



POLICY UPDATE

Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers

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

Volume 09, Issue 12 – December 2009

Across ICANN

[Policy Update Experiments with Streamlined Format](#)

[Issues Currently Open for Public Comment](#)

[Transitions](#)

ccNSO

[ccNSO Welcomes Mozambique as 100th Member](#)

[ccNSO Adds Shared Resources Web Page](#)

[Other Issues Active in the ccNSO](#)

GNSO

[“Specific Trademark Issues” Team Reports](#)

[Inter-Registrar Transfer Policies WG Reviews Comments from Public and Stakeholder Groups](#)

[Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery WG Receives Initial Survey Findings](#)

[Registration Abuse Policies Group Aims to Report by March 2010](#)

[New GNSO Council Pushes Ahead on All Fronts](#)

[Other Issues Active in the GNSO](#)

ASO

[ARIN Shakes Up Policy Proposal for Recovered IPv4 Addresses](#)

[Postpone Transition to 32-Bit ASN? RIPE Says Yes](#)

Joint Efforts

[Issues Active in Combined Efforts](#)

At-Large

[ALAC Responds to Board Review Report](#)

[ALAC Advises on the Introduction of IDN ccTLDs](#)

[ALAC Opposes Changes to the NomCom](#)

[EURALO Produces Outreach Brochure](#)

SSAC

[Issues Active with the SSAC](#)

Read *Policy Update* in Your Preferred Language

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

[ICANN Policy Update statement of purpose](#)

Send questions, comments and suggestions to: policy-staff@icann.org.

Policy Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees

Address Supporting Organization	ASO
Country Code Names Supporting Organization	ccNSO
Generic Names Supporting Organization	GNSO

At-Large Advisory Committee	ALAC
Governmental Advisory Committee	GAC
Root Server System Advisory Committee	RSSAC
Security and Stability Advisory Committee	SSAC

Across ICANN

Policy Update Experiments with Streamlined Format

Each monthly issue of *Policy Update* provides the latest information on the status of issues working their way through the policy development process within ICANN. However, complex policy issues require much study; and controversial issues stimulate much discussion within ICANN's multi-stakeholder community. The result: not every issue passes a significant milestone every month.

Until now, when an issue has not progressed in newsworthy fashion, *Policy Update* has reprinted last month's article about that topic. That approach makes each issue of the *Update* comprehensive and thorough. But it also makes it difficult for the reader to quickly spot new developments.

In this issue, we experiment with a fresh approach. Where there are new developments to report, you'll see our normal article. If an issue is still alive and still progressing, but has not hit a newsworthy milestone since the previous issue of *Policy Update*, we provide a link to the most recent past article. This approach makes it much easier for you to scan new developments, while still providing background information with one-click convenience.

We're trying to make *Policy Update* a shorter, quicker read that better fits your busy schedule. Our request: scan this month's issue, then let us know if you prefer this new format or our traditional format. Send your thoughts to policy-staff@icann.org. Thanks for sharing your perspective!

Issues Currently Open for Public Comment

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

- [Final Report on Three-Character Requirement and Variant Management](#). This report from the IDN-Implementation Working Team addresses how to manage variants of internationalized top-level domain names, and whether there can be exceptions to the three-character requirement for generic Top Level Domains (gTLDs). Comment by 8 January 2010.
- [2010 – 2013 Strategic Plan](#). ICANN invites comments from the community on this draft of its plan for the next few years. What should be the high-level objectives? Comment by 21 January 2010.
- [Special Trademark Issues](#). The Special Trademarks Issues Working Team (STI) has published its recommendations for creating a Trademark Clearinghouse and Uniform Rapid Suspension Procedure to protect trademarks in the New gTLD Program. Comment on their report by 26 January 2010.
- [New gTLD Program: Draft Expressions of Interest/Pre-Registration Model](#). ICANN is soliciting comments on the Draft Expressions of Interest/Pre-Registrations Model for new generic top-level domains (new gTLDs). According to this draft model, entities interested in participating in the first round of the New gTLD Program are required to submit basic information about the participating entity and requested top-level domain, also referred to as "string." Comment by 27 January 2010.

More Information

For the full list of issues open for public comment, plus recently closed and archived public comment forums, visit the [Public Comments](#) page.

Transitions

Jordi Iparraguirre resigned as the representative from the Registries Stakeholder Group to the GNSO Council, due to workload. His place is being taken by Caroline Greer from dot-mobi (Caroline's [Statement of Interest](#)).

If you would like to thank a volunteer whose significant work in a leadership position is done, send a brief email to scott.pinzon@icann.org and we'll try to work your note into the next issue of Policy Update. Submissions must be received by the 7th of each month to appear in that month's issue.

ccNSO Welcomes Mozambique as 100th Member

At a Glance

The country code Name Supporting Organization (ccNSO) has accepted the membership application of Mozambique (.mz), bringing the number of ccNSO members up to 100.

Background

Any manager of a country code top-level domain can apply for membership in the ccNSO. Membership has grown significantly during recent years, almost doubling in the last three years. In 2009 alone, the ccNSO added 18 members, including country code operators for .IL (Israel), .DE (Germany) and .EU (European Union).

More Information

- Statistics on ccNSO membership growth [[PDF](#), 41K]
- [Alphabetical list of all ccNSO members](#)
- [Status of all member applications](#)

Staff Contact

[Gabriella Schitteck](#), ccNSO Secretariat

ccNSO Adds Shared Resources Web Page

At a Glance

On its website, the ccNSO has launched a new page which gathers free resources that might be of use for ccTLD registries.

Recent Developments

Most of the resources were provided by ccTLDs, and also by institutions such as [NLnet Labs](#) and organizations such as [ENISA](#). The resources are divided into three categories: Technical Resources, Marketing Resources and Policy Resources.

Background

The initiative for this page came from the Participation Working Group, which recommended that the ccNSO Secretariat launch such a page for the benefit of all ccTLD registries around the world.

Next Steps

The page has only started and resources will be added continuously. The ccNSO Secretariat invites all registries (or similar institutions) to submit resources which they think other registries might find useful.

More Information

Look for the Resources tab on ccnso.icann.org

Staff Contact

[Gabriella Schitteck](#), ccNSO Secretariat

Other Issues Active in the ccNSO

- [IDN Policy Development](#)
- [Redirection and Wildcarding](#)
- [Delegation/Re-delegation of ccTLDs](#)
- [Incident Response Planning](#)

“Special Trademark Issues” Team Reports

At a Glance

The GNSO Council is reviewing an alternative proposal to combat cybersquatting in the New gTLD Program. Recommendations they develop will be considered by the ICANN Board of Directors.

Recent Developments

ICANN has published the third version of the Draft Applicant Guidebook, which describes implementation details for the upcoming opening of the domain name market to many new TLD operators. The GNSO’s new gTLD policy recommendations were approved by the Board, but did not specify how to protect trademarks in new gTLDs. Thus, ICANN Staff has published a series of memoranda and proposals describing solutions for several new trademark protection mechanisms. The Staff based their work on recommendations from the Implementation Recommendation Team (IRT) and on public comments.

The ICANN Board asked that the GNSO expedite evaluation of certain of these proposals, to determine whether they are consistent with the GNSO’s policy recommendations. In response, the GNSO Council convened a select group of representatives from each Stakeholder Group and Constituency, to evaluate the recommendations. The Work Team (commonly referred to as the STI Work Team, because they evaluate “special trademark issues”) has published its report containing an alternative proposal to the recommendations contained in the Draft Applicant Guidebook.

Next Steps

The GNSO is expected to vote on the recommendations described in the STI Recommendations Report at its 17 December 2009 meeting.

Background

The latest draft of the Applicant Guidebook describing the process to apply for new generic top-level domains (gTLDs) was released on 4 October. ICANN proposed a series of new solutions to enhance protections of trademark rights in new gTLDs.

The policy recommendations previously adopted by the GNSO recommended that new gTLD strings must not infringe the existing legal rights of others. The ICANN Board has requested that the GNSO review these implementation proposals and provide feedback on whether they are consistent with this policy

recommendation, or whether there is an alternative proposal to address these concerns that is equivalent or more effective and more implementable than the current proposal.

The GNSO convened the STI Work Team to respond to the Board request. The STI team developed an alternative proposal to address the issue of trademark protection in new GTLDs, as described in its Report. The STI proposal supports:

- The creation of a Trademark Clearinghouse, envisioned as a convenient, centralized location to store registered trademark information on behalf of trademark holders. The Clearinghouse could support certain rights protection mechanisms, such as sunrise or Trademark Claims processes offered by registries.
- The creation of a Uniform Rapid Suspension procedure, which could provide trademark holders with a cost effective, expedited process in clear-cut instances of trademark abuse, provided that the procedure includes appropriate safeguards to protect registrants who engage in legitimate uses of domain names.

More Information

- [More about trademark issues in the New gTLD Program](#)
- [The Board's Letter](#)
- [Email archives for the STI Work Team](#)
- [The STI Recommendations Report](#)

Staff Contact

[Margie Milam](#), Senior Policy Counselor

Inter-Registrar Transfer Policies WG Reviews Comments from Public and Stakeholder Groups

At a Glance

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

Recent Developments

The IRTP Part B Working Group held an open [Working Group meeting](#) in Seoul at which it reviewed the Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy. Their goal was to determine whether they could devise possible modifications in response to

Question A in their charter, “whether a process for urgent return/resolution of a domain name should be developed.”

The Working Group also solicited public comment on the issues the group addresses. The comment period closed in October, and the group has started reviewing the comments received (see <http://forum.icann.org/lists/irtp-b/>).

Next Steps

Following this review, the Working Group will turn its attention to the Constituency / Stakeholder Group Statements it has received. For further information, please consult the [IRTP Part B Working Group Workspace](#).

Background

The IRTP Part B Working Group addresses five issues relating to domain name transfers, specified in their [Charter](#) and in the [August issue](#) of *Policy Update*. The IRTP Part B Working Group has been meeting bi-weekly.

More Information

- [IRTP Part B Public comment period](#) (closed 5 October 2009)
- IRTP Part B Issues Report [[PDF](#), 256K]
- [Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy](#)
- PDP Recommendations [[PDF](#), 124K]

Staff Contact

[Marika Konings](#), Policy Director

Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery WG Receives Initial Survey Findings

At a Glance

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

Recent Developments

Following the ICANN meeting in Seoul, ICANN Staff continued to gather information for the registrar survey which is intended to help inform the deliberations of the Working Group. The survey reviews current registrar practices regarding domain name expiration, renewal, and post-expiration recovery. The [preliminary results of this survey](#) have now been presented to the Working Group.

Next Steps

The Working Group will continue meeting weekly to discuss the questions outlined in its [charter](#). Following the finalization of the registrar survey, the Working Group will need to review the results in further detail to determine how these may potentially influence its response to the charter questions.

Background

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

The GNSO Council adopted a charter for a Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery Working Group (PEDNR WG) at its meeting on 24 June in Sydney.

Following the adoption of the charter, a call for volunteers was launched ([PDF](#)). In addition, a PEDNR workshop was held at the ICANN meeting in Sydney, enabling a first exchange of views with the broader ICANN community on the issues outlined in the charter above. A transcript and audio recording of the workshop is available [online](#).

The Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery Working Group (PEDNR-WG) has been meeting weekly. The Group developed a registrar survey, intended to provide additional information that can inform the deliberations of the Working Group. In addition, the Working Group has started the review of the comments received during the [public comment period](#), which was launched to solicit views on the questions outlined in the [PEDNR WG Charter](#).

The Working Group held a [workshop at the ICANN meeting in Seoul](#), at which it provided an overview of the discussions to date. The group also presented its findings in relation to contractual provisions, as well as registrar practices in relation to post-expiration. Furthermore, ICANN Staff provided an overview of the initial results of the registrar survey.

More Information

- GNSO Issues Report on Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery [[PDF](#), 416K]
- [Translations](#) of the GNSO Issues Report on Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery

- ICANN [Staff response](#) to GNSO request for clarifications
- [PEDNR Public Comment Period](#)

Staff Contact

[Marika Konings](#), Policy Director

Registration Abuse Policies Group Aims to Report by March 2010

At a Glance

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

Recent Developments

The Working Group has started meeting weekly, with the objective of delivering an Initial Report for review at the ICANN meeting to be held in March 2010 in Nairobi, Kenya. The Working Group has continued reviewing the list of abuses it defined, including domain tasting, fake renewal notices, pay-per-click and cybersquatting. In addition, a number of sub-teams are reviewing issues such as uniformity of contracts; spam, phishing and malware; and, Whois availability.

Background

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

In addition, a Uniformity of Contracts sub-team formed, and meets regularly to review existing abuse provisions in registrar and registry agreements and to discuss questions related to the uniformity of contracts. The sub-team ponders issues such as, would there be benefits to having more uniformity in contracts? How effective are existing provisions in dealing with registration abuse?

The [RAP Working Group held an open meeting](#) in Seoul. There, it briefed the community on its activities and discussions to date, including updates from the different sub-teams on Uniformity of Contracts and Spam, Phishing, Malware.

Click [here](#) for further background.

More Information

- Registration Abuse Policies Issues Report, 29 October 2008 [[PDF](#), 400K] and [translation](#) of summary
- [Registration Abuse Policies WG Charter](#)
- [Registration Abuse Policies Mexico City Workshop Transcript](#)
- [Registration Abuse Policies Working Group Workspace](#) (Wiki)

Staff Contacts

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

New GNSO Council Pushes Ahead on All Fronts

At a Glance

The Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) is implementing a comprehensive series of organizational and structural changes to improve the efficiency, effectiveness and accessibility of the organization. To become familiar with the GNSO's new structure, visit the [GNSO Improvements webpage](#).

Recent Developments

Having seated a new GNSO Council at the meeting in Seoul, Councilors are now working diligently to understand all issues presently in the policy development process, and to progress appropriately on those issues. A number of procedural, structural, and housekeeping issues remain under discussion.

Council and Work Team Implementation Efforts. The GNSO's Operations Steering Committee (OSC) and Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC) oversee five Work Teams staffed by volunteers from the GNSO and ALAC communities. The Work Teams develop specific proposals and mechanisms for implementing the GNSO Improvement Recommendations adopted by the Board. These five Work Teams pursue the following activities:

Policy Process Efforts:

- The [PDP Work Team](#) is developing recommendations for a new policy development process (PDP). The team continues its drafting work, meeting weekly.
- The [Working Group Model Work Team](#) is still reviewing drafts of its two new guidebooks, "Working Group Implementation and Charter Drafting Guidelines" and "Working Group Operating Model Guidebook."

Operations Efforts:

- The [GNSO Operations Work Team](#) continues meeting bi-weekly to address additional provisions to the GNSO Operating Procedures now that the new Council is seated. One issue under discussion is how to address Council member abstentions, conflicts of interest, and any impacts on voting procedures.
- The GNSO [Constituency & Stakeholder Group Operations Work Team](#) developed recommendations for a “tool kit” of basic administrative, operational and technical services that could be made available to all Constituencies. These recommendations were approved by the Operations Steering Committee (OSC), and a motion to approve the recommendations will be considered by the GNSO Council at its 17 December meeting. The Work Team is finalizing recommendations on its remaining tasks.
- The GNSO [Communications Coordination Work Team](#) (CCT) submitted to the OSC its final recommendations to (a) enhance the GNSO’s ability to solicit meaningful community feedback, (b) improve GNSO’s coordination with other ICANN structures, and (c) make gns0.icann.org more usable. At the OSC’s request, ICANN Staff gathered OSC member comments concerning the report and drafted a letter (currently circulating for approval) to the CCT containing suggestions for the Work Team to consider. One specific recommendation is to split the final CCT report into two sections: (1) Technology and (2) Communications and Coordination -- to take advantage of the Technology aspect being closer to completion. Staff developed drafts for both of these reports, which are currently being reviewed pending final approval by the CCT.

Next Steps

The community implementation Work Teams will continue developing recommendations for implementing the GNSO restructuring goals approved by the Board. Existing GNSO Constituencies will be expected to continue their re-confirmation discussions and it is hoped that recommendations from the GNSO Constituency Operations Work Team will combine neatly with that process. Dialogue on permanent CSG and NCSG charters will also likely begin soon.

The Board is expected to continue its deliberations on the pending new Constituency petitions.

Background

Through a series of decisions at its February, June, August and October 2008 meetings, the ICANN Board has endorsed a series of goals for improving several aspects of the GNSO’s structure and operations. These decisions culminate from a two-year effort of independent review, community input and Board deliberations. To learn about the GNSO’s new structure and organization, please see the discussion and diagrams on the [GNSO Improvements webpage](#).

More Information

- [GNSO Improvements Information Web Page](#)
- [Latest public documents on proposals for new constituencies](#)
- New Bylaws relevant to the New GNSO Council [[PDF](#), 160K]
- New GNSO Council Operating Procedures [[PDF](#), 108K]

Staff Contact

[Robert Hoggarth](#), Senior Policy Director

Other Issues Active in the GNSO

- [Vertical Separation between Registries and Registrars](#)
- [Whois Studies](#)
- [Fast Flux Hosting](#)

ASO

ARIN Shakes Up Policy Proposal for Recovered IPv4 Addresses

At a Glance

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

Recent Developments

The RIRs discussed the proposal at their most recent meetings. APNIC has adopted the proposal, which has passed final call in AfriNIC and LACNIC. In ARIN, the proposal has been modified and the modified version has recently passed final call. RIPE was awaiting the outcome in ARIN before acting on the proposal. The main question now is whether the different versions adopted lend themselves to reconciliation as a single global policy.

Next Steps

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

Background

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

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

More Information

- [Background Report](#) (updated 4 September 2009)
- [Global Policy Proposal for Handling Recovered IPv4](#)

Staff Contact

[Olof Nordling](#), Director Services Relations

Postpone Transition to 32-Bit ASN? RIPE Says Yes

At a Glance

Regional Internet Registries (RIRs) are discussing a proposed global policy for Autonomous System Numbers (ASNs). The proposal would change the date for a full transition from 16-bit to 32-bit ASNs from the beginning of 2010 to the beginning of 2011, in order to allow more time for necessary upgrades of the systems involved.

Recent Developments

The proposal has been introduced in all RIRs (AfriNIC, APNIC, ARIN, LACNIC and RIPE). It is under discussion in AfriNIC, has passed final call in ARIN, LACNIC and APNIC, and has been adopted in RIPE.

Next Steps

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

Background

Autonomous System Numbers (ASNs) are identifiers used for transit of IP traffic. ASNs were originally 16 bits in length, but a transition to 32-bit ASNs is under way to meet increasing demand. In line with the adopted Global Policy currently in force for ASNs, 16-bit and 32-bit ASNs exist in parallel, but all will be regarded as 32 bits long beginning in 2010. The proposal defers that date to the beginning of 2011.

More Information

- [Background Report](#) (posted 4 September 2009)

Staff Contact

[Olof Nordling](#), Director Services Relations

Joint Efforts

Issues Active in Combined Efforts

- [ICANN definition of Geographic Regions](#)
- [Registrar Accreditation Agreement \(RAA\) amendments and registrant rights](#)
- [Internationalized Domain Names \(IDNs\)](#)

At-Large

ALAC Responds to Board Review Report

At a Glance

In response to a requirement in ICANN's Bylaws, Boston Consulting Group/ Colin Carter & Associates conducted an external review of the effectiveness of

ICANN's Board of Directors. The Board Review Working Group took the consultant's findings and issued a draft report with eight recommendations for improving the Board. ALAC has issued a statement responding to the recommendations.

Recent Developments

On 19 September 2009, the ICANN Board Review Working Group issued its Draft Final Report. In response to a call for public comment announced on 5 October 2009, the ALAC prepared a statement containing the views and suggestions of the At-Large community as relayed to the ALAC in a bottom-up process pertaining to the eight recommendations made by the Board Review Working Group

In broad terms, ALAC supports the Board Review Working Group recommendations that are contained within the Draft Final Report; but has a number of concerns on several of the specific recommendations. For example, regarding the WG's recommendation to reduce the size of the Board, ALAC stated that having two Board members elected by the At-Large community, rather than only one as resolved by the Board on 27 August 2009, would allow for greater balance and diversity of the Board. The ALAC statement also disagrees with the suggestion of the WG that the At-Large Director should replace the current position of the ALAC liaison to the Board. Rather, the ALAC recommends that when the At-Large Board Member is seated, the position of ALAC liaison to the Board continue at least until a second At-Large Board member is put in place.

The proposed comments from At-Large / ALAC were initially composed by Sebastien Bachollet, Chair of the At-Large working group on the Future Structure and Governance of ICANN. The original text was made available for At-Large community comment and was discussed during a teleconference of the At-Large Working Group on the Future Structure and Governance of ICANN on [27 November 2009](#).

Rev2 of the text, prepared by Sebastien Bachollet with assistance from Adam Peake, incorporated comments received from the At-Large community and the members of the At-Large Working Group on the Future Structure and Governance of ICANN. Rev3 of the text (the present document) includes grammatical clarifications.

The ALAC ratified the Statement with a 13 - 0 vote on 9 December 2009.

Next Steps

The ALAC Statement will be transmitted to the ICANN Board of Directors. The At-Large community will continue to be involved in the discussions related to the Board Review Working Group process.

More Information

- [ALAC Statement on the Board Review WG Report](#)
- ICANN Board Review Working Group Draft Final Report [[PDF](#), 228K]
- [ALAC vote to ratify the statement:](#)

Staff Contact

[Heidi Ullrich](#), At-Large Secretariat

ALAC Advises on the Introduction of IDN ccTLDs

At a Glance

The IDN Policy Development Process Working Group is developing policies they'll recommend for managing internationalized domain names (IDNs). The group issued a draft of a policy paper on the introduction of IDN country code top-level domains (ccTLDs). ALAC has issued a statement responding to the paper.

Recent Developments

The ALAC Statement on the “Draft Topic Paper for Policy on the Introduction of IDN ccTLDs” provided input to the IDN Policy Development Process WG 1 in the form of seven questions. The questions included requests for clarifications on issues such as:

- Who can be an IDN ccTLD operator?
- What is the selection process for IDN ccTLD operators for a territory?
- Who decides which group has the “rights” to an IDN ccTLD in a given script?

The paper also poses suggestions for additional topics to be addressed by the Working Group, mostly related to IDN ccTLD strings.

The ALAC ratified the Statement with a 14 - 0 vote on 9 December 2009.

Next Steps

The ALAC Statement will be transmitted to the ICANN Board of Directors. The At-Large Working Group on IDN Policy will continue following the output of the Working Group on the Selection and Delegation of IDN ccTLDs (IDNccPDP WG 1).

Background

The ALAC statement was first drafted by James Seng, Chair of the At-Large Working Group on IDN Policy. The original text was made available for At-Large community feedback on 25 November 2009.

This text was further discussed during a teleconference of the At-Large Working Group on IDN Policy on [3 December 2009](#).

The first revision of this document (the present version) was prepared by James Seng and incorporates comments received from the At-Large community on the original version.

More Information

- Draft Topic Paper for Policy on the Introduction of IDN ccTLDs [[PDF, 116K](#)]
- [ALAC Statement on Draft Topic Paper for Policy on the Introduction of IDN ccTLD](#)
- [ALAC Vote to ratify the Statement](#)

Staff Contact

, [At-Large Secretariat](#)

ALAC Opposes Changes to the NomCom

At a Glance

In response to a call for public comment on the Review of the Nominating Committee (NomCom) Draft Report, the ALAC issued a strong statement that neither the size of the NomCom nor means of representation should be significantly changed, other than to reflect any changes in the structure of the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees.

Recent Developments

The “Review of the NomCom” Draft Final Report recommended reducing the size of the NomCom, including decreasing the number of ALAC representatives from their present five (one from each Regional At-Large Organization, or RALO), to three (rotating among the regions). The ALAC statement argues that any reduction in ALAC representation is unwise from the standpoints of geographic diversity, the broad range of ICANN issues beyond generic names addressed by the At-Large community, and representation of the Internet-using public.

Background

The [original version](#) of the ALAC Statement on the NomCom Review was composed by Wendy Seltzer on behalf of the North-American Regional At-Large Organization and published on 17 November 2009.

The At-Large Working Group on the Future Structure and Governance of ICANN decided to use the North American Statement as a basis for their Draft ALAC Statement on the NomCom review and held a [teleconference on November 27th](#) to discuss the Statement.

Adam Peake subsequently incorporated the suggestions made during that discussion and published the final draft version of the ALAC Statement (the present version) on 1 December 2009.

The ALAC ratified the Statement with a 14 - 0 vote on 9 December 2009.

Next Steps

The ALAC Statement will be transmitted to the ICANN Board of Directors. The At-Large community will continue to monitor discussions related to the review of the NomCom.

More Information

- [ALAC Statement on the NomCom Review](#)
- Review of the ICANN Nominating Committee – Draft Final Report [[PDF](#), 396K]
- [ALAC Vote to ratify the Statement](#)

Staff Contact

, At-Large Secretariat

EURALO Produces Outreach Brochure

At a Glance

Members of the At-Large European Regional Organization (EURALO) worked intensively to create a brochure, which they will use for information dissemination and outreach activities.

Recent Developments

Members of the European Regional At-Large Organization (EURALO) created a brochure for increasing awareness of EURALO within Europe. Included in the EURALO brochure are the key issues members are working on, including the

introduction of new generic Top-Level Domains (gTLDs), trademark issues, internationalized domain names (IDNs), and the transition from IPv4 to IPv6. The brochure will be used to facilitate outreach activities.

The brochure also provides information on the membership of EURALO. The brochure has already been distributed at such key events as the Internet Governance Forum held in Sharm el Sheikh, Egypt 15 – 18 November, 2009.

Next Steps

EURALO members will use the new brochure for outreach to potential new At-Large Structures at upcoming regional events. Regional organizations in the four other At-Large regions will be developing their brochures in the near future.

More Information

- EURALO brochure [[PDF](#), 176K]

Staff Contact

, At-Large Secretariat

SSAC

Issues Active with the SSAC

The Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) is considering several security related issues, including the Report of the Root Scaling Study Team, display and usage of Internationalized registration data (Whois data), orphaned domain names, and domain name history. These and other topics may be the addressed in future SSAC Reports or Advisories.

Staff Contact

[Julie Hedlund](#), Director, SSAC Support