



# At-Large Toronto Meeting Reports

If you have logged-in and are unable to edit this page, please email [staff@atlarge.icann.org](mailto:staff@atlarge.icann.org) to ask for authorisation

Meeting	Date and Time	Assignee and RALO	Report
NCUC Conference	12-Oct-2012	Glenn McKnight	<p>Attended day long NCUC session at the Royal York, Photographed session see pictures</p> <p>Video produced on history of NCUC</p> <div> □□□□□□□□ : 'widget'</div> <div> □□□□□□□□ : 'widget'</div> <p>The entire session was LIVESTREAMED</p>
SSAC Meetings	14-19-Oct-2012	Julie Hammer (APRALO)	<p>A Report on SSAC Meetings which I attended remotely is posted on the SSAC Liaison Page:</p> <p><a href="#">ICANN Meeting 45 Toronto October 2012 – SSAC Liaison Report.</a></p>
GAC High Level Meeting	15-Oct-2012	Marta Morgan Associate Deputy Minister, Industry Canada	<div></div>
Future Challenges WG	15-Oct-2012	Garth Bruen (NARALO)	JJ and Evan on the R3 White paper, updates of acceptance...

GAC High Level Meeting	15-Oct-2012	Yrjö Länispuro (APRALO)	<p>The need for a GAC High Level Meeting has been discussed back and forth since many years. The idea was resurrected in the ATF directed the Board to work with GAC to establish a process to determine when and how ICANN engages senior government officials on a regular and collective basis to complement existing GAC process.</p> <p>The idea to have a GAC High Level Meeting in Prague (June 2012) didn't work out, and it finally happened in Toronto, Monday 15, 2012.</p> <p>The lead time for the meeting was rather short, so the meeting was less "senior" than some had hoped for. You don't move ministers to Toronto, many participants of the "senior" meeting were actually the same GAC representatives as in any other meeting, but in some cases representatives a notch or two higher than usual.</p> <p>In spite of this, the first attempt to have a "senior" GAC in connection with an ICANN meeting can be deemed at least a moderate success.</p> <p>Participants were in a positive mood after the upbeat performance of Fadi Chehadé, the new ICANN CEO in the morning. At the very least, it did no harm, and it can be argued that it did some good.</p> <p>Every speaker endorsed the multistakeholder approach, many of course with the qualification that the role of the governments needs to be enhanced (as Chehadé himself had demanded). Many speakers presented their domestic multistakeholder Internet Governance models. Brazilian models from various cultures and environments should be studied and compared.</p> <p>The implementation of most of the 27 ATRT recommendations was positively assessed. There was discussion on what issues should be addressed in the second ATRT review. Issues most often mentioned early opportunities for GAC interventions in PDP's on SO level and ICANN from new gTLDs but finances of the whole organization.</p> <p>Internationalization/globalization was another big theme of the discussion, reflecting what Mr Chehadé had said in his speech in the morning. China had its own list for the topics of the next ATRT (Enhancing government role in IANA, new gTLDs. Russia suggested making the "senior" GAC a regularly repeated feature for strategic issues, since GAC is now becoming more important.</p> <p>On the whole, the meeting played its role in engaging (Chehadé's favorite verb) governments on a slightly higher level than usual, with better coordination within governmental structures.</p> <p>role in ICANN, governance issues, IANA and review of new gTLD experience.</p>
Women in the DNS Meeting	15-Oct-2012 07:00	Annalisa Roger (NARALO)	<p>The Women in the DNS met alongside ICANN North American meetings in Toronto. A breakfast room filled by 7 a.m. Monday morning. ICANN's opening meeting with enthusiasm to support each other, to network, and to reach out to local business women. Founder of the advisory group met later in the week to further develop the mission and ability to serve its growing membership, which will include a group founded at the March 2009 meeting in Mexico and has met every ICANN meeting since then, growing in number.</p> <p>The Toronto breakfast was sponsored by Uninett, DotGreen, and Neustar. Local Canadian Joan Kerr, Director of FBSC.org in Canada, gave an address about her own experience developing programs that unite women to support their achievements and others. The event provided a way to connect early in the week, promoting further dialogue in other Law and Policy Forums during the ICANN assembly. The meeting was a way for women, typically outnumbered in the industry, to make connections and deepen their interaction with the ICANN community.</p> <p>The next meeting of the DNS will be Monday morning of ICANN in Beijing, China. For more information, visit LinkedIn (<a href="http://www.linkedin.com/groups?gid=3838635">http://www.linkedin.com/groups?gid=3838635</a>) and Facebook.com/DNSWomen.</p>
WHOIS Working Group	15-Oct-2012 11:00-12:30	Garth Bruen (NARALO)	<p>Carlton chaired continuous discussion of the analysis of WHOIS policy, problems, abuses. Much of the conversation concerned coordination in discussion. Much of this is "what next", we know where the issues are, what do we do to move forward with effective solutions.</p>

WHOIS Working Group	15-Oct-2012 11:00-12:30	Gordon Chillcot (NARALO)	<p>A representative of Business Constituency (an attorney) attended. He was there to listen. Tried not to say much, but did listen.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>topic of what compliance issues should be in this version of the RAA. Special attention paid to whois entries and how they should be in RAA.</li> <li>No reference made to SSAC055, but some to SSAC054. Seems that some people view this as a definitive paper.</li> <li>A general agreement to listen. No-one said much, though, except Evan and Garth.</li> <li>A much more interesting conversation in the halls during the two hours after, though, including the idea that WHOIS is not like set in the EU, following their rules, another, perhaps, for China</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>note that agreements for information exchange for law enforcement already exist.</li> <li>WHOIS has been going for 20 years and more. My opinion - time to re-visit along the lines of SSAC055</li> <li>THICK WHOIS</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a PDP is in force. There should be someone on this from ALAC.</li> <li>There was a remark that it "might" be bogged down or delayed – my question: by SSAC055?</li> </ul> <p>R3 PAPER AND FUTURE CHALLENGES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Question of how the R3 paper should go out to journalists, for example</li> <li>should the R3 paper be a cross-constituency WG</li> <li>while we're at it, should we re-organize constituency groups across ICANN</li> <li>the paper needs to be re-written</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>note, however, that this is not yet an ICANN document. Cross-constituency consensus is not there yet.</li> <li>The R3 paper was passed to my ALS (GTALug). One of the committees is taking an interest in it and some discussion is expected.</li> </ul> <p>LEGACY IP SPACE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>this session was divided in two topics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>whether ICANN is the right place to be even talking about this (PERSONAL COMMENT – Oh, COME ON!)</li> <li>What do we want to talk about, anyway.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Many questions. No attempt to organize a way to address the answers. Some venting.</li> <li>Many people seemed to go away satisfied. Did not include me.</li> </ul> <p>Other sessions attended by other GTALug delegates included the "newbies" session. from which the following observation:</p> <p>"The newbie stream was informative. Especially the questions from the participants. The challenges of African registrars and the implications for other countries around the world were thought-provoking."</p> <p>Our members also attended sessions on IPV6 issues, DNSSEC and, of course the Public Forum. I'm waiting for the observations</p>
At-Large new gTLD WG	15-Oct-2012 14:00-15:00	Garth Bruen (NARALO)	Avri reviewing status of new gTLD application process, comments, objections, problems, etc.
At-Large New gTLD Working Group Meeting	15-Oct-2012 14:00-15:30	Glenn McKnight (NARALO)	<p>Intensive session dealing with moving forward issues and protocols. Issue brought up that the monthly meeting schedule. As an out bit daunting to keep informed. Need to catch up the reading.</p> <p>Monday night celebration See video</p>
At-Large Future Challenges Working Group Public Workshop	15-Oct-2012 14:00-16:45	Glenn McKnight (NARALO)	<p>The public presentation of the paper <a href="#">MAKING ICANN Relevant, Responsive and Respected</a>.</p> <p>Invitation to have public feedback on document The point about creating a special funding window and I would be happy to volunteer this issue.</p>
Study Group on the Use of Names for Countries and Territories	15-Oct-2012 14:30-13:30	Eduardo Diaz (ALAC /NARALO)	<p>The meeting was mostly informative since the working group is waiting for the results of an UNESCO survey sent to a sub-set of the will provide important information to the working group that will help in understanding/validating some of the names that these count An example of this is Holland (tourist name) which in reality is Netherlands.</p> <p>The Study Group's goal is to provide the ccNSO Council, ccTLD community and other interested stakeholders, including the GAC a overview of the scope and issues associated with the use of Country and Territory names as TLD strings.</p> <p>Please <a href="#">CLICK</a> here to get a copy of the meeting transcript.</p>
The ICANN African Strategy Working Group meeting ( ASWG)	15-Oct-2012 15:00-16:45	Fatimata Seye Sylla (AFRALO)	<p>The ASWG, a multistakeholder group including African representatives of all the ICANN constituencies, initiated during the Prague draft an ICANN 3-year strategic plan for Africa. The group presented the work done in consultation with the African community.</p> <p>All the attendees appreciated this draft strategy and more importantly the fact that, once finalized, it is to be included into ICANN strategy whole. Inputs from the community are still welcome. The final draft is expected by December 2012 and an implementation plan by</p> <p>Note: Tijani is a member of the ASWG, representing At-Large</p>

DNSSEC for Everybody - A Beginner's Guide	15-Oct-2012 17:15-18:30	Ogi Mitev (NARALO)	Great session. Learned the basics of how DNSSEC works and some of the implementation challenges
NARALO Outreach Event: An Evening with At-Large: Honoring the RALOs	15-Oct-2012 19:00-21:00	Ogi Mitev (NARALO)	Great presentations. Had the opportunity to meet with Naralo members.
ALAC: Policy Discussion - Part I	16-Oct-2012	Garth Bruen (NARALO)	See: <a href="#">At-Large Meetings - Tuesday, 16 October 2012</a>
NARALO Outreach Table	16-Oct-2012	Glenn McKnight (NARALO)	Outreach table for new ALS, running out of brochures.
ALAC Meeting with the ICANN Board	16-Oct-2012	Garth Bruen (NARALO)	Multi-topic, top-level discussion with the Board
Various NOMCOM short presentations	16-Oct-2012	Glenn McKnight (NARALO)	NCUC, Registrars, ALAC, Non Profit User Group, Short summary roadshow on the NOMCOM year and introduction to the new Chair and Chair Elect which are both ALAC.
NARALO Capacity Building Session 2	16-Oct-2012	Garth Bruen (NARALO)	See <a href="#">At-Large Meetings - Tuesday, 16 October 2012</a>
Fellowship Morning Meetings	16-Oct-2012 07:00-09:00	Ogi Mitev (NARALO)	Learned about the ICANN structure
Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG)	16-Oct-2012 09:45-11:15	Ogi Mitev (NARALO)	Talked about new gTLDs
Meet with Veni Markovski	16-Oct-2012 13:00-15:00	Ogi Mitev (NARALO)	Talked about the structure of ICANN and how I can help
Music Night	16-Oct-2012 19:30-21:30	Ogi Mitev (NARALO)	Met with event participants
ISOC Member & Chapter Meeting	16-Oct-2012 19:00-21:30	Ogi Mitev (NARALO)	Meeting with ISOC leadership and chapter members, talked about the strategy for the next 12 months how to improve
Impact of new gTLDs on ICANN structures" (Board SIC + AC & SO Chairs)	17-Oct-2012	Jean-Jacques Subrenat (EURALO)	See <a href="#">Report</a> prepared by Jean-Jacques Subrenat
NOMCOM Public Meeting	17-Oct-2012	Glenn McKnight (NARALO)	Early meeting with the BGC in the morning and Public meeting on NOMCOM Afternoon ALAC meetings

At-Large new gTLD Review Group Meeting	17-Oct-2012	Dev Anand Teelucksingh (LACRALO)	no update of RG Statements of Interest (SOIs) Seth Reiss expressed his opinion regarding the comments by InternetNZ and IT for Change, India support for proposal to extend deadline for comments from At-Large from November 7 2012 to November 14 2012
Naralo Capacity Building Session 3	17-Oct-2012 07:00-09:00	Ogi Mitev (NARALO)	Got to meet the Naralo team
ALAC reporting: "Impact of new gTLDs on ICANN structures" (Board SIC + AC & SO Chairs)	17-Oct-2012 08:00-09:00	Jean-Jacques Subrenat	<p>A breakfast meeting, called by Board members Bertrand de la Chapelle (BdIC) and Ray Plzak (RP), was attended by AC and SO C (Chair of ALAC was represented by JJS). The CEO spoke at the beginning of the meeting. BdIC suggested the discussion be centered on "impact of new gTLDs on ICANN structures" be conducted in the coming months, and how should this be reviewed?</p> <p>Here are just a few of the points made (this does not purport to be a full verbatim report):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marilyn Cade (Business community) remarked a view of "the global landscape" was necessary to determine future structures.</li> <li>Stéphane van Gelder (outgoing GNSO Chair) underlined the need for a balanced approach, especially with the expected form groups (brands, IDNs...); more time will be necessary to come up with the appropriate structures.</li> <li>Tony Holmes (ISP) suggested that in order to properly address the issue, it is necessary to have a clearer view of the threats.</li> <li>Alain Berranger (NPOC) observed that there is a need for a neutral forum where Internet governance issues can be thoroughly discussed.</li> <li>JJS (ALAC) made 2 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>although it was distributed at this breakfast meeting as one of several responses to BdIC's initiative on the "Impact of new structures", the ALAC White Paper "Making ICANN Relevant, Responsive and Respected" (R3) was not drafted for this ; much earlier than BdIC's topic, was therefore not a response to BdIC's request, and had a much broader purpose. BdIC is publicly.</li> <li>More specifically on the impact of new gTLDs, the ALAC calls for a fair balance, both in structures and in process. Status must be addressed globally, and ICANN should therefore avoid amending one or another of its components without a global consensus. IDNs of special importance, including as a means of furthering diversity.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Jeff Newman (incoming GNSO Chair): the expected increase in the number of gTLDs will create a need for much more operational ICANN, and not only on matters of governance or policy.</li> <li>Lyman Chapin (SSAC) suggested that new arrivals would provide new talent, and asked how this could be properly tapped?</li> <li>Milton Mueller (NCUC) pointed out that this is really about political and economic power. The announced new arrivals would be requiring a new balance. In creating new structures, it will be important to decouple the structures from the power game.</li> <li>Olof Nordling (Staff) suggested that, in a complex configuration with new actors, resilience would be of the essence.</li> <li>Ray Plzak (Board), in summing up, remarked that, in ICANN, issues usually followed the dividing lines of constituencies. Their structures and methods. The approach taken by the SIC is deliberate, not driven by a sense of urgency, and aims at achieving ICANN's Strategic planning.</li> <li>Bertrand de la Chapelle (Board) made the following points, specifically in response to questions from JJS on the way forward: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>before ICANN-46 in Beijing, the community-wide consultation will continue, with the idea of arriving at a consensus position</li> <li>if this is anything to go by, here is a list of key words noted during this meeting: balance, evolution (rate of -), taxonomy, consensus, structure AND process AND mindset, systemic, IDNs, users, compliance, operational.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
DNSSEC Workshop	17-Oct-2012 11:00-13:00	Ogi Mitev (NARALO)	Discussions around DNSSEC implementation challenges

Whois Update	17-Oct-2012	Holly Raiche (APRALO)	<p>RFC 3912 (Whois Protocol Specification) has never been internationalised, and Whois has no data framework, no standard for expi numbers, etc. It is now difficult to give particular clients (e.g., LEA, security) privileged access.</p> <p>WEIRDS – the protocol being developed, will standardise a data framework, be a simple, easy to use protocol supporting international based on client authorisation.</p> <p>RESTFUL (Representational State Transfer) – existing protocol, uses HTTP, is stateless, layered and cacheable. Some RIRs now Whois to RESTFUL than to Port 43 Whois.</p> <p>The Working Group is scheduled to complete its work by December 2013.</p> <p><b>Report on Whois Survey Results – GNSO Council Study</b></p> <p>The study, authorised by the GNSO Council, was to look at the feasibility of a Whois study, looked at</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The willingness and ability of relay/reveal request originators, privacy/proxy providers and registrars to participate in a full study</li> <li>• Assess the availability of data and conditions under which it would be shared</li> <li>• Sample regional limitations</li> </ul> <p>The outcomes were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tangible results may not align with the study goals</li> <li>• Participation would drop if the study is perceived as identifying 'bad actors' – noting that it may highlight that the practices of rr</li> <li>• Participation might improve with adequate confidentiality and privacy guarantees</li> <li>• Most actors would only be able to provide anonymised data</li> </ul> <p><b>Steve Sherry SSAC – on the SSAC 055 Response to the Whois Policy Review Team Final Report</b></p> <p>Reviewed the SSAC response to the Whois Final Report – looking at the technical issues, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No uniform data model exists for domain name registration data</li> <li>• The Whois protocol has no standard capacity for handling non ASCII text</li> <li>• Are looking for a replacement protocol</li> </ul> <p><b>University of Chicago – NORC</b></p> <p><b>Whois Registrant Identification Study</b></p> <p>The project looked at Whois variables, domain user variables and domain content variables. The draft analysis was presented, looking at differences, registrant differences and potential commercial activities. The intent of the study was to understand domain users and rr – natural or legal persons, who are the registrants – privacy/proxy, natural persons or legal persons and potential commercial activities. The ICANN website shows the range of findings including, for apparent registrant type, 38.6% were legal persons, 32.8% were natural persons, 28.6% were proxy servers.</p> <p><i>The statistics are on the ICANN website for the Toronto meeting. The issues for ALAC here are what can be shown (or not) about the privacy/proxy servers, and what we can know about them</i></p> <p><b>Briefing on other ICAN Whois Activity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whois Policy Review Team – Final Report</li> <li>• SSAC 055 – commenting on the Final Report</li> <li>• ALAC statement on the Final Report</li> <li>• Thick Whois PDDP – being chartered by the GNSO</li> <li>• Whois Technical Survey</li> </ul>
IPv6 Workshop	17-Oct-2012 13:30-14:45	Ogi Mitev (NARALO)	Great talk on IPv6, mostly the current state in Canada
Multi-Stakeholder Discussion : Legacy Internet Protocol (IP) Numbers in the Current Policy Environment	17-Oct-2012 15:00-17:00	Ogi Mitev (NARALO)	Great talk about the legacy IPv4 space. Participated in the panel.

Contractual Compliance – Audit Strategy	17-Oct-2012 15:30-16:45	Holly Raiche (APRALO)	<p>Timetable for the compliance strategy:</p> <p>Began in 2011 – with assessment and the beginning of implementation. In 2012, built up staffing, including outsourcing for audit skill audit plan (where we are now). (While the audit function will be undertaken by the outsourced company, it is being managed within</p> <p>In the compliance pyramid, at the bottom is self assessment, on top of that preventive activities (including monitoring, audits, education we are now), followed by informal resolution and on top, formal resolution.</p> <p>The aim of the audit is to proactively identify deficiencies and manage the remediation process.</p> <p>The three year audit plan will have a consistent approach over three years, where all contracted parties (registries and registrars) will have numbers. The presentation included a list of clauses in the RAA on which compliance will be audited (including clauses on resellers clause 3.7.8) plus clauses in the ICANN/Registry agreement.</p> <p>The audit will be done over a three year period, with a random sample of one third of the registries/registrars the first year, a second final third in the last year. New gTLDs will be rolled into the audit plan.</p> <p>In questions, when asked what happened to self assessment the response was that self assessment doesn't validate the accuracy are needed for public confidence in compliance AND the results of audits will be published – to ensure public confidence in the audit concerns, ICANN will go back to the registry/registrar first – but the outcomes will be published.</p> <p>On auditing registrars with multiple contracts, it will be enough to show compliance by demonstrating operations once that are consistent customer base.</p> <p>Depending on findings, registries/registrars may be audited more than once, as necessary.</p> <p>The Audit Plan will be published soon, and comments welcome. (NB – are using the 2009 RAA clauses, but will also look at the 200</p>
Gala Night	17-Oct-2012 19:00-20:00	Ogi Mitev (NARALO)	Met with event participants
PPC-Community Consultation	18-Oct-2012	Yaovi Atohou (AFRALO)	<p>This meeting was organized by the Public Participation Committee to inform the community about the Consolidated meetings strategy intended to hear from the community</p> <p>The Board Member Sebastian Bachollet opened the session led by Filiz Yilmaz. During the questions/answers period I pointed out the public comment page is not clear to me regarding a paragraph:</p> <p>"Consolidated Meetings Proposal for 2014, 2015 and 2016:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Hold the first meeting of the year in two cities in Asia Pacific.</li> <li>▪ Hold the second meeting of the year in two cities in Europe.</li> <li>▪ Rotate the third meeting of the year through North America (2014), Africa (2015) and Latin America/Caribbean (2016). These Meetings for each year."</li> </ul> <p>The Powerpoint Presentation during the session is more clear</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hold the first Meeting of the year for 2014, 2015 and 2016 in Asia Pacific</li> <li>• Hold the second Meeting of the year for 2014, 2015 and 2016 in Europe</li> <li>• Rotate the third Meeting of the year through: North America - 2014      Africa - 2015      Latin America/Caribbean - 2016</li> </ul> <p>Most of the participants who had the opportunity to speak after the presentation seem not to be in favour. The comment period will</p>
NOMCOM Private Meeting	18-Oct-2012	Glenn McKnight (NARALO)	<p>First meeting for 2013 NOMCOM</p> <p>Discussion recommendations for improvement of NOMCOM</p>
Naralo Capacity Building Session 4	18-Oct-2012 07:00-08:00	Ogi Mitev (NARALO)	
Fellowship Morning Meetings	18-Oct-2012 08:00-09:00	Ogi Mitev (NARALO)	Met with Lesley Cowley
IANA Business Excellence Workshop	18-Oct-2012 09:00-10:30	Ogi Mitev (NARALO)	IANA asking for feedback on how to do better
ICANN Strategic Plan Community Update	18-Oct-2012 10:30-11:30	Ogi Mitev (NARALO)	Presented the strategy map and metrics

