


# At-Large Beijing Meeting Reports Workspace

Reports submitted by At-Large community members who covered non-At-Large events at the ICANN Beijing meeting. Please note that reports will be posted after the meeting begins.

Meeting	Date and Time	Assignee and RALO	Report
---------	---------------	-------------------	--------


New gTLD SSR Update	8 April 2013, 1500-1630	Julie Hammer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Report on New gTLD SSR Update by SSAC Liaison</a></li> <li>• The Audiocast of the Session can be found at <a href="http://beijing46.icann.org/node/37057">http://beijing46.icann.org/node/37057</a></li> </ul> <p><b>General Points</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IANA is ready to process delegations wef 1May.</li> <li>• Growth of traffic in the root zone is not really dependent on the no of TLDs. The change on the size of the root zone will not be changes (eg deployment of DNSSEC in 2010).</li> <li>• L-root has been collecting some metrics (wef 3 Apr) so that long term trends can be observed i.e. they are establishing the ba</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion on SAC057 - Internal Name Certificates</b></p> <p><i>Certificate Authorities (CAs)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not all CAs are members of the CA/Browser Forum and may not abide by Ballot 96. (See <b>Supplementary Note</b>)</li> <li>• Even if they do, there will still exist a vulnerability window because of the 120 days (Ballot 96).</li> <li>• We don't really know what certificates have been issued for these internal name servers.</li> </ul> <p><i>Browser Vendors</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ICANN Security Team is working with Browser Vendors on this issue. Some browsers do not check for revocation of certificate</li> <li>• Part of Solution might be to use DANE and sign with DNSSEC.</li> <li>• Options being considered by browser vendors to address this will only be applicable to latest versions and there will still be ma use.</li> </ul> <p><i>Other Applications</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Browsers are not the only applications used to connect to the internet. There are a number of other protocols that rely on Certi web queries.</li> <li>• Some applications don't support renovation checking at all, or a man-in-the-middle attack can stop the revocation from happer</li> <li>• One mitigation is to ask server manufacturers to turn on OCSP Stapling by default (On-Line Certificate Status Protocol). This status would be checked.</li> <li>• There may be other complex interactions between the DNS and other applications at the root level, cross application issues, w explored. SSAC has been asking for interdisciplinary studies on these issues and ICANN may need to act as coordinator/facil</li> </ul> <p><b>Other Issues and Concerns</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Irrespective of the case where certificates already exist for yet to be released gTLDs, there is also a problem associated with i configurations which utilise these names with or without certificates at the second or third levels eg example.com where .exarr gTLD. Queries to these new gTLDs may be directed to these internal networks, causing problems for businesses, consumers observed that ISPs will likely bear the brunt of complaints if this occurs and possibly incur significant costs in customer supp core services.</li> </ul> <p><i>Letter from Paypal</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letter identified their concern about 'significant security issues related to delegating gTLDs that are currently in wide use as d state the top 10 of these represent 10% of the total query load at the root servers. The top 13 invalid queries some of which a RFC6762 are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• .invalid .wpad .home .belkin .corp .lan .domain .localdomain .localhost .local .intranet .internal .private</li> </ul> </li> <li>• This was highlighted in <b>SAC045 - Invalid Top Level Domain Queries at the Root Level</b>. Recommendations were made in t</li> </ul> <p><i>New Measurements</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SAC057 is based on data from August 2010. One member of the community has collected similar but not identical data since examined only web queries in the .com and .net TLDs, looking for IPs that are pointed to by DNS names. Although the results found that there are some 25 million certificates associated with 51 applied for new gTLDs, the biggest being .corp with 102 ur</li> <li>• The top 4 in order of size were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• .corp .home .offline .inc</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Others that are also commonly found are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• .site .mail .bank .ads (active directory service)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>There was a call to the community to identify any other issues and concerns which should be addressed in relation to new gTLDs.</p> <p><b>Supplementary Note</b></p> <p>Mozilla has a Network Security Services (NSS), a set of libraries designed to support cross-platform development of security-enable applications. This library provides a complete open-source implementation of the crypto libraries used by AOL, Red Hat, Sun, and o of products, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Mozilla client products, including Mozilla Suite, Firefox, and Thunderbird.</li> <li>• The Netscape browsers</li> <li>• AOL Communicator and AOL Instant Messenger (AIM)</li> <li>• Open source client applications such as Evolution, Gaim, and <a href="http://OpenOffice.org">OpenOffice.org</a> 2.0.</li> <li>• Server products from Red Hat: Red Hat Directory Server, Red Hat Certificate System, and the mod_nss SSL module for the A</li> <li>• Server products from the Sun Java Enterprise System, including Sun Java System Web Server, Sun Java System Directory S Portal Server, Sun Java System Messaging Server, and Sun Java System Application Server.</li> </ul> <p>At the SSAC Public Meeting in Beijing (0800-0900 Thursday 11Apr12), it was revealed by a member of the CAB Forum that recentl to adopt the gTLD requirements (ballot 96). Once Mozilla adopts it, the requirement will be binding on all CAs (in NSS), regardless Forum members.</p>
---------------------	-------------------------	--------------	---

DNSSEC for Everybody -- A Beginners' Guide	8 April 2013, 17:00-18h30	Yaovi Atohoun	<p>When typing a name in a browser for example, that name must be first translated into a number by a system before the connection system is called the Domain Name System (DNS) and it translates names like <a href="http://www.icann.org">www.icann.org</a> into the numbers – called Internet Protocol coordinates the addressing system to ensure all the addresses are unique.</p> <p>DNSSEC (DNS Security Extension) is a technology to secure the Domain Name System.</p> <p>During this session, the panelist presented through a sketch a scenario where user is redirected to another website pretending that when there is a security problem. DNSSEC can be implemented by any individual or organization who is handling a Domain name server.</p> <p>Another session for a half day workshop is scheduled for April 10, 2013.</p>
Thick Whois	8 April 2013	Holly Raiche	<p>Thick Whois GNSO Working Group (providing the GNSO Council with a policy recommendation on universal 'thick' Whois) looking at response consistency, stability, accessibility, impact on privacy and data protection, cost implications, synchronization and migration competition in Registry services, existing WHOIS applications, data escrow and Registrar Part 43 WHOIS requirements.</p> <p>Began with a brief explanation of what 'thick' and 'thin' whois means. For thick, registrar collects data on the registrant, the domain ; provides the information to the registry. For thin registries, only the domain data published – but all three data types retained. The Whois on most issues – but not all.</p> <p>The issue for this session: privacy. Specifically, looking at the privacy implications for the Registrants who have registered their information with the expectation that only domain data would be captured at the Registry during a transitional period where they've registered their information there are strong privacy protections in local law? And now that data is going to be published in a Registry where the local law is different registrants may arise if they deal with a registrar in a 'privacy-friendly' country with strong privacy laws, but the registry is in a jurisdiction with privacy laws and registrant data is then made publicly available when all registries are 'thick'.</p>
Middle East Strategy	8 April 2013	Holly Raiche	<p>Middle East Strategy : The meeting talked to strategies that are being worked on to improve achieve three goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foster two-way engagement between ICANN and the broader Internet community in the region;</li> <li>• Build strong and competitive domain name industry in the region;</li> <li>• Promote multistakeholder Internet governance mechanisms in the region.</li> </ul> <p>Strategic Focus areas are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DNS security and stability</li> <li>• Domain name industry</li> <li>• Internet governance ecosystem</li> </ul> <p>In comments, the CEO of AusRegistry made suggestions including the need for metrics (such as number/percentage of registration registrations for businesses, number of gTLDs, ccTLDs, and talked of the need to promote local content as a driver.</p>
Multistakeholder Roundtable	8 April 2013	Holly Raiche	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Multi-Stakeholder Roundtable:</li> <li>• First session was on the new gTLDs. Speakers included Jeremy Malcolm, Consumers International, Peter Nettlefold, Vice-Chair Business Constituency, GNSO, Maguy Serad, ICANN Compliance.</li> <li>• Malcolm: Focus on end users- names they use, not have. Issues for consumers include the possibility of phishing, software incompatibilities expectations from the new names. Overall, the impact is likely to be relatively minor – a don't know, don't care attitude.</li> <li>• Nettlefold: Taken the view that they aren't keen to object outright, but concerns include issues of defensive registrations, whet of trust with strings. On PICS, there was a need to identify the goal of commitments made in applications.</li> <li>• On compliance, there are issues of enforceability, who can raise concerns, who is notified, and what are the enforcement mechanisms</li> <li>• Jamil: Are three stakeholders: the end user, the registrant and the trademark holder. All three should be protected. It is important including whether there are IP risks attached to the name. What about scripts other than ASCII, and what about words that are Trade Mark clearing house to deal with those issues. On PICS, the current obligations are on registries – but what about registrants who are a pattern of abuse, with no mechanism to deal with it. Finally, developing countries do not have mechanisms to deal with become soft targets.</li> <li>• Serad: Compliance has been identifying the gaps in PICS and are building a readiness plan. There will be proactive monitoring, enforceability, there is a lack of clarity on whether they are contractual obligations.</li> </ul>

Constituent Stakeholder Travel Guidelines Update & Review	9 April 2013, 16:00-17:00	Tijani BEN JEMAA	<a href="#">Rapport_Constituent Stakeholder Travel Guidelines</a> 
Whois Working Group	10 April 2013	Holly Raiche	<p>Whois Working Group</p> <p>Review of documents published</p> <p>Since then, have been additional negotiations, and has been agreement in principle to additional issues</p> <p>Cautions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has been a 4year process and there is a level of anxiety about the final text</li> <li>• The specification on privacy/proxy has been condensed</li> <li>• What about verification of the true registrant using a privacy/proxy service</li> </ul>

ICANN Finance Open Session	10 April 2013, 1:00-12:30	Tijani BEN JEMAA	<a href="#">Report_ICANN Finance Open Session.pdf</a> 
	11 April 2013	Holly Raiche	<p>Engagement with RIRs – especially APNIC – be aware of events involving RIRs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New groups, including new gTLD outreach</li> <li>• Need for feedback on ATRT2</li> <li>• Is survey on ICANN image</li> <li>• Is a need for a youth session or youth forum as a bridge between users and ICANN</li> <li>• Need for briefing sessions</li> <li>• Issue of individual membership</li> <li>• Elections: (for APRALO Chair – Holly's term ends 30 June, for APRALO Vice Chair (YJ's term ends 30 June) and for Secretar term ends 30 June) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nominations are from 9 April to 3 May</li> <li>• 4 May – 10 May – acceptances by nominees</li> <li>• 17 May – 7 June: Elections</li> <li>• 1 July – Newly elected leaders' terms begin</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Global Stakeholder Engagement	11 April 2013, 11:00-12:30	Tijani BEN JEMAA	<a href="#">Report_Global Stakeholder Engagement.pdf</a> <div></div>
-------------------------------	----------------------------	------------------	--

Meeting Strategy Working Group	11 April 2013, 09:00-10:30	Eduardo Diaz and others	<p>Members of the MSWG Group:</p>  <p>This was the first meeting of the Meeting Strategy Working Group (MSWG). It was mostly an introductory meeting. The agenda was</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Welcome</li> <li>2.Composition</li> <li>3.Goals</li> <li>4.Deliverables</li> <li>5.Organization</li> <li>6.Schedule</li> <li>7.AOB (any other business)</li> </ol> <p>Please check here for more details: <a href="https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/40929548/ICANN_MS WG_Beijing_2013_0-version=1&amp;modificationDate=1367251475241">https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/40929548/ICANN_MS WG_Beijing_2013_0-version=1&amp;modificationDate=1367251475241</a></p> <p>The next meeting will be a telephone conference to be held May 2, 2013 @ 1400UTC. The group agreed to have these calls every 1</p>
--------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------	---

ccNSO Study Group on Country and Territory Names	11 April 2013, 08:00-09:00	Eduardo Diaz	<p>This was one of the final meetings of the WG.</p> <p>The Study Group was established by a resolution of the ccNSO Council on 8 December 2010. The Study Group was tasked with de</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• the way in which the names of countries and territories are currently used within ICANN, be it in the form of policies, guidelines;</li><li>• the types of strings, relating to the names of countries and territories that currently used, or proposed to be used, as TLDs; and</li><li>• the issues that arise (or may arise) when current policies, guidelines and procedures are applied to these representations of c</li></ul> <p>The Study Group is comprised of representatives from across the ICANN stakeholder community and has been conducting its work</p> <p>A Final draft report was discussed and will be shortly presented to the public for comments.</p> <p>Final draft recommendations from the group are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The ccNSO Council is recommended to request the Board to extend the current rule in the Applicant Guidebook to exclude all in all languages, for consecutive rounds of new gTLD applications.</li><li>• It is further recommended that the ccNSO Council takes the initiative to establish a cross community working group to review t country and territory names under current policies and propose a consistent and uniform definition that should be applicable a and AC's. The GNSO, ALAC and GAC should be invited to participate in such a WG.</li></ul> <p>Please check meeting transcript here: <a href="#">Transcript Country Names Beijing.pdf</a> and final draft report here: <a href="#">2012-03 ccNSO Study Group Names -Final Report v02.docx</a></p> <div data-bbox="464 646 1497 1663"></div>
--	----------------------------	--------------	---



<b>INTERNET GOVERNANCE. THE GLOBAL AGENDA.</b>	08 april  17:00- 19:00	Natalia Enciso	Governance itself its very complex. We are on a learning curve, understand very complex issue, understand each other. 2 main iss Sheik, IGF Baku, Bali. Enhanced cooperation. Review UN GA WSIS. Growing confusion, lot of these documents refers to similar pi differences and apparently contradicted. Deeply discussion in Paris Wsis +10. Recommend to deep in the discussion in Bali. Consi framework of commitment for intern principles universal by nature and supported not only by gov but other stakeholders. Would be ; to Human Rights Declaration, Not know if it is realistic. As look as wee keep the principles to very high level, no torture, freedom of clearer principles, not bidding. The challenged is not in the internet development. Bali is a good opportunity to test it out. One step is give an overview to have a real basis and can start from a factual analysis. WCIT was a treaty making conference, does not lend its to discuss at the IGF. Theme spam, big issue in Dubai already discussed in Athens in 2006, not to revisit. Explore further in Bali. IG and reinvent itself. Too much of a routing track, difficult to navigate to the meeting.Finding new and innovative ways of framing the i main sessions issues, enhanced cooperation, freedom right freedom of expression on the internet, intern principles, legal frameworl multistakeholder cooperation, economic and social aspects the internet as an engine for growth and advancement. How to move fr decided the preliminary proposals, very short proposals outline the concept, an the MAG would decide how to move forward. The cl to manageable program. Received an indication the community should be after Paris, many proposals of HR, cybercrime, freedom capacity building, youth participation, IP and digital content, MS cooperation, Regional cooperation. The big challenge now is to cor program. Will meet again in May in Geneva in open consultation. ICC prioriy to ensure that enhanced cooperation remain fully multi Modalities. Multistakeholder approach, mutual trust, consensus, ECOSOC rules apply for observers, constraints (time, resources, helpful to have many observers in the first meeting. Its just a getting together. Consultations probably soon online. Results made av website. Brazil is one of the country that is supporting this discussion of principles that could be of universal values on internet gove cooperation starts with enhanced communication.
--	---------------------------------	-------------------	---

Policy vs. Implementation	10 april 9:00 - 10:30	Natalia Enciso	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The rules for formal policy development are clear in the ICANN Bylaws, but the policy implementations are not so clear.</li> <li><u>Policy role within ICANN</u>, 3 supporting organizations responsible for policy: Address Supporting Organization, Country Code Names Supporting Organization, Generic Names Supporting Organization. GNSO is responsible for developing and recommending suitable level domain.</li> <li>Multiple approaches to identify policy issues, reviewing, creating policy proposals, and providing policy advice, Advisor SSAC, GAC. Policy Review Team: Whois. Experts Groups: Implementation &amp; Recommendation Team.</li> <li><u>Implementation Process</u>: reports, public comments, MS process.</li> <li><u>Implementations approaches</u>: Identifying implementations issues, reviewing implementations, create policy implementation.</li> <li>We have Fast-track team (IDN), Stakeholder team (TMC), staff team (Applicant Guidebook), external consultants. It is from policy to implementation.</li> <li>Who is responsible for making decisions relating to implementations?</li> <li>Faster process: is the staff look up the policy, produce implementation proposal, public comments, and Board approval.</li> <li>Slower process: GNSO WG looks at an issue, present for GNSO Council approval, goes to the Board for approval, and Ex. gTLD transfer.</li> <li>TENSIONS: The GNSO wants to be consulted on implementations policies. Key issue: the perception is that if something works would take a lot of time (months, years) and creates tension. The reality is that the GNSO in many topics works with consent from various Stakeholders, come up into a vote. Tension as well. Use some other process.</li> <li>Provide more clarity. Not separate things. True MS input.</li> <li><u>Staff Paper</u>: Objective is to be forward looking. Different variations in PDP. Not clearer or transparent for the community what the role are of different groups in the process. Impossible task to draw a line between what is policy and what is implementation can set clearer processes.</li> <li>Draft framework: outline a broad one, what need further discussions or clarifications. Identify criteria, principals. Suggest term suggestions for improvements. Ex. SO/AC how they provide advice when they are being requested by the Board, for advice and the timeframe.</li> <li>Real focus: clearer process, predictability and transparency, what happens when policy moves into implementation? policy development stage of discussions? Clarify the role of the different Stakeholders groups. Focus as well on the policy to facilitate implementations.</li> <li>The paper is for discussions: <a href="http://gns0.icann.org/en/correspondence/policy-implementation-framework-08jan13-en.pdf">http://gns0.icann.org/en/correspondence/policy-implementation-framework-08jan13-en.pdf</a>.</li> <li>Question 1 - What is from the perspective of your community the main priority with regard to the discussion on policy vs. implementation?</li> <li>Priority to design a framework that works for the long term. Is not sensible to try to find a bright line between policy and implementation judge by whether it is elegant, its outcomes. As it is said, the proof on the pudding is on the eating.</li> <li>Policy very often comes up in the act of interpreting the policy while doing the implementation. Ex. New gTLD. implementation changes, policy is still involve in implementation issues. Constant awareness.</li> <li>Eliminate the issue that you don't need to involve the supporting organization in the implementation. Has a responsibility are implemented according to the policy that has been approved.</li> <li>Main priorities are mechanisms to work together.</li> <li>Not find ourselves in a position to draw the line. Policy is what you are going to do and implementation how you are going to anticipate implementation. Good implementation has to respect the intention of the policy makers.</li> <li>Look back to past for viable lessons, experiences.</li> <li>Policy is what you want, implementation is what I want. Establish some guidelines. Beneficiary of those policies, be going to implement them.</li> <li>Key concern is to have a sense of notice when our obligations are going to change. If there is a new rule, new obligation notice of that rule, to understand your new obligations, lengthy enough time to parties to comment, give modification suggestions. Decent Explanation of how the results are going to be. Strive for how the dispute are going to be solved.</li> <li>Question 2 - Do you believe that an overall framework could be created for all policy implementation activities within ICANN?</li> <li>Don't need to be an overall framework, all policy and implementations activities are here to be principles regarding notice</li> <li>Do not need to be the same across SO/AC. Balances. Making sure that we are consulting not only the ASOS but the ccTLDs</li> <li>Not practical given the different reality, not a single framework for each SO/AC.</li> <li>Might be a challenge.</li> <li>Most definitely be set up, the nature of policy and implementation pretty much remain the same, prefer an overall framework</li> <li>Could work for the definition. How is it put back to the ASO, no way we can do that with a single framework. Evolve in different ways</li> </ul> </li> <li> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Question 3 - One of the questions that was raised in the staff discussion paper is how to deal with instances where no consensus issues or competing 'policy advice' is received from different SO/ACs? From your perspective, should additional mechanisms be created to 'force' cross-community engagement and decision-making (see for example EU conciliation procedure <a href="http://www.se2009.eu/how_does_the_conciliation_procedure_work.html">http://www.se2009.eu/how_does_the_conciliation_procedure_work.html</a>) or should alternative approaches be explored?</li> <li>Cross Community engagement should be a natural. Culture of silos is something that needs to be addressed. Fundamental principle is difficult to engage, how the GAC engage in early stage of the process, engage a broader level of the community. The question indicate the problem right in the question.</li> <li>We can't force cross community activities. There has to be a mechanism for fostering it.</li> <li>Is not necessarily natural if there is not a need or interest. Look alternatives. Never get over of silos, we have to learn from our silos.</li> <li>Mediate specific points of disagreements, find commonalities. Bridge silos through many mechanisms.</li> <li>Should expect wide divergence. EU has a conciliation process. No solution if you guys can't come up with one. Force from government and law enforcement.</li> <li>Practical solution. Delegating the issue to mediation. Use the tools that exists in the real world.</li> <li>Consensus driven model, if there is conflicting policy advice, then is an acknowledgment that the status quo is not sufficient change. Experts are here, no need for a third party to solve our problems. Can come to an agreement cannot force a principle that we have to agree in order to proceed.</li> <li>Someone with better skills can help bring us to a higher place. Come to a better place with better tools.</li> <li>Question 4 - What should be the next step in addressing this issue? Some have suggested the creation of a cross-community approach on this approach? Are there certain elements that would need a cross-community approach while others should be addressed by SO/ACs?</li> <li>SO with the involvement of the AC should take the first steps on addressing this issue. GNSO form a WG. Develop relevant for them. Take to a cross community level.</li> <li>Developing is a good idea.</li> <li>Opportunity to implement. Tests cases with the Brand Registry Group, Close Generics, Singular and plural contentions</li> <li>Excellent idea to explore this issues. Try to identify challenges. Address them.</li> <li>We already have some templates that has worked and has flaws and can be refined.</li> <li>High level examination, require heavy involvement from all the SO/AC. Similarities and differences.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
---------------------------	--------------------------	----------------	---

Global Stakeholder Engagement	11 April 2013, 11:00-12:30  Grand Hall A	Hong Xue	ICANN GSE team formed 4 teams on "Collateral", "Conferences, event and speaker panels, workshops", "Digital engagement", and model (community self-assessment)" respectively. The team outlined the different engagement models, from "Inform, Raise Awareness Engagement", "contribution to policy" to "access to public at-large". Each team had its own discussions and then presented its suggestions. The suggestions included pursuing outreach beyond 3 ICANN meetings, improving translation/interpretation quality, and developing a framework. ICANN will develop more programs and tools from region to region and from SG to SG. Generally, it seems ICANN is building a framework of significant budget and resource impact. On the other hand, ICANN has not been able to effectively link up its various programs and matrix.
-------------------------------	--	----------	--