Pre-Buenos Aires Policy Update Webinar
Thursday 11 June 2015 10:00 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 everyone. Let's begin.

Thank you for joining our policy update in advance of the ICANN 53 meeting in Buenos Aires. My name is David Olive, ICANN Vice President for Policy Development Support. And I am conducting this webinar from the Istanbul regional hub where I'm located today.

I want to thank everyone. The purpose of this webinar is to provide an update to you on the policy and advisory development activities expected at ICANN 53 in Buenos Aires. Members of the Policy Development Support team will be providing an update relating to the various community groups. And you may be working with some of them on a regular basis in your regular work at ICANN.

Just to remind you that this recording will be - this webinar will be recorded and transcribed, and the slides will be made available to you. A link will be provided at the end of our presentation. And so you can refer back to it at your leisure or as you're preparing again for your in person participation in Buenos Aires or your remote participation at ICANN 53. And we will have a

question period at the end, though if you have a question during the presentations, please put it into the Chat and we'll make every effort to answer it.

If we'll go to the next slide on ICANN 53 outlook, I just want to show you and highlight some of the main sessions that will be taking place. In particular on Monday of course we have the welcoming session. At that particular session the ETHOS award for recognizing community volunteers will be at that session as well. In the afternoon the community leaders will be holding a high interest topic session. The focus will be on how to frame a discussion on the use of the proceeds from the new gTLD program.

Tuesday of course are the important meeting days for the various stakeholders and constituencies, and they also meet with the board of directors. Wednesday are the public meetings of the various councils and executive committee, and we'll also have the (Lack Rollo) showcase. More will be said about that. And on the Thursday session we'll have parts on the CEO succession process, obviously the ICANN public forum, culminating with the ICANN board meeting in the afternoon.

In terms of the next slide which shows about the ICANN 53 in focus, obviously most of the work and discussions will be around the accountability and transition issues that most of the community is working very hard on to provide their inputs and provide recommendations in that area.

I would briefly like to turn to policy development at ICANN on the next slide. This relates to you in participating in this webinar who are interested in or actively involved in the policy development process. The primary role of ICANN is to coordinate the policy development relating to the global internet systems of unique identifiers.

Our open and transparent development processes promote well informed decisions based on expert advice from a diversity of views from all our

stakeholders. Many of you of course have inputs into these processes. Why do we do this? It's to support your work in the policy development or advice processes, and support your understanding of the issues for inputs that you can make.

In the next slide we talk about the support tools for the policy development process. And of course volunteers look at these issues. They form working groups, and consider it from many angles. And these working groups are open to everyone in the ICANN community. All working groups and discussions are documented so that full access can be seen and the discussions are there.

If we move to the policy development who slide, recommendations are formed and refined by the ICANN community through its supporting organizations - the Address Supporting Organization, the Country Code Name Supporting Organization, and the Generic Name Support Organization, as well as influence by the Advisory Committee, the At Large, the Governmental Advisory Committee, the Root Service System Advisory Group and the Security and Stability Advisory Group -all comprised of volunteers like yourself interested in the process.

Public comment of course is sought at several stages of the development process to let interested community members provide their views on the policy proposals, and to insure that policy recommendations reflect the concerns and perspectives of the broader internet community. And that of course results our recommendations that are fair, effective and carefully considered by all people.

With that I would just like to do a brief advertisement for the webinar on the next slide. The chairs of the cross community working group on the stewardship proposal will be holding a webinar today. And if you have time I would encourage you to watch this one. But if you cannot, of course it will be recorded, and there's further information on this slide.

With that I'll turn it over to members of the Policy Development Support team who will be talking to you about the various policy and advisory activities in their particular groups that they service. I'd like to turn it over to Marika Konings to talk about the Generic Name Supporting Organization and its activities in ICANN 53. Marika, the floor is yours.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much David. Hello everyone and thank you for joining us today. So my name is Marika Konings. I'm based in the ICANN office in Brussels, and a Senior Policy Director and team leader for the Generic Name Supporting Organization or the GNSO.

So in addition to the work that's going on in relation to the IANA stewardship transition, that proposal as David just mentioned, as well as enhancing ICANN accountability. And there are also numerous other projects that the GNSO is working on, including over ten policy development processes in their various stages.

And of course not possible to cover all these projects in the time that we have allocated for this webinar, our contribution will focus on those efforts that have recently achieved an important milestone, also which decisions or next steps are expected to be considered in Buenos Aires.

So for the first one of those I'll hand it over to my colleague Mary Wong.

Mary Wong: Thank you Marika. Hello everybody. I just want to repeat David and Marika's thanks and welcome to you for joining this webinar today. My name is Mary Wong, and I work remotely like many of my other colleagues. As you know our team is fairly globally distributed. Like Marika, I'm a Senior Policy Director, and assist with supporting the Generic Name Supporting Organization primarily.

So my task is to talk to you about one of those many projects that Marika has mentioned is underway, and this is about the accreditation of privacy and proxy service providers by ICANN. This is a policy development process, and a working group was charted as you see from the timeline towards the end of 2013.

I am very pleased to report as you see again from the timeline that as of last month this working group having completed over 60 meetings including some in person meetings and ICANN public meetings has published its initial report for public comment. As David noted earlier, public comment is a very important part of the policy development process. And hopefully you or your groups or your representatives from those groups who may have participated in this PDP will join the public comment and let the working group know what you think of some of its initial recommendations.

The public comment period closes again as you see from the timeline on the 7th of July which is a couple of weeks after the Buenos Aires meeting. And we hope that this will give you and your groups ample time to consider the report and to contribute your input.

The aim is to then prepare the final report which will take on board and into account all the public comments received. In fact all GNSO working groups when they come to this stage have to review all the public comments, analyze them, and see which of their recommendations may need to be changed or updated or added to in the final report. And the idea here is to have that done well before the next ICANN meeting for submission to the GNSO Council who will then vote on whether or not to accept those recommendations that have reached consensus amongst the working group.

You'll see here on this slide too that the scope of the working group that was charted was to look at issues that while they were identified during the last round of negotiations for the registrar accreditation agreement, those were

issues that were not addressed and that would be otherwise suited for the GNSO to conduct a PDP.

As you know, the registrar accreditation agreement is the contract that binds ICANN and all our accredited registrars through whom everyone who wants to register a domain name in the gTLD space would have to go. And those issues or rather issue that was identified upon the completion of the last round of RA negotiations were issues relating to the accreditation of privacy and proxy services.

Now again as you know, these are service providers who allow you as the registrant of a domain name to hide either some or all of your contact information from the publicly accessible directory online known as the Whois directory which normally would contain contact details as well as other information about a web site and its registrant.

There are quite a number of preliminary recommendations, and so this slide only highlights some of the key or major ones. And the primary one is that the working group has figured that for purposes of accreditation anyway, there should be no distinction in principle between the two types of services.

And under this key recommendation #1 you see on this slide that there are several specific recommendations that the working group believes would be important for the accreditation process, including for example the fact that accredited providers would have to publish a number of compulsory or mandatory provisions in the customer terms of service. And ICANN itself would have to publish a list for public availability of all accredited providers.

Because contactability of a provider, whether that be a registrar or any form of service provider, is an important issue for those who wish to either update or contact the registrant or the holder of a domain name. That has been something the working group has considered, along with the responsiveness of that service provider after being contacted.

And one of the purposes of having these two requirements is for any member of the public or law enforcement or a rights holder to report abuse. And so here again under #2 you see some specific recommendations that the working group has compiled for public comment.

The other two key recommendations that we've highlighted on this slide relate to two topics that have been of long standing concern and discussion throughout the ICANN community, including within and outside the Generic Name Supporting Organization. And that is relay of communications, in other words requiring a service provider to forward communications to its customers.

The working group has some recommendations on how this ought to be done in terms of electronic communications. And the other piece of this - the other long standing topic of concern regards the reveal of a customer's identity or his or her contact details in response to a request, possibly from law enforcement or possibly from an intellectual property rights holder or some other third party including consumer protection agencies and the like.

So the working group has some recommendations for all of these, including the use of terms that they hope can be uniformly defined to minimize confusion in the community. And what may be most interesting about this last topic is that for the first time a working group has come up with a fairly detailed and specific framework as an example of how to handle and how to respond to requests for the disclosure of customer identity by at least one group of requestors.

And this illustrative framework has been developed for intellectual property rights holders. And there is a question as to whether and how this kind of framework could apply to other types of requesters, for example as I mentioned law enforcement, consumer protection agencies, anti-abuse groups and the like.

Now that is still an unanswered question as you see here in bullet point #3 on this next slide. And there are other questions and issues on which the working group has not yet reached consensus. That concerns certain forms of commercial activity. If a web site is associated with activity that has online financial transactions, for example the buying and selling of goods, whether that should impact its ability to use some of these privacy or proxy services is still a question.

And while the working group has come up with a way to handle the initial relay or forwarding of requests to a customer, it has not yet reached consensus on what happens if those requests need to be escalated. So those as well with some preliminary recommendations I've touched on that have reached consensus are all in the initial report.

And as you can tell because these touch on topics of concern across the community, the working group is hopeful that you and your groups will be able to provide public comment, in particular on the open questions on which the working group will seek to reach consensus during preparation of its final report.

So this last slide is more information. There's some background, there's a public comment forum link. As we mentioned in the Adobe Connect Chat, all of these slides will be published and available online so you can look at them at your leisure. There's also a template that the working group has prepared to enable you to provide your input if you find that somewhat easier to go through the various recommendations in that form as opposed to submitting a general comment.

And on that note I hope this has been interesting. And I will turn it over to my colleague, Lars Hoffman, who will talk to you about another GNSO PDP that is coming to a close. Lars?

Lars Hoffman: Thank you Mary. My name is Lars Hoffman, and together with my colleague, Julie Hedlund, we are supporting the translation and transliteration of contact information PDP working group.

As you can see on the slide here, the group has been working since December of 2013, and it is due to submit its entire report this month. And I'll get back to that at the end of this little presentation.

As you can see, the group is charted to deal with two questions mainly, whether it is desirable to translate or transliterate contact information into a single common language or script, and then who should decide who should bear the burden of transforming contact information to a single language or script? A quick side note, the group decided to use transforming as an abbreviation of translate or transliterate.

Moving on to the next slide, those among you who are familiar with the group's initial report that was released in December last year will have seen these arguments or similar ones before. They opposed mandatory transformations. For example data submitted in original language is often more accurate. Significant costs may be connected to translate accurately large data sets, and to do so crucially in a consistent way.

And the financial burden is likely to be focused on underserved regions - I'm sorry. There are a couple of more here, and there's also a number more in the final report. And you are warmly encouraged obviously to read through that maybe on your plane ride to Buenos Aires if not before.

The working group proposes altogether seven recommendations. There's a summary there on the slide in the AC room. The key one is that it does not recommend mandatory transformation of contact information. Also registrants should be able to submit their contact information in their own script or language. And it would be up to the registrars to decide according to their business model which scripts and language they support. And of course the

burden of verification remains with them regardless of what language or script would be used by the registrant.

Well actually I'm going to stay on this slide for just a moment. As you remember from earlier in the year, the group is due to submit its report this month. And I'm a bit excited to let you know that the content has called deadline passed last night at 23:59 ETC. There was no objections. So it's very much expected that on today's call this afternoon the group will conclude its work and send the report on to the GNSO Council who will hopefully consider it during its meeting in Buenos Aires.

On the last slide here you see a few important links, the top one to the final report where it will be eventually posted. It's not there yet. And I think that's all for me. Thanks very much, and I'm passing it on to my colleague, Steve Sheng. Thank you.

Steve Sheng: Thank you Lars. My name is Steve Sheng, and I am based in the Los Angeles hub office where it's not so bright and early. Moving on to the first slide - having difficulty moving here.

I just wanted to start with a little background on the group. With the 2012 new gTLD round well on its way towards completion with the application submission process, the application evaluation process, the contention resolution process largely complete, and over 600 TLDs delegated, the community thought that analysis and discussion of the 2012 round should begin.

So in June 2014 the GNSO Council adopted a resolution to create the new gTLD subsequent procedures discussion group, a group that is intended to discuss, debate and analyze the 2012 round and identify issues or subjects for a possible future issue port, and subsequently possible future PDP working group which could result in changes or adjustments for subsequent new gTLD procedures.

And lastly for this slide, I just wanted to point out there was broad participation across the supporting organizations, advisory committees, stakeholder groups, constituencies, which is invaluable in lending their respective and unique insights and experiences to the discussion group.

So the current status of the discussion group is that it has just finished a set of three deliverables. The deliverables include (unintelligible). All right - continuing. So the current status of the discussion group is that there are three deliverables. And the first is an executive summary which is intended to provide a brief summary on the background of the program, current program status, and more importantly a narrative explaining the deliberations of the discussion group.

The second document is in a matrix where the discussion group is attempting to assign or associate the issues that the discussion group members identified, and connecting them with a principle recommendation or implementation guidance from the 2007 new gTLD's final report, where applicable of course.

In doing so it helps determine whether the principles or recommendations or implementation guidance may need to be amended, additional detail added, possibly sufficient as existing currently written or perhaps even no longer relevant and maybe could actually be deleted. And so if an issue was unable to be mapped to one of these areas, it possibly signaled to the group that it was an area for new policy work in fact.

And so lastly, the discussion group also prepared a draft charter which is intended to be included in the possible issue report and possible PDP working group. In this charter the discussion group identified or was attempting to identify the minimum set of subjects or issues that they expect to be worked on in a possible PDP as well as provisional groupings for how they could possibly be worked on by that PDP working group.

So there is a face to face - oh sorry, I think I missed a section - the next steps. Apologies for that. These three deliverables will be submitted to the GNSO Council along with a request for a single issue report and a motion for the council to be able to take action if they so choose.

So while the discussion group feels that a single issue report is the best path forward using the matrix and the draft charter as a basis for the staff drafted issue report, it's of course ultimately up to the GNSO Council to determine the path forward.

Moving on to the last slide - just wanted to point out that there is a face to face for the new gTLD discussion group. It's Wednesday the 24th, 11 to 12 local time. And if you'd like to look at the materials of the group, it's available on - will be available on the web site. And it's already available on the Wiki.

Moving on to Marika. That's all I had - thank you.

Marika Konings: Thank you Steve. I'll be talking to you now about the efforts of the GNSO Policy and Implementation working group.

I think as many of you may be aware, there has been increased focus over the last couple of years of how to deal with policy and 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 sufficiently clear processes in place to deal with those kind of questions?

As a result of those conversations, the GNSO Council formed a working group to focus on a number of questions that specifically relate to policy and 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 have since worked on reviewing those comments received and finalizing

its report which it was able to deliver to the GNSO Council earlier this month on the 2nd of June.

So in short the working group is putting forward a number of recommendations for the GNSO Council to consider. So in response to one of its charter questions which was asked for recommendations concerning a set of principles that would underpin any GNSO policy or implementations made at discussion, the working group recommends adhering to a number of principles and requirements that it has outlined in its final recommendations report.

These principles cover principles and requirements that apply to both policy and implementation, those that primarily apply to policy, and those that apply primarily to implementation. Furthermore in addition to the - the only formal process the GNSO currently has which is the GNSO policy development process or PDP, the working group also proposes three new standardized processes for GNSO deliberations.

And namely the first one, GNSO input process, and the intention that this process will be used for those instances for which a GNSO Council intends to provide nonbinding advice, which is expected to typically concern topics that are not gTLD specific and for which no policy recommendations have been developed to date.

In this context nonbinding advice means that it has no binding force on the party that it's provided to. So for example this process could be used to provide input on the ICANN strategic plan or recommendations from an accountability and transparency review team. The expectation that such input would be treated in a similar manner as public comments are currently considered by the entity to whom the input is provided.

And secondly the working group is proposing a GNSO guidance process or GGP which is to be used in those instances for which GNSO Council intends

to provide guidance that is required to be considered by the ICANN board, by which is not necessarily expected to resolve a new contractual obligations for contracted parties.

And guidance developed through a GGP means advice that has a binding force on the ICANN board to consider the guidance. And it can only be rejected by a vote of more than two thirds of the board, if the board would determine that the guidance provided is not in the best interest of the ICANN community or ICANN.

It is expected that this process would typically be used to provide clarification of or advice on existing gTLD policy recommendations. This could be in response to a specific request from the ICANN board, but it could also be at the own initiative of the GNSO Council to an issue that it has identified. For example such a process could have been used in relation to the request that was received a couple of years ago from the ICANN board to provide input on the (Doug Brand) registry agreement of Specification 13.

And thirdly the working group recommendations the creation of a GNSO expedited policy development process. And this process is expected to be used in those instances in which the GNSO Council intends to develop recommendations that would result in new contractual obligations for contracted parties that meet the criteria for so called consensus policies as well as meeting the qualifying criteria to initiate such an expedited PDP.

And those qualifying criteria are that one, it has to address a narrowly defined policy issue that was identified and scoped after either the adoption of a GNSO policy recommendation by the ICANN board, or the implementation of such an adopted recommendation. Or it is providing new or additional policy recommendations on a specific policy issue that had been substantially scoped previously such that extensive background information already exists. For example if there has been an issue report on a policy development

process that was not initiated or part of a previous PDP that was not completed, or through other projects such as a GGP.

So further details on each of these processes can be found in the final recommendations report. It is important to note that the working group has emphasized that none of these processes should be used as a second bite at the apple. So only if circumstances have changed and new information is available, should the council consider using these processes for an issue that has already been dealt with on the previous occasion through a different process.

And as a result of deliberations on the three implementation related charter questions, the working group is also recommending that the policy development process manual that outlines the steps and procedures for a PDP, that it is modified to require the creation of an implementation review team following the adoption of PDP recommendations by the ICANN board. But the GNSO Council should have the flexibility to not create such an implementation review team in exceptional circumstances, for example if there's already another implementation review team in place that could deal with the PDP recommendations.

It also recommends the adoption of the implementation review team principles as have been outlined in the final report that would need to be followed as part of the creation as well as the operation of implementation review teams.

So the GNSO Council will now consider the final recommendations report for adoption during the meeting in Buenos Aires. Provided that the GNSO Council adopt these recommendations, we expect that a public comment forum will be opened following that specifically for those recommendations that will require changes to the ICANN bylaws, such as for example some of the new proposed team (unintelligible) processes, following which the ICANN board would consider these changes for approval.

So in addition to the project mentioned in the previous slide, we also wanted to briefly mention three other projects, two of which have meetings in Buenos Aires and one of which you can expect a public comment forum to open shortly after the ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires.

The first one of those is the IGO-INGO access to curative rights protection mechanisms policy development process. This working group is considering whether existing dispute resolution processes should be amended or whether a new process should be developed to address specific needs and concerns of IGOs and INGOs.

This 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 to hear where the group is currently at. The working group is aiming to deliver its initial report for public comment at the end of this year.

Secondly, the board recently reconfirmed its request for an issue report, which is the first step in a policy development process, on defining the purpose of collecting, maintaining and providing access to gTLD registration data, and consider safeguards for protecting data, using the recommendations of the expert working group as an input to and if appropriate as the foundation for a new gTLD policy.

The preliminary issue report that's being prepared by ICANN staff is expected to be shortly after the ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires for public comment. So if you're interested in that topic, please look out for that and provide your input.

And last but not least is the Data and Metrics for Policymaking Working Group. This working group has been tasked to establish a framework to inform fact-based GNSO policy development. The working group has recently

completed draft data request guidelines and templates to support the framework and is in the process of reviewing and refining a preliminary initial report, which it hopes to publish for public comments in Q3 of this year.

This working group also has a session in Buenos Aires on Thursday the 25th of June from 7 to 8 local time. That is also open to anyone interested to participate.

For further information about the GNSO activities and to prepare for the ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires, the GNSO team has created a dedicated webpage, which includes all of the essentials for your review. And you'll find the link to that page on this slide.

In addition to these GNSO projects, there are also a number of cross-community working groups, which several of the ICANN supporting organizations and advisory committees participate. I mentioned earlier the Cross-Community Working Group on IANA Stewardship Transition and Enhancing Accountability, but we also wanted to briefly update you on two other cross-community working groups and that's - for that I'll hand it back to Mary.

Mary Wong: Thank you.

Marika Konings: It's Lars actually. Sorry.

Mary Wong: Yes it is. No problem.

Lars Hoffman: That's all right. I won't take it too badly. Thank you, Marika. Together with Marika and Bart Boswinkel we support the cross-community working groups on the use of country and territory names as top level domains.

                 This CWG was charted by the ccNSO and the GNSO Council to establish (unintelligible) frameworks, if you want, for the use of country and territory

names as top level domains. And to emphasize this just one more time, the group does not concern itself with second or third level domains.

The group has identified three broad issues, along which has structured its work. There's a two-letter codes, three-letter codes and four country and territory names. And in addition, the group has set out to establish some definitions of key terms.

Since the ICANN meeting in Singapore, the group has advanced its work. It has achieved to draw up a list of definitions and has also started substantial discussions on two-letter codes and are planning to present a progress paper either in Singapore - sorry, either in Buenos Aires or shortly thereafter.

And in addition also, the group is trying to maintain close relations with the back working group on the protection of geographic names in the gTLD space to assure there is a complementary policy development going on.

As you can see on the slides here, the group is meeting face to face on Monday at 1 pm local time in Buenos Aires. It's an open session with all community members welcome and of course encouraged to join the discussions. And I think that it is. You see there the (unintelligible) is ICANN 54 for the initial report.

And with that I'll pass it onto Mary, I believe. Thank you.

Mary Wong: Thank you, Lars. And this will not take very long. This cross-community working group, or CWG, that I was going to update you on has been affectionately christened CWG squared, as you see on this slide, because this is the CWG to development a framework of principles for future CWGs.

The group has been working for awhile, and I don't think I need to emphasize to everyone on this call that there is clearly an increasingly reliance on the use of CWGs across the ICANN community on increasing issues of common

interest. However ICANN does not have an existing framework of principles or consistent published rules that would determine the formation, the chartering, the operating rules for the closure and the follow up of any CWG.

So this CWG was jointly chartered by the GNSO and the Country Codes Names Supporting Organization or, ccNSO, who you will hear from next, to really develop an initial set of these principles for sharing with the community and for finalization with the community.

So in Buenos Aires the working group will be discussing a very early framework proposal, and that will be on Wednesday, and hopefully you or your groups will be able to join this group remotely or in person to contribute your feedback, especially if you've been participating in any one of the past or current cross-community working groups that we now have.

And having mentioned the ccNSO, I now have the pleasure of turning this over to my colleague, Bart, who will update you on their activities. Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you, Mary. Let me quickly take you through the update on the ccNSO. I want to focus on a - the main topics and some additional work of the ccNSO and the broader ccTLD community in Buenos Aires.

So I'll touch upon the ccNSO process for making decisions on the CWG proposal, assuming it will be submitted through the chartering organizations, a little bit on the secure e-mail list activities, specifically for ccTLDs, in general some other substantive work and provide you some background information.

Now first to the ccNSO decision making on the CWG's stewardship proposal. As (David) already alluded to, this is one of the major CWG working groups that is ongoing. And why I included this for - in this policy webinar is that at the ccNSO meetings in Buenos Aires, it will take up a large portion of time. There will be over five hours dedicated to discussing and - the CWG proposal

in order to reach a decision on the proposal on whether to submit it from a ccNSO perspective to the ICG.

Now as you know, the ccNSO is one of the chartering organizations and for that reason it is engaged in the decision making process, but what is important to understand is that ultimately the ccNSO members do represent only, although a large portion, but only a portion of the full ccTLD community. The ccNSO is seeking a full or is seeking support from the broader ccTLD community on this process. So both for members and for non-members of the ccNSO. To give you a rough idea, there are about 248 ccTLDs, and 153 of them are members of the ccNSO.

Another issue that why the ccNSO is taking so much time to discuss and understand it is the potential overlap with the limited policy scope of the ccNSO. As some of you will be aware, the ccNSO Council sent letters to the CWG and CCWG co-chairs alluding to the point that in principle if both or one of them identifies potential issues that fall within the remit of the policy scope of the ccNSO, they are advised to inform them so the ccNSO can take this on in its upcoming policy work. And already two issues that have been identified.

One have is the retirement of ccTLDs, and secondly whether or not to introduce an independent appeal mechanism for the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs. So there is potential overlap with delegation, re-delegation work of the ccNSO. And then thirdly, and that's not just specific for the ccNSO, but it is important for the broader community in the ccNSO to understand is the dependency on the accountability work.

Now as I said, the ccNSO is not just made up of the ccNSO council but also as, say, the second part of the organization is the ccNSO membership, and a third but outside the ccNSO are effectively the ccTLDs who are not members of the ccNSO. So at the end of the day -- and that's why it's taken so long as well -- at the end of the day the role of the ccNSO Council is not to make a

decision in isolation, but the role of the ccNSO Council is more to reflect the sense of the community on the CWG proposal.

So what will happen in Buenos Aires, what will the ccNSO discuss and how is it structured? The main part of the ccNSO sessions, as I said over five hours, is on information sharing and discussion. The program committee has -- the ccNSO Meetings Program Committee that is -- has identified different blocks and they will be - and they are dispersed over the full days, different blocks on discussion.

And they range from general information sharing to specific information sharing discussions on elements of the CWG proposal, and then finally that's the wrap up and the sense of the community. And this will happen on Wednesday afternoon. wrap up and sense of the community on the CWG proposal as is.

So we hope that not only the ccTLDs present in Buenos Aires will participate in that exercise but also ccTLDs will participate remotely. And this will culminate in the ccNSO Council meeting on Wednesday afternoon to reflect - that will reflect the sense of the community. So that is about the main sessions of the ccNSO in Buenos Aires.

Secondly I want to touch upon a completely different topic to show you the breadth of the activities of the ccNSO and its working groups and which will come to a close in at or around the Buenos Aires meeting, and that is around the secure communications e-mail list.

This (SECEL) or Secure E-mail List Working Group, is a third phase in a process to engage the full ccTLD community in enhancing the security of the DNS. It started as a result, as some of you may recall, from what is called the (conflicker) incident. So that's some time ago.

And after an extensive discussion, including a test and a check on feasibility, the working group has now reached almost conclusion on a creation of a secure e-mail list. And please note, this e-mail list is not used as a classical e-mail discussion list. It is rather a telephone book so that enables ccTLD operators to easily and quickly look up each other's contact information in case of an incident.

The e-mail list itself is not secured but exchanges on the information on the list are in fact not encouraged. It is rather suggested that the subscribers use the data and then go on - and then contact each other through other means such as telephone.

The reason why this is not secured, and this also illustrates some of the issues we're dealing with, is if it would be secured, it would exclude many ccTLDs who would not have the capacity to join, especially these type of lists are only valuable if as many ccTLD operators as possible will join.

So another point is this e-mail list, or the (SECEL), is run by the ccNSO's secretariat OAC platform. The ccNSO secretariat is just handling the administration and there are several procedures which are around the subscriptions which are ensured by say the working group and in future potentially by a governance committee.

Currently there are 153 subscribers, including IDNs, and outreach efforts still continue. These are the numbers, say, the numbers of the 9th of June, and of the 153 ccTLD subscribers they represent over 300 people. More information is available at the URL.

Finally I want to touch upon some other work of the ccNSO. First of all the ccNSO Strategic and Operational Planning Working Group, as those of you know who have attended more of these webinars, this is a standing committee of the ccNSO and is - was established in 2009. It provides input and feedback on ICANN's strategic and operational plans. And I just want to

highlight that they submitted and provided input on the ICANN fiscal year '16 operational plan and budget, will inform the ccNSO on, say, their findings and will have a discussion with ICANN staff on their findings to check what is happening.

And finally just again a working group that has been recently created, which is the Guideline Review Committee. This is a committee that reviews the internal ccNSO rules and guidelines to - on, say, whether they reflect the current practices of the ccNSO and to update them in order to deal with the growth of the ccNSO.

As I said, there were 153 ccNSO or ccTLDs who are members of the ccNSO, and most of these guidelines were developed in 2008, 2009 period when there were less than 100. So the change of scale probably results in a change of practices and procedures as well. Please note that this review is independent of and not linked a structural review of the ccNSO itself, which is anticipated in one or two years.

Finally, some background information on the ccNSO meetings and the other topics I've touched on. And now I want to hand over to my dear colleague, Barbara Roseman. Thank you.

Barbara Roseman: Thank you, Bart. I'd like to discuss the Address Supporting Organization and their activities at the upcoming meeting. The Address Council is composed of 15 members -- excuse me -- three from each region, with one person from each region being elected each year. Regional policy forums of each RIR slots, so two of the members, and the executive board of each RIR appoints one person from each respective region.

The most current appointees were (Mark Elkins), who was appointed to replace (Alan Barrett) through December of 2015. (Alan), as you may or may not know, took over the CEO of - as the CEO of AFRINIC. And (Ricardo

Patera) through LACNIC was reappointed to chair through December of 2018.

Global policy in the ASO scheme has a very particular meaning, meaning the RIRs developed many regional address policies and a very few policies that affect IANA and the relationships to the RIRs are the called global policies. Some areas of local policy under discussion at the RIR meetings have been IPV4 transfer policies, listing qualifications for IPV6 allocations, and inter-registry transfers of IP address blocks.

So that would be transferring from one user to another, IP addresses that were for instance assigned originally in the APNIC region and are now going to be used in the ARIN region, for instance. And those are all active discussions where there is a good healthy amount of concern about what the consequences of these different policies might be. None of them are global policies in that they don't involve the relationship between IANA and the RIRs, and so they're just being discussed locally.

At ICANN 53 there will be work sessions throughout the week. The discussions are the RIR and ASO proposals on the IANA transition. And the ASO will be meeting with the ICANN board of directors. One of their responsibilities at the ASO Address Council is to appoint board members, ICANN board members, and (Rowan Desilva) has been appointed to replace Ray Plzak as seat nine of the board of directors beginning after ICANN 54.

There will be an ASO/AC public meeting and workshop. This is a - their annual face-to-face public meeting where they get all of their ASO/AC members together. And it's currently scheduled for Wednesday 24 June from 15:30 to 17:00. That may change. There's some discussion about trying to work around some conflicts that some people have and so it may end up being earlier in the day on Wednesday.

And with that I'd like to hand this over to Steve Sheng to talk about the Root Service System Advisory Commitment.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Barbara. The Root Server System Advisory Committee consists of 12 voting root server operator representatives. These are appointed by the ICANN board. They also consist of three non-voting root zone management partners. Currently IANA, NTIA and VeriSign; three non-voting liaisons from the Internet Architectural Board, the ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Commitment and from the ICANN board.

For - currently it's chaired by (Lehman) from (Iroot) in Sweden, and (Triptee) from the University of Maryland, (Droot). The RSAC meets monthly via teleconference and in person ICANN meetings. The RSAC caucus is another structure that currently consists of 61 root server system experts. A case in point is 43% of them do not work for root server operators.

So if you recall earlier, the purpose of the restructuring of the RSAC and the creation of the caucus is to provide broader input for root server matters from non-root server operator experts. So we're seeing that.

The caucus has held a successful kickoff meeting in ITF 92 in Dallas, and currently it's working on a few items. The first item is the caucus is reviewing a report on root zone TTLs. This is a technical perimeter that specifies how long a set of resource records should remain a cast of the recursive resolvers. The TTLs for the root zone has not changed for the past almost 20 years, and the RSAC caucus is taking a proactive look to see, given today's Internet environment, whether these perimeters need to be changed. So the report is currently finished and it's reviewed in the RSAC caucus. It's expected to be sent to the RSAC for action in ICANN 53.

There are a few proposed study areas, three of them. The first one is whether or not to (unintelligible) the root servers .net zone. This is the zone that, you know, hosts the DNS records for the root servers. And second is whether or

not to, you know, instead of having these in the root server's .net zone, actually move these to a new TLD dot root servers. So that's - the first two are closely related.

And the second proposed item is to create a framework to track deployment of RSAC's 002 statistics. That is a set of statistics published by root server operators to monitor the overall growth and health of the root zone. So those are the proposed study areas.

At ICANN 53 the RSAC will actively participate. They have three working sessions to discuss various internal matters and continue to plan for 2015. The RSAC will also meet with ICANN board, the SSAC, the Cross-Community Working Group on ICANN Accountability. Their session, their public session, is on Wednesday 24th of June.

Moving on next, my colleague Julie and I will talk about the - provide you with an update in the SSAC. I'll talk about a reason of Advisory SSAC 70, and my colleague Julie will talk about SSAC 71 and SSAC at ICANN 53.

Public Suffix List. So a Public Suffix list is a domain under which multiple parties that are unaffiliated with the owner domain may register sub-domains. So we look at, you know, we provided some examples here. For example, Dot Org, Dot CO.UK, K12.PA.US.

These suffixes can be one label, two label or three labels as shown in the example. And there's really no problematic way to determine the boundary where the DNS label changes stewardship on a public suffix.

The tracking this boundary is actually critically important for security, privacy and usability issues in many systems and applications; we'll show you a few.

So this table lists a few of the uses for the public suffix. It originally started by Mozilla Foundation only to - for the security of cookie settings; that is to

restrict setting over privileged cookies. And currently it is being used - this feature is used by every major Web browser. In addition to that, there's the issue of (SS South) certificates which is also a security issue.

The last three points about navigate ability, TLD validation, domain (unintelligible) is actually critical to the acceptance of TLDs. Let me give you an example in the next slide.

For example, major browsers use Public Suffix Lists to determine whether a term, a domain, put in the browser bar should be sent to the search engine or should perform a DNS low cup (sic).

However, if different browsers, which is in this case are using different versions of the Public Suffix, then you see different results entering the same query. So this is one result. If you enter a newly formed newly delegated TLD, it works in Google Chrome which uses a more recent version of the Public Suffix, but it doesn't work in Safari which uses an earlier version.

So the SSAC looks into these issues and makes a set of recommendations towards different parties. So the recommendations can be categorized into two broad buckets.

From the long-term perspective, the SSAC recommends the IETF and the technical community to standardize the PSL alternative realizing it is a design compromise.

In the short-term realizing the PSL are being used, you know, by major browsers, lots of applications, and it's critical important for the acceptance of TLDs the SSAC recommends a set of actions in the short-term to what ICANN IANA application developers to address these issues.

So that's a quick overview of SAC-70. This will be presented at ICANN 53.

Next I'll hand over to my colleague Julie to talk about SAC-71.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Steve and thank you everyone for joining us today.

Our comments on the ccWG Accountability Work Stream 1 Proposal from the SSAC center on the SSAC's advisory role as an advisory committee to ICANN specifically in its charter, the SSAC advises the ICANN community and board on matters relating to the security and integrity of the Internet's naming and address allocation systems. And the SSAC in its comment noted that its advice should be evaluated on its merits.

The SSAC has never given or sought any standing for its advice, and it should be evaluated by affected parties, believes that because of its purely advisory role to which it's best suited, it asks the ccWG Accountability to take this into account in its review of the options that it describes in its proposal in Section 512.

Also the SSAC notes that it has no comment at this time on whether or not illegal structures are required or desirable to compel ICANN and the Board to respond to the SSAC's advice, is concerned about the way in which the proposed new SO/AC 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 notes the relatively short time available for consideration of the ccWG's draft proposal and thus reserves the right to make additional comments as further details are developed.

You can find the SSAC's comments that is SSAC-71 posted in the Public Comment Forum earlier this week and also published on the SSAC Web page.

And also a highlight of SSAC activities at ICANN 53. There will be the DNS SEC for everybody, a beginner's guide on the 22nd of June from 5:00 to 6:30 pm, and that is a very popular and helpful guide. And I urge anybody who is at the meeting to attend.

There's also the DNS SEC Workshop which is at a higher technical level but still provides a wealth of information. That is on the 24th of June on Wednesday from 9:00 am to 3:15 policymaking, and then the SSAC Public Meeting on the 25th of June from 8:00 to 9:00 am where the SSAC will give an overview of all its recent activities.

In addition, the SSAC is meeting with the community, with the ALAC, the GAC, the GNSO and also the Board. For more information, here is the Web page and also the list of publications.

Thank you very much. And now I'd like to turn things over to my colleagues Olaf Nordling and Julia Charvolen.

Julia Charvolen: Thank you Julie. Hello everyone. My name is Julia Charvolen. I'm the GAC Services Coordinator and I'm going to provide you with an update on the Governmental Advisory Committee which is also abbreviated at the GAC.

The GAC is comprised of government and international governmental organizations -- IGO. And the GAC has currently 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 of its transition and ICANN's Accountability program.

The GAC is one of the chartering organizations for both the Cross-Community Working Group by name and the Cross-Community Working Group on Accountability. Both of those discussions will be held on Sunday.

In Buenos Aires, the GAC will be discussing the remaining issues related to the new gTLD program such as the protection of IGO names and acronyms, the implementation of GAC safe guarded by (sic), and country and territory names as second level domain names.

Among the various public policy issues currently being discussed within ICANN, the GAC established four new working groups.

Firstly, 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 (unintelligible) for human rights and international law as well as community efforts to organize discussions on this matter. The 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, the DNS, and the main name registration are not used to enhance unlawful activity, abuse, consumer fraud and/or violations of law. The working group will also be meeting on Tuesday.

The Underserved Regions and Community Applications working groups are two new working groups which were previously subgroups under the future gTLD working group. Both have become independent working groups similar to the Country and Territory Names working group focusing on preparing for future realms.

All of the afore mentioned working groups will be presenting their terms of reference to the GAC for endorsement in Buenos Aires. 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 ATIT-2 Recommendation which is being addressed by a number of working groups.

The GAC will also begin to prepare for ICANN 64 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 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 Communiqué Drafting Session which is being held on Wednesday afternoon.

You are all most very welcome to follow the GAC sessions in the meeting room (unintelligible) - I'm sorry. All sessions will be available in the six languages as well as Portuguese.

And with that I will hand it over to Heidi Ulrich to talk about the ALAC.

Heidi Ulrich: Thank you very much Julia. Hello everyone, my name is Heidi Ulrich. I'm the Senior Director for At-Large and I'm based in the Los Angeles hub office.

Today I'm going to be joined by two of my teammates supporting the At-Large community; Arial Liang, At-Large Policy Coordinator, and Silvia Vivanko, Manager At-Large Regions.

We are delighted to give you a brief update on the activities of the At-Large Advisory Committee or the ALAC. And the At-Large community consisting of the five regional At-Large organizations and now 190 At-Large structures that have taken place between the 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 begin with, the ALAC's main topics in Buenos Aires, there will be two main topics. The first 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 of Transition Working Group, TWG for short, have been held since August 2014. And in Buenos Aires, over five hours of At-Large sessions on this topic are scheduled to take place.

In terms of content, the ALAC is generally supportive of the Draft CWG's proposal. The ALAC would prefer an IANA wholly integrated into ICANN but is willing to accept a compromise of a separate legal entity.

The ALAC is officially very concerned about the lack of multistakeholder oversight involvement and will offer guidance of how this might be addressed. This main topic will be discussed during meetings of the ALAC and the Transition Working Group on Sunday and Tuesday.

The second main topic of the ALAC is ICANN Accountability and Transparency. In general, the ALAC is supportive of the direction being taken by the ccWG. In its comment to public comment, the ALAC provided guidance on a number of issues some of which the ccWG is explicitly 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 mechanism is required, and how the potential use of such

enforceability will alter the spirit of the organizations. And this topic will also be discussed during meetings of the ALAC and the Transition Working Group on Sunday and Tuesday during the ICANN week.

For ALAC and At-Large activities at ICANN 53, they will be very busy. They will be holding 29 formal meetings as well as many informal meetings.

For their meeting with the Board ICANN Board of Directors on Tuesday morning between 8:30 and 9:30, the ALAC will raise the questions on the topics of equitable access for all stakeholders. This question is focused on the ATRT-2 Recommendation 10.5 which focuses on the Board needing to facilitate the equitable participation in equitable ICANN activities.

The second question is postponement of the At-Large Review as an example of community accepting an overloaded agenda. And the third question is the topic of the picas in Category 1 gTLD.

The ALAC will be meeting with the ccNSO, GAC, NCSG and SSAC leadership as well as Senior ICANN Staff during the ICANN meeting. And also 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 Group on Sunday, the At-Large Technology Task Force on Monday, the At-Large Ad-hoc New Meeting Strategy Working Party on Tuesday, the Transition Working Group meeting two parts on both on (unintelligible) in the afternoon, the At-Large Capacity Building Working Group on Wednesday, and the ICANN Academy Working Group meeting on Wednesday.

And importantly, the ICANN 53 Meeting looks for much of the application process for the Third Annual Leadership Training Program which will be taking place at ICANN 54 in Dublin. The Academy Working Group organizes

that -- the Leadership Training Program -- and this is open to all incoming or current leadership AC/SO/SG leaders.

These At-Large working groups provide the primary source of ALAC policy advice developments and the ALAC policy statements.

And I'd now like to hand the floor over to my colleague Ariel who will provide an update on the ALAC Policy Statement submitted for ICANN 52. Ariel?

Ariel Liang: Thank you very much Heidi. This is Ariel Liang, At-Large Policy Coordinator.

In addition to the ALAC policy advice statement on the CWG IANA 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 requests since the end of ICANN 52.

Now I will provide you a summary of these four ALAC statements. First, with regard to the potential change to Registrar Accredited Patient Insurance Requirement, the ALAC (unintelligible) the commercial general liability insurance policy shortened as CGL is the most critical barrier for underserved regions to put this page in a domain name industry.

The ALAC proposes that ICANN eliminate the CGL, and has alternative reserves (unintelligible) provided by the registrars according to their transaction volumes for covering any harm caused to registrants by registrars wrongful acts.

Second, after reviewing the Version 2 of Maximum Starting Repertoire shortened as MSR2, a deliverable under the procedure to develop and maintain label generation rules for the root zone with respect to IDN labels.

The ALAC recommends that clarifies the likely impacts of changes to the underlying (unintelligible) standards to MSR2. In addition, the ALAC assures its support to ICANN's IDN program and welcomes joint activities that involve At-Large structures in relevant geographies.

Third, the ALAC generally supports the proposed principles in the GNSO policy and implementation initial recommendation report. The ALAC pointed 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 regard to the proposed additional GNSO processes, the ALAC suggests stress testing to better understand these facts of the changes.

Next, the ALAC is satisfied with the ICANN Draft FY16 Operating Plan and Budget as a whole, but has one specific comment related to the support of ICANN policy department.

Considering that multistakeholder policy development (unintelligible) ICANN from any other organization, the ALAC is concerned that the overall budget allocated to the policy department and supporting SOs and ACs is about 10% of the total budget. More specifically, given the increase of activities related to the expansion of the At-Large community, organizational review and upcoming policy development processes, the ALAC calls for hiring additional full time staff in a policy department supporting both the ALAC and the GNSO in FY16.

On Tuesday, 23rd of June in ICANN 53 Buenos Aires, At-Large members will meet with ICANN Finance Staff to have a full-on discussion on FY16 Operating Plan and Budget advice. On the same day, At-Large members and 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 its policy development process.

For more information about the ALAC Policy Advice, you may visit the Correspondence Page on the At-Large Web site for the adopted advice (unintelligible) At-Large Policy Development Wiki Workspace to follow the (unintelligible) underdevelopment.

Over to you Silvia.

Silvia Vivanko: Thank you very much Ariel.

Hello. My name is Silvia Vivanko. I am Manger of At-Large Regional Affairs, and I will review the remedies (sic) at ICANN 53.

Reflecting the increased activities within the (unintelligible), all regions will hold the respective to monthly meetings face-to-face in Buenos Aires. APRALO we'll hold the APRALO African joint meeting on the same African views on the proposal of the Governments of Internet Unique Identifiers on Wednesday, June 24th.

APRALO will hold this meeting on Wednesday 24th, and among other issues there will be a discussion on the progress and implementation of the APRALO/APAC vital framework.

EURALO will hold this monthly meeting on Tuesday 23rd. One of the main items of discussion will be the preparations for the dinner assembly to be held at ICANN 54 in Dublin.

LACRALO will hold this due meeting on Wednesday 24th. Subjects will include the IANA Transition, the passage of building, and a review of the LACRALO internal procedures.

And NARALO will hold this monthly meeting on Wednesday the 22nd. The topics will include outreach engagement and the new NARALO newsletter. Next slide.

I will review the cross RALO meetings at ICANN 53. Upon invitation of Fadi Chehadé, ICANN's President and CEO, all five RALO Chairs will participate in the community roundtable with AC, SO, SG RALO chairs on Friday, June 19th, before the start of ICANN 53.

On Saturday the 20th at 10:00 am, the RALOs will hold the RALO Chairs Meeting co-chaired by LACRALO and EURALO other chairs. The (unintelligible) meeting of this group has as its aim the leveraging of senior use between the global stakeholder engagement team and the At-Large community in the work with civil society in the ICANN context.

The focus will be a discussion on the civil society engagement within ICANN and with Jean-Jacques Sahel, ICANN's VP for Europe as invited speaker.

On Saturday 20th, the RALOs will also meet with the ALAC leadership team or ALT in the RALO Chairs and ALT meeting to discuss issues of strategic importance for At-Large.

Finally, the Five RALOs will hold the Regional (Unintelligible) Meeting on Wednesday 24th. Among other issues, the result of the Cross RALO Professional Capability Survey will be discussed.

And now I would like to invite you to a very special event. The LACRALO Showcase 2015 Knowledge for Inclusion. This LACRALO event is scheduled for Wednesday the 24th at 18:30 until 20:30 at the meeting room Golden Corn. This is a community celebration inviting the ten communities to learn more about the achievements of LACRALO.

They will showcase how LACRALO is engaging a diverse community of 47 (unintelligible) spread out in Latin American and the Caribbean in 16 countries. Approximately 20 LACRALO liaisons will attend this event.

This will provide you an opportunity to meet and greet LACRALO and At-Large community members personally.

The speakers will include ICANN's President and CEO Fadi Chehadé, ICANN's Board Chairman Steve Crocker, ALAC's Chair Alan Greenberg, (Unintelligible) for Latin America and the Caribbean Rodrigo de la Parra, LACRALO's Chair Alberto Soto, and LACRALO departing ALAC member Fatimo Cambronero.

Please join us for a very special music and dance, (Dango Dance), and lesson. Performance by (Fulclore Company), company for (Unintelligible). This event is co-sponsored by ICANN, (Lac Nece) and Google 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 and I'm a Community Engagement Support Coordinator on the Policy Team.

I'd like to handle the question-and-answer now. So if you'd like to ask a question from the audio, please press star followed by 1 and record your name clearly before speaking. Your name is required to introduce your question and open your line. Thank you.

So once again, if you'd like to ask a question, please press star followed by 1. Thank you. I'll just give it a moment to see if we have any questions.

Yes and Nathalie Peregrine just noted that you can also type your question in the Chat if you have any questions.

So we do not have any questions for the moment, so I'll just address the next slide which addresses the questions that we received through the RSVP form.

We received a couple of questions regarding Fadi Chehadé's resignation and regarding cyber threats. For the answers to these questions, please refer to the links provided on the slide.

We also received a specific question regarding one of the GNSO working groups. And the question was, "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 (unintelligible) process and its followers?"

The answer provided by Staff support for this working group was, "The next step is consideration of their recommendation by the GNSO Council in BA. Please find the link on the slide. After the GNSO Council consideration, there will be a public comment period prior to the Board consideration since these recommendations involve changes to the ICANN bylaws. And this will be followed by an ICANN Board consideration."

"Once adopted, the adopting of the bylaws and the GNSO operating principles shouldn't take very long, but all-in-all it could take up to six months."

Let's just see again if there are any audio questions. So if you'd like to ask a question, please press star 1.

Operator, do we have any questions?

Coordinator: At this time, we have no questions on queue.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you very much.

Well if you have any questions following the webinar or any inquires as to how to stay updated with the Policy Team, please use the team email

address which is Policy Dash Staff at ICANN Dot Org. You may also follow us on Twitter using the handles that are used on the slide here.

The Policy Team also releases monthly policy updates which are available in Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish. And to sign up for these monthly issues, please follow the URL provided on the slide.

If you're new to working groups or have already been participating in working groups, I would like to (unintelligible) for asking questions. You will find the GNSO Working Group Newcomer Open House Session very useful. These sessions are community led for new GNSO working group participants to come together and discuss any questions they may have about working group procedures and/or processes in an informal setting. The next session is scheduled for Thursday, 25th of September at 12:00 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 and thanks members of the Policy Team for their comprehensive review of activities in ICANN 53, and for audience and community members for listening in to this. I know we provided a lot of information to you, and to that extent, the slides will be available as well as the transcripts and the recordings to help you look at all that as you can.

The Policy Team of course is now 27 full time employees, subject matter experts and SO and AC Support Staff. We have the capability of 15 languages. We are located in nine countries with five times those to serve you as best we can in the policy and advisory development processes at ICANN.

And after that extent, here is kind of a list of those people. Some of them you may know; others you may run into putting voices on teleconferences to

faces if you're at the ICANN Meeting in Buenos Aires Face-to-Face or on teleconferences as well.

With that, here is the place where you can access the slides, the transcripts and the recordings, and again, subscribing to our monthly update is a very good way to keep informed about the latest activity. Of course, you can ask and send us emails at any time and we're happy to explain and direct you to the right working group or the substance that you have a question upon.

With that, I just see we're running a little bit over time. I would like to thank our community members for their participation and listening to our update. I hope that it has been helpful and provides you with the background that you need as we go forward to other decisions and actions that will be taking place in Buenos Aires at ICANN 53.

With that, I would like to wish everyone a good evening, good afternoon or good morning, whatever you may be. I'm looking forward to seeing you either face-to-face in Buenos Aires or remote participation. We welcome you on your involvement.

Thank you very much and my team thanks you as well.

END