccNSO decision making around the CWG proposal in this presentation. I will go into a bit of alternative work undertaken by the ccNSO and ccNSO working groups, which will be discussed during these meetings, the two day meetings as well.

So, first of all, the decision making around the CWG stewardship proposal. The ccNSO has some particular issues dealing with the proposal. It has to, first of all, as one of the chartering organizations, it is expected to take a decision in Buenos Aires around the proposal itself. But ultimately, the council is not the decision making for, it is the ccNSO membership and the ccTLD community itself. And what makes it more difficult in this case, and especially around the CWG proposal, it affects the full ccTLD community. So, not just the ccNSO members, but those ccTLDs, which is approximately 90, which are not member of the ccNSO.

A second issue, and that's of concern for those of you who have been following the discussions around CWG, is potential overlap with the very limited policy scope of the ccNSO around delegation, re-delegations, and retired of ccTLDs. So, effectively, the policies around the IANA function itself. And then thirdly, but this is not uniquely for the ccNSO, but they have to deal with the relation and the interdependency where the discussions around ICANN's accountability. So, the accountability work. So, in short, the ccNSO council is very much dependent on the view of the ccTLD community at large, in moving forward on the CWG proposal.

So now, how is the discussion structured in this case? The ccNSO program working group is very aware of the importance of this topic. Has scheduled

over five hours for the ccNSO, and the ccTLD present and participating remotely to deal with, and discuss the CWG proposal. And included, you will see a general overview of the different sessions. They start on Tuesday, continue on Wednesday morning. And then around, say, Wednesday afternoon, there will be a three and a half hour session to wrap it up, and to have a late discussion.

And the ccNSO council meeting is scheduled, in this case not normally at five, but most likely we'll start at five and not at four. So, as always, these meetings are open, so you'll welcome if you're interested to attend that meeting as well. So, that is around the major topic of discussion at the ccNSO meeting in Buenos Aires.

Secondly, I want to touch upon the work of a - in the third phase of a working group, which is called the (Sake) working group. The reason for touching up on this, is to show you that other work is ongoing. This is the third phase of a process to set up an engaged ccTLD community in a mechanism to deal with security incidents.

As I said, the third phase - first of all, the first phase was right after the computer incident, so that's quite some time ago, on defining what should be needed for such a security mechanism. The second phase was a working group that dealt with refining and setting up a very enhanced system. But unfortunately, it became too costly based on, say, the requirements et cetera.

So, it not turned out into the third phase, which is very operational, and around the introduction of what is called a secure email list. And please note, this is not to be used as a classical email list, et cetera. It's more used as a telephone book to enable ccTLD operators to easily and quickly look up each other's contact information in case of a security incident.

It is, say, this time the name of this is used, although not secured. But, it is intended not to be used to exchange information, but rather that subscribers

can use the data to contact each other. Another mechanism, and this is the result of the say the second phase, is that some ccTLDs especially do not have the capacity to join a more versatile and secure system.

So, the strength of the system will be to have as many ccTLDs joined as possible. And as you can see to date, 150 ccTLDs have joined the list already. That means subscribed to the list. And that includes 300 people from the different ccTLD operators. The email list is run by the ccNSO secretary (OA) platform.

So, you see there is a lot of collaboration with other communities as well. And the role of the ccNSO secretary is just handling the administration. The current working group members are responsible for designing and maintaining the procedures, and overlooking the work of the secretary. And in the near future, there will be a suggestion to create another governance structure to close off the working groups. So, it's an example of other work, which will come to closure at the BA meeting, or soon after the BA meeting. For those of you who are interested in the topic, there is a link included as well.

Just some other work of the ccNSO that will be high on the agenda, and that's what I've listed here, is the work of the ccNSO strategic and operational planning working group. This is one of the standing committees in the ccNSO, which has provided input and feedback to ICANN's strategic and operational plan, since 2009. And this time, it provided input on the draft fiscal year 16 operational plan and budget.

And again, this will be a topic for discussion much at the ccNSO meeting. But the working group will meet with ICANN staff. And it is part of the exchange between the Board and the ccNSO as well. And then, another working group that I want to highlight it what is called the ccNSO guideline and review committee. This working group is focusing on the internal guidelines of the ccNSO.

The ccNSO has developed over time a whole set of rules and guidelines to manage its internal affairs. And say, the last one was - the core of this set was adopted in 2008. And as a result of the growth and the changing practices of the ccNSO, it was time to review again, in light of the growth of the ccNSO in particular, and of the change in practices. As I said too, what is worth to note is this is independent of the structural reviews of the ccNSO, which is scheduled in one and a half, two years.

Finally, some more background information on what is happening in the ccNSO, the meeting agenda. As said, the ccNSO meeting is open for all if you're interested in the topics of discussion. Somewhat background on the SOP and on the SAC here. So, the secure incident repository working group, and on the guideline review committee. And now, I want to hand it over to my colleague, Barbara Roseman.

Barbara Roseman: Thank you. I'd like to discuss the address supporting organization. The ASO address council has 15 members, three from each region, and one person from each region is elected each year. The regional Board of each RAR each selected two of the members, and the executive Board of each RAR approved one person from its respective region.

The most recent appointees have been Mark Elkins in the AFRINIC region to replace Alan Barrett through his term of December 2015. Alan has recently taken the position of CEO of AFRINIC. And Ricardo Patera in LACNIC, which reappointed to serve through December 2018. The ASO treats global policies somewhat differently than the other constituencies and advisory committees.

Their remit is that a global policy is one that the RARs develop through their different regional policy fora. And only policies that affect the relationship between IANA and the RARs are considered global policy. However, there are a number of areas of work that the different RARs work on that are not global policy. And areas of local policy currently under discussion at the RAR

meetings include IP reform transfer policies, the listening of qualifications for IPv6 allocations, and inter-registry transfers of IP address block.

(Rhonda Silva) was recently appointed to replace (Ray Paul Zach) on Seat 9 of the Board of Directors beginning after ICANN 54. (Ray) has chose not to sit for the re-appointment again. And this is one of the responsibilities of the ASO address council, to appoint the two seats that the ASO has on the Board of Directors.

The ASO will be engaged in work sessions throughout the week in crisp discussions, which are their participation in the CWG meetings. And meeting with the ICANN Board of Directors. They're also currently scheduled to have an ASO AC public meeting. This is their face-to-face annual meeting where all of the ASO AC members get together. And a workshop on Wednesday. The time of this is changing. But right now, it's scheduled for 15:30 to 17:00. And we will publicize the new time and room when it's available.

I'd like to pass this now to Carlos Reyes, to talk about the root service system advisory committee. Carlos.

Carlos Reyes: Thank you, Barb. As of last year, the RSAC has completed a restructuring process. And currently it is meeting monthly. There are 12 appointed root server operator representatives. Three root zone management partner representatives from NTIA, IANA, and VeriSign, as well as three liaisons. The RSAC is currently coached by Lars-Johan Liman from (I Root). And (Tristy Sinhoff) from the University of Maryland, which operates D root. As part of its infrastructure, the RSAC established the caucus.

The caucus consists of technical experts in the root server's system. There are currently 61 of these experts, and 43% of them do not work for root server operators, thereby expanding some of the skills available within the RSAC caucus. The caucus held a successful, quick meeting at ITF 92 in Dallas. This is earlier this year in March. And they are currently completing

work on report on root zone TPLs. That working group was established shortly after ICANN 52 in Singapore. So, the work party has done incredible amounts of work in the past few months. And RSAC will soon consider their report. Future areas of study include whether or not to DNS assign the root server's .net zone.

And whether or not to move root server's .net to a new TLD. The caucus is also contributing to the process of creating a framework, to track deployment of RSAC 002. RSAC 002 is a publication that basically establishes general measurements for the root server system. And that was approved last November.

The caucus is an open group that had an application process. And interested parties are recommended to apply by submitting a statement of interested to [rsac-membership@icann.org](mailto:rsac-membership@icann.org). At ICANN 53, the RSAC will have three work sessions. Like the other groups, they will be focusing on obviously the stewardship and accountability issues. They will also be discussing some of the future work items that I mentioned earlier, and how to prioritize some of these items for the caucus.

And they will also be planning their first RSAC workshop, which will be a sticking place later this year. As part of the RSAC's engagements with ICANN, they will be meeting with the SSAC and the Board of Directors. For those of you who are interested in learning more about RSAC and its work, they will have a public session Wednesday 24, June in the afternoon. And they'll be providing updates on implementation of their first two publications, as well as overview of the craft advisory from the root zone TTL work party. And with that, I will introduce by colleague, Steve Chan, for an update from security and stability advisory committee.

Steve Chan: Thank you, Carlos. Since ICANN 52, the SSAC has published two advisories, SSAC 70 and SSAC 71. I will provide a brief overview of SSAC 70, and my colleague, Julie, will talk about SSAC 71. So, SSAC 70 concerns about the

growing use of public suffix-ness. Public suffix is a domain under which multiple parties that are un-affiliated with the owner, may register sub domains. So, some examples provided here. For example, .org, .co, .uk, .k12, .pa, .us. As you can see, public suffix can be one label, two label, or three labels.

There is really no programmatic way to determine this boundary. Tracking the boundary is critically important. Here, the SSAC lists several key use cases for the public suffix. The first two concerning the security and stability. And it's really the original motivations for the public suffix. The next three on navigateability TLD validation domain highlighting, is really an extension use of public suffix. But, it critically impacts the acceptance of TLDs and domains. So, let me highlight one for you. So for example, all the major browsers use the public suffix to determine whether a domain name entered into a browser needs to conduct a DNS search, or to be redirected to a search engine.

If the public suffix - different browsers are using different versions, then a user may see inconsistent results. So, here we are showing a Google Chrome is using a more recent version of the public suffix, can display a new TLD website properly. Where Apple Safari was using an older version of a public suffix, which directed to Google search. So, that impacts the acceptance of the TLDs. Based on that, the SSAC made a series of recommendations. These are in two broad categories. From the long terms, the SSAC recognized that public suffix is really a convenient compromise for the application developers.

And going forward, it recommends the INTF to standardize PSL alternatives that are better, more robust, more secure. The second part of the SSAC recommendation is recognizing that it takes some time for the ITF to develop a new specification. And also, for the implementers to adopt. While in the meantime, public suffix are playing a more and more important role in applications.



So, the ALAC calls ICANN to work with the Mozilla (conversation), the application development community, to address some of the immediate concerns. So, that's all. Next, I'll hand this over to my colleagues, Julie, to talk about SSAC 71. Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Steve. This is Julie Hedlund and I'll talk about SSAC 71, SSAC comments on cross community working group proposal on ICANN accountability enhancement. Very briefly, the comments relate to the SSAC's role, as defined in its charter. The SSAC advises the community and Board on matters relating to the security and integrity of the internet's naming and address allocation systems. In its comments, the SSAC notes that it is neither given nor thought any standing for its advise, other than it should be evaluated on its merits, and adopted or not according to that evaluation by the affected parties.

The SSAC also believes that this purely advisory role is the one to which it is best suited. And it asks the CCWG accountability to take this into account, in its review of the options described in Section 512. And also, the SSAC has some additional comments. It notes it does not have a comment at this time -- pardon the background noise -- on whether or not a legal structure is required or desirable to compel ICANN and the Board to respond to the SSAC's advice. It is concerned about the way in which the proposed new SOAC membership model might affect the way in which the SSAC operates.

It expects that the community will adopt an organizational structure that recognizes the role and importance of high quality expert advice on security and stability. And it notes the - pardon the background noise. And it notes the relatively short time available for consideration of the draft proposal, and reserves the right to make additional comments as further details are developed.

And then very quickly, the SSAC activities at ICANN 53, there is the DNS SSAC for everybody session and beginner's guide, the workshop on the 24th,

the public meeting on the 25th, and also meetings with the community as you see here. And for more information, you can refer to the links that we provide on the slides. Thank you so much. And now, I'll turn things over to Olof Nordling and Julia Charvolen.

Julia Charvolen: Thank you, Julie. Welcome everyone, my name is Julia Charvolen. I am the GAC services coordinator, and I'm going to give you an update on the government advisory committee, which is also abbreviated as the GAC. The GAC is composed of governments and international governmental organizations, IGOs. And the GAC currently has 152 governments as members, and 32 IGOs known as observers. During ICANN meetings, the GAC meets face-to-face. And in between ICANN meetings, the GAC works remotely.

The purpose of the GAC is to provide advice to the ICANN Board regarding public policy matters. The GAC will meet in Buenos Aires to discuss the progress of the IANA stewardship transition, and ICANN's accountability program. The GAC is one of the charting organizations for both the cross community working group on name, and the cross community working group on accountability. Both discussions will be held on Sunday. In Buenos Aires, the GAC will be discussing the remaining issues related to the new detailed program, such as the protection of IGO names and acronyms, the implementation of GAC safeguard advice, and country and territory names as second level domain names.

Among the various public policy issues currently being discussed within ICANN, the GAC has established 48 working groups. Firstly, the human rights and international law. The GAC has established a working group on this topic, in order to develop a position paper on ICANN's respect for human rights and international law, as well as community efforts to organize discussions on this matter. This session will be held on Tuesday. Secondly, public safety.

The GAC has established a working group on this topic to assess, and seek to ensure that the domain name system, also known as DNS, and domain name registration, are not used to enhance unlawful activity, abuse, consumer fraud, and or violation of this law. The working group will also be meeting on Tuesday. The underserved regions and community applications working group are two new working groups which were previous sub groups under the future detailed working group. Both have become independent working groups, similar to the country and territory name working group, focusing on preparing for the future.

All of the aforementioned working groups will be presenting their terms of reference to the GAC for endorsement. In addition, the GAC will also meet with the GNSO, the ccNSO, the ALAC, and the ICANN Board during the Buenos Aires meeting. The times and locations of these meetings are posted to the ICANN public schedule. The GAC has also a number of internal matters to address in BA. Specifically, the implementation of the ATRT2 recommendation, which is being addressed by a number of working groups. The GAC will also begin to prepare for ICANN 54 in Dublin, by opening nominations for Vice Chair candidates in Buenos Aires, with the intent of holding elections in Dublin.

The GAC will also begin preparations for the next high level governmental meeting, which is scheduled to take place at ICANN 55 in Marrakech. In Buenos Aires, the GAC will be meeting from Saturday to Thursday morning. All sessions are open, with the exception of the communicator session, which is being held on Wednesday afternoon. You're very welcome to follow the GAC sessions in the meeting rooms, and all sessions will be available in the six UN languages, as well as Portuguese. And with that, I will hand it over to Heidi Ulrich, to talk about the ALAC. Thank you.

Heidi Ulrich: Thank you, Julia. And hello everyone. My name is Heidi Ulrich. I'm the Senior Director for At-Large. So today, I'm joined by two of my teammates, Ariel Liang, our Large policy coordinator, and Silvia Vivanco, manager At-Large

Regional Affairs. We are delighted to give you a brief update on the activities of the At-Large advisory committee for ALAC, and the At-Large community consisting of the five regional At-Large organizations (Rayon), and 190 At-Large structures. That had taken place between ICANN meetings in Singapore and Buenos Aires.

We will also provide a preview of At-Large activities that are being planned for ICANN 53. So, to being, the ALAC main topics in Buenos Aires, there are two of them. The first one is the NTIA IANA functions stewardship transition. Weekly calls of the At-Large ad hoc working group on the transition of the US government stewardship of the IANA function for its transition working group for shores, have been held since August 2014. Over five hours of At-Large sessions on this topic are scheduled to take place at ICANN 53. The ALAC is generally supportive of the draft CWG proposal.

ALAC would prefer in IANA holding intricate into ICANN, but it is willing to accept and compromise other separate legal entities. The ALAC is additionally very concerned about the lack of multi-stakeholder oversight involvement, and will offer guidance as to how this might be addressed. This main topic will be discussed during meetings of the ALAC, and in a transition working group on Sunday and Tuesday. The second main topic for the ALAC is ICANN accountability and transparency. In general, the ALAC is supportive of the direction being taken by the CCWG.

In its comments to the public comment, the ALAC provides guidance on a number of issues, some of which the CCWG explicitly were seeking, and others where the ALAC believes that reconsideration may be required. In particular, the ALAC has strong concerns about whether true enforceability of the proposed mechanisms is required, and how the potential use of such enforceability will alter the sphere of the organization. This topic will also be discussed during the meetings of ALAC and the transition working group on Sunday and Tuesday.

Moving to ALAC and At-Large activities at ICANN 53. During the ICANN meetings in Buenos Aires, the At-Large community will be holding 39 formal meetings. Most of these meetings will be interpreted into French, Spanish, and Portuguese. The At-Large community will also be holding numerous informal meetings. For the meeting with ICANN Board of Directors on Tuesday between 8:30 and 9:30, the ALAC will raise questions on the topics of equitable access for all stakeholders. That question I focused on the ATRT2 recommendation 10.5, which states that the Board must facilitate the equitable participation in applicable ICANN activities.

Second, a postponement of At-Large review, as an example of community accepting an overloaded agenda. And then thirdly, a picks and category one TLD as an example of useful discussion, informal discussion between ACSOs and the Board. The ALAC will be meeting with the ccNSO, the GAC, the NCSG, and SSAC leadership, as well as ICANN staff. Seven, At-Large working groups will be meeting face-to-face to facilitate progress in both policy and process activities.

And these are the At-Large accessibility working groups, the At-Large technology task force meeting on Monday, the At-Large ad hoc new meeting's starting to do working parties, meeting on Tuesday, the transition working group part one and part two meeting's on Tuesday afternoon, the At-Large capacity building working group meeting on Wednesdays.

And then, the ICANN academy working group meeting. And this is not exclusively an At-Large working group, but a cross community, an informal cross community working group. This will be meeting on Wednesday as well. And importantly, ICANN will mark the launch of the leadership training program, which will take place at ICANN 54, to which all ACs and SOs may select incoming currently just to attend.

At-Large working group provide the primary source of ALAC policy advice development into ALAC policy statements. And for more on the policy

statement that the ALAC has submitted between Singapore and Buenos Aires, I would like to hand the floor over to Ariel, who will provide an update on these things. Ariel.

Ariel Liang: Thank you, Heidi. This is Ariel Liang, At-Large policy coordinator. In addition to the ALAC policy advice statements on the CWGIN, our second draft proposal, and the CCWG accountability draft report, that Heidi highlighted previously, the ALAC submitted four other policy advice statements, in response to ICANN public comment request, (unintelligible) ICANN 62. Now, I will provide you a summary of these four ALAC statements.

First, with regard to the potential change to registrar accreditation insurance requirements, the ALAC says the commercial general liability insurance policy shortened at the CGL, is the most critical barrier for underserved regions to participate in the domain name industry. The ALAC proposes that ICANN eliminate the CGL, and as an alternative reserve a (sum) provided by the registrars, according to their transaction volume, recovering any harm across the registrars - caused the registrants by the registrars wrongful acts.

Second, after reviewing the version Q of maximum starting repertoire, shortened as MSRQ, a deliverable under the procedure to develop and maintain labor generation rules for the root law, with respect to adding on labels. The ALAC recognize that ICANN clarifies the likely impact that changes to the underlying unicode standards to MSRQ. In addition, the ALAC assures its support to ICANN's ID1 program, and welcomes joint activity that involves a large structure in the relevant geography.

Third, the ALAC generally supports the proposed principles in the GNSO policy and implementation initial recommendation report. The ALAC points out that when new or additional policy issues are introduced in the implementation process, resolution of those issues must involve all impacted stakeholders, not just the chartering organizations. Moreover, with regards to the proposed additional new GNSO processes, the ALAC suggests

(trespassing) to better understand a fact after changes. Lastly, the ALAC is satisfied with the ICANN draft FY16 operating plan and budget as a whole, and has one specific comment related to the support of ICANN policy department.

Considering that multi-stakeholder policy development differentiates ICANN from any other organization, the ALAC is concerned that the budget's allocated to the policy department, and supporting SLCs and ACs is about 10% of the total budget. More specifically, given an increase of activities related to the extension of At-Large community, organizational reviews, and (unintelligible) processes, the ALAC calls for hiring additional full-time staff in the policy department, supporting both the ALAC and the GNSO in FY16. On Tuesday, 23 of June in ICANN 53 Buenos Aires, At-Large members will meet with ICANN finance staff to have a full off discussion about FY16 operation plan and budget advice.

On that same day, At-Large members in the GNSO privacy and proxy services accreditation issues working group will also hold a presentation and discussion, to help the wider community understand and engage in the policy development process. For more information about At-Large policy advice, you may visit the corresponding page on the At-Large Web site for adopted advice. Or, visit the At-Large policy development weekly workspace, to follow the ones under development. Over to you, Silvia.

Silvia Vivanco: Thank you, Ariel. Hello, I am Silvia Vivanco, manager At-Large Regional Affairs. And I will review the (Rallo) meetings at ICANN 53. Reflecting the increased activities within the (Rallo), all regionals will hold the respective June monthly meeting face-to-face in Buenos Aires. At (Rallo), we hold the At-(Rallo) African joined meeting on the same African views on the proposal of the governance of internet unique identifies on Wednesday June 24th. (AP Rallo), we hold the monthly meeting on Wednesday 24th.

Among other issues, there will be a discussion on the progress and implementation of the (AP Rallo) (unintelligible) framework. (Rallo) will hold this monthly meeting on Tuesday, 23. One of the main items of discussion will be the preparations for the General Assembly to be held at ICANN 54 in Dublin. Like (Rallo), we hold a June meeting on Wednesday 24th. And topics will include the IANA transition, the capacity building, and a review of the (Rallo) internal procedures. Finally, (Na Rallo) will hold this monthly meeting on Monday the 22 of June. And the topics will include, among others, outreach engagement and our new (Na Rallo) newsletter.

I will speak now about the cross (Rallo) meetings at ICANN. First, after the invitation of (unintelligible), all five (Rallo) chairs will participate in the community round table, with ACSOSG and (Rallo) chairs on Friday 19 of June, before the start of ICANN 53. On Saturday 20 of June, the (Rallo) will hold the (Rallo) chairs meetings, co-chair by (Lak Rallo) and new (Rallo) chairs. The meeting of this group has as its aim, delivering of synergies between the globalistic holder engagement team, and the outreach community in their work with civic society in the ICANN context. The focus will be a discussion on civic society engagement within ICANN.

And we have (Jinjacks Aheil), ICANN's VSCVP for Europe, as invited speaker. On Saturday 20th of June, the (Rallo) will also meet with the ALAC's leadership team in the (Rallo) chairs meeting, to discuss issues of the strategic importance for At-Large. Finally, the five (Rallo)s will hold the regional (unintelligible) meeting on Wednesday 24th. Among other issues, the resource of the cross (Rallo) professional capabilities survey will be discussed. And now, I would like to invite you to a very special event, the (Lak Rallo) showcase, 2015, Knowledge for Inclusion. (Lak Rallo)'s event is scheduled for Wednesday 24th of June at time 18:30 to 20:30, at the meeting room, Golden Horn.

This is a community celebration inviting the ICANN community to learn more about the achievements of (Lak Rallo) and the At-Large community. They will



showcase how (Lak Rallo) is engaging a diverse community of 47 LASs that's spread out in Latin America and the Caribbean in 16 countries. And approximately 20 (Lak Rallo) LASs will attend this event in person. So, this will provide your next opportunity to meet and greet (Lak Rallo) members, and At-Large community members. The speakers include ICANN's president and CEO, Fadi Chehadé. ICANN's Board chairman is Steve Crocker. ALAC's chair, Adam Greenberg. GSCVP for Latin American and the Caribbean, (unintelligible). (Lak Rallo)'s chair, (Iberto Foto).

And (Lak Rallo)'s departing ALAC member, (Fatima Tombranedo). Please join us for a very special music and dance, tango dance and lessons. Performance by company (unintelligible). This event is co-sponsored by ICANN (unintelligible) and (unintelligible) Argentina. Please join us to celebrate the achievements of the At-Large community. Thank you and over to you, Benedetta.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you very much, Silvia. My name is Benedetta Rossi, community engagement support coordination. With that, I would like to begin the question and answer session. If you'd like to ask a question, please press Star followed by one and record your name clearly, so the operator can be able to open your line. Again, if you'd like to ask a question, please press Star followed by one, and record your name. Your name is really required to introduce your question. Thank you.

While we wait for questions to come in, I'd like to turn to the next slide, which identifies questions that were submitted using the Webinar's RSVP form. Four questions, as you can see from the slide. You can find them on the screen. For more information regarding (unintelligible) resignation, and regarding cyber threat, you may refer to the links provided on the slide. We also received a specific question regarding one of the GNSO working group. And the question is, "When will the recommendations made by the policy and implementation working group be implemented? In other words, how long will

it take for ICANN's community to implement the GNSO's guidance process and its followers?"

The answer provided by staff support for the policy and implementation working group, is the next step is consideration of the recommendation by the GNSO counsel NBA. You may find the link to the recommendation. And after the GNSO counsel consideration, there will be a public comment period prior to the Board consideration, since these recommendations involve changes to the ICANN bylaw. And this will be followed by ICANN Board consideration. Once adopted, the updating of the bylaws and GNSO operating procedures should not take very long. But, it can take up to six months.

Once again, if you'd like to ask a question, please press Star 1 and record your name clearly. Operator, do we have any questions? Also, you can use the chat in the RSVP room to submit a question, if you'd like to address this question to the policy team. Okay, I'm told we do not have any questions from the audio. But, if you have any questions following the Webinar, or any inquiries as to how to stay updated with the team, please use the team email address, [policy-staff@icann.org](mailto:policy-staff@icann.org). You may also follow up on Twitter using the handles which I've shown on the slide.

The policy team also releases monthly updates, which are available in Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian, and Spanish. To sign up for these monthly updates, please follow the URL shown on the slide. If you need to work in groups, or have already been participating in working groups, you would like to brush up your base or asking questions, you will definitely find the GNSO working group newcomer open house questions useful.

These sessions are community lead, for new GNSO working group participants to come together and discuss questions they may have about working groups procedures or processes in a very informal setting. You're very, very welcome to participate in the next session, which is scheduled for

Thursday, 25th of September at 12 UTC. I will now turn it over to David Olive for his closing remarks. Thank you very much, and over to you, David.

David Olive: Thank you, Benedetta. The policy team was pleased to be able to present to you some summaries of the activities coming up at ICANN 53 in Buenos Aires, in the policy and advisory development area. We thank you for your participation. This slide tells you a little bit about the team. We're 27 members, with experts and support services in five time zones, nine countries, and with 15 language capabilities.

To show you the level of activity at an ICANN meeting, as you well know, as you volunteer for many of the working groups or the sessions, the policy development team will be supporting over 160 sessions in Buenos Aires, showing the activity and the efforts of the community in various working groups, council meetings, and discussion areas, both dealing with the transition and the accountability matters, but also regular topics that we discussed here on the policy briefing. So with that, I would like to thank you for your time and attention. The transcript and slides can be accessed on this URL. And also, to keep up on a regular basis, our monthly policy update is a convenient, quick guide, and I recommend it to all of you.

With that, I would like to say there's a question here that Rudy has given. "Are there a maximum level of working groups we can handle at ICANN?" And I think Marika does provide that answer, Rudy. It really depends on the level of the volunteer engagement and staff support to assist and help on that engagement. It really would be dependent upon the SOs and ACs. Some of them set certain limits in their workload, and their annual work programs. And others really prioritize according to the issues that are coming at them, or being addressed at a particular time. With that, I would like to again say thank you. We hope to see people who are travelling to ICANN 53 face-to-face.

We will welcome you there as well. For those of you not doing that, but please participate remotely. There are active tools that allow that to happen.

And we would also look forward to hearing from you and welcoming you in that format. With that, I would just like to wish everyone a good evening, good afternoon, and good morning, wherever you may be. Safe travels if you're going to Buenos Aires. And we hope to hear from you remotely as well. Thank you very much. Goodbye.

END