



**POLICY UPDATE**

**Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers**

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

Volume 09, Issue 11 – November 2009

## **Across ICANN**

[Policy and Related Issues Currently Open for Public Comment](#)

[Transitions](#)

## **ccNSO**

[ccNSO Membership Closes on 100](#)

[ccNSO Insists New gTLDs Should Not Include Country Names](#)

[ccNSO Seeks Comments on IDN Policy Development](#)

[ccNSO to Study Redirection and Wildcarding](#)

[Delegation/Re-delegation WG Expects Substantive Discussion in Nairobi](#)

[Incident Response Planning WG Plans Its Work, Works Its Plan](#)

## **GNSO**

[GNSO Seats New Council in Seoul](#)

[GNSO to Evaluate Trademark Protections for the New gTLDs](#)

[Request for Proposals on Two Whois Studies Close Soon](#)

[Inter-Registrar Transfer Policies WG Reviews Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy](#)

[Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery WG Considers Comments, Survey Responses](#)

[Registration Abuse Policies Group Asks, Would Contract Uniformity Provide Benefits?](#)

## ASO

[Policy Proposal for Recovered IPv4 Addresses Inches Along](#)

[Postpone Transition to 32-Bit ASN? Proposal Makes Final Call in Four RIRs](#)

## Joint Efforts

[Geographic Regions WG Set to Survey the World](#)

[GNSO / ALAC RAA Joint Group Digests Public Comments on Registrant Rights](#)

[Joint GNSO / ccNSO IDN WG Readies for More Work](#)

## At-Large

[Report: At-Large Activities Jumped in Quantity and Diversity during 2009](#)

[At-Large Takes a Stand on ICANN's Public Consultation Process](#)

[ALAC Comments on "Improving Institutional Confidence"](#)

## SSAC

[SSAC Presentations from Seoul Available On Line](#)

---

## 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 these updates 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](mailto:policy-staff@icann.org).

### **What's on the Calendar for Today?**

Keep up-to-date on ICANN policy development by visiting the online calendars of ICANN's policy development and advisory bodies. Three of the most active calendars include: [At-Large Calendar](#); Country Code Names Supporting Organization ([ccNSO](#)) [Master Calendar](#); and [Generic Names Supporting Organization \(GNSO\) Master Calendar](#).

## Across ICANN

---

### **Policy and Related Issues Currently Open for 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:

- [Proposed Bylaw Changes to Improve Accountability](#). ICANN's Board has directed that two proposed accountability measures be posted for public comment, as the latest step in the Improving Institutional Confidence process. Please comment on the "Community Re-examination Vote" and the "Independent Review Board" ideas by 27 November 2009.
- [Expressions of Interest in New gTLDs](#). ICANN requests information, advice and proposed models before it solicits expressions of interest in new gTLDs. A call for expressions of interest in new gTLDs could provide ICANN and potential applicants important information about the level of interest in the program, which could help with planning for the coming new gTLD round. The public comment forum will be open until December 11, 2009 however, community members that wish to have their input considered by the Board during its December meeting, should submit comments no later than November 27, 2009.
- [TNO Report Describing Root Scaling Model](#). The Netherlands Organization for Applied Scientific Research (TNO) has published a report describing the characteristics of a quantitative model that could be used for dynamic analysis of root scaling issues. Please comment by 29 November, 2009.

- [Root Scaling Study Team Report](#). The ICANN Board requested the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC), the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC), and the ICANN staff, including the IANA team, to study the potential issues regarding the addition of IDNs, IPv6 addresses, DNSSEC and substantial numbers of new TLDs to the root zone. Recommendations will be based on this report; comment by 29 November 2009.
- [.POST Sponsorship Agreement](#). ICANN and the Universal Postal Union (UPU), a specialized agency of the United Nations, have reached an agreement in principle for UPU to sponsor the .POST Top-Level Domain. Final approval is subject to ICANN's public comment process and consideration by the Board of Directors. Comment by 1 December 2009.
- [Draft Topic Paper for Policy on Introducing Internationalized ccTLDs](#). What topics and issues need to be considered when developing a feasible policy for the selection and delegation of internationalized country code top level domains? Let the ccNSO know; comment by 4 December 2009.
- [Proposed Amendments to the UDRP Supplemental Rules of the Czech Arbitration Court](#). The Czech Arbitration Court (CAC), an Approved Provider for the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) is proposing to amend its Supplemental Rules to provide for an alternative page limit and processing fee for certain UDRP Complaints. Comment by 11 December 2009.

### More Information

For the full list of issues open for public comment, as well as a list of recently closed and archived public comment forums, refer to the [Public Comments](#) page.

---

## Transitions

With the seating of the new GNSO Council during ICANN's meeting at Seoul in October, many hard-working volunteers ended their terms of service. The ICANN community extends special thanks to Avri Doria, the outgoing Chair of the GNSO. Thanks also go to the following departing councilors: Cyril Chua, IPC; Ute Decker, IPC; Tony Harris, ISPCPC; Tony Holmes, ISPCPC; Jordie Iparraguirre, RyC; Carlos Souza, NCUC; Maggie Mansourkia, ISPCPC; and Philip Sheppard, CBUC.

The GNSO Council also thanks the following Constituency Chairs, whose terms recently ended, for their dedicated service: Jonathon Nevett, Chair of the Registrar Constituency (starting in 2006); and Steve Metalitz, Chair of the Intellectual Property Interests Constituency (starting in 2001).

The community extends a warm welcome to the following newly-minted GNSO Councilors: Rafik Dammak, NCSG; Caroline Greer, CSG; Debra Hughes, NCSG; Andrei Kolesnikov, NCA; Wendy Seltzer, NCSG; Rosemary Sinclair, NCSG; David Taylor, CSG; Wolf Ulrich-Knoben, CSG; and Jaime Wagner, CSG. A complete list of current GNSO Council members is available [online](#).

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](mailto: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 7<sup>th</sup> of each month to appear in that month's issue.

## ccNSO

---

### ccNSO Membership Closes on 100

#### At a Glance

*With the recent acceptance of two new members in the Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO), membership now rests at 99 country code TLD operators. Zambia (.zm) and the Federal State of Micronesia (.fm) joined the ccNSO as members 98 and 99.*

#### Next Steps

The ccNSO looks forward with anticipation to see which ccTLD will become its one hundredth member.

#### More Information

- Alphabetical list of all ccNSO members  
<http://ccnso.icann.org/about/members.htm>
- Status of all member applications  
<http://ccnso.icann.org/applications/summary-date.shtml>

#### Staff Contact

[Gabriella Schitteck](#), ccNSO Secretariat

---

# ccNSO Insists New gTLDs Should Not Allow Country Names

## At a Glance

*The ccNSO Council is reiterating its long-held position that when applicants request new generic top-level domain names (gTLDs), names of territories should not be allowed as domain names until the internationalized domain name (IDN) country code policy development process (ccPDP) concludes.*

## Recent Developments

At the ICANN international meeting in Seoul, South Korea, ccTLD managers met with ICANN Board members Peter Dengate-Thrush and Mike Silber, and with ICANN CEO Rod Beckstrom, to discuss a proposed method for protecting country names in the new gTLD application process. In particular, some ccTLD representatives present questioned why the ccNSO and Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) recommendations on this issue had not been accepted as part of the [new gTLD Draft Applicant Guidebook](#). Meeting participants reiterated their view that when applicants request new generic top-level domain names (gTLDs), names of territories should not be allowed as domain names until the [internationalized domain name \(IDN\) country code policy development process \(ccPDP\)](#) concludes.

The ccNSO Council has now formed an ad hoc working group that is drafting a letter to ICANN's Board, reiterating their call for the protection of country names.

## Next Steps

Once the working group has drafted the letter, it will be sent to the ccNSO Council for approval. Once approved, the Council will send it to ICANN's Board.

## Background

Previously the ccNSO Council submitted a note to the same effect during the public comment period on version 2 of the Draft Applicant Guidebook, then again during public comments on version 3 of the Guidebook. They also previously adopted a motion calling for the protection of territory names.

## More information

- Web page of the working group on the protection of country names (includes relevant ccNSO documents):  
<http://www.ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/protection-country-names-wg.htm>

## Staff Contact

[Bart Boswinkel](#), ccNSO Senior Policy Advisor

---

## ccNSO Seeks Comments on IDN Policy Development

### At a Glance

*The Internationalized Domain Names Country Code Policy Development Process Working Group ([IDN ccPDP WG](#)) has requested comments from the public on what issues and topics to consider when deciding how internationalized country code names should be managed.*

### Recent Developments

The IDN ccPDP Working Group recently published a draft “[topic paper](#)” as they work their way toward recommending policy for how international country code top-level domain names can be selected and delegated. The purpose of this Topic Paper is to identify and define the topics and issues that should be considered when proposing such a policy, so that the policy is both thorough and feasible.

### Next Steps

After the public comment period ends on 4 December, the Working Group will take into account the comments, then finalize the paper. The finalized paper will serve as a basis for drafting the first proposals for an overall global policy.

### Background

Many in the ICANN community are aware of the IDN ccTLD Fast Track program, which is intended to provide a temporary process for country code operators to propose a limited number of strings as internationalized domain names. The IDN ccPDP WG is working toward developing a permanent global policy and process for managing all future IDN ccTLDs.

### More information

- Announcements of Call for Comments  
<http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-04nov09-en.htm>
- Comments received to date  
<http://forum.icann.org/lists/idn-ccpdp/>

### Staff contact

[Bart Boswinkel](#), Senior Policy Advisor ccNSO

---

## ccNSO to Study Redirection and Wildcarding

### At a Glance

*ICANN's Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) has defined redirection as bad practice, and the Board has called for prohibiting it in top-level domains (TLDs). However, some country code operators make use of redirection. The ccNSO seeks further understanding of the divergent viewpoints.*

### Recent Developments

During the international meeting in Seoul, ccTLD operators met with SSAC members. A Korean registry explained the reasons they use redirection. Ram Mohan and Steve Crocker, from SSAC, explained why they consider redirection bad practice.

### Next Steps

In order to understand the issues associated with redirection, the ccNSO Council will set up a small ad-hoc study group and liaise with SSAC and the Stability, Security and Resilience group of ICANN. The study group will also liaise with the ccTLDs who are currently using redirection. The group will solicit views, and then will report to the Council and ccTLD community

### Background

*Redirection* turns up most often during web surfing. In this context it is the practice of responding to an HTML query for a non-existent domain with links to marketing web sites, when the proper response should return an error message. This is also known as a *synthesized response*. The Internet is more than web surfing, so redirection has further negative ramifications on DNS, email, and other protocols and processes.

At ICANN's June 2009 international meeting in Sydney, the ICANN Board passed a resolution requesting that the ccNSO propose mechanisms to avoid the use of redirection and synthesized DNS responses by a ccTLD.

### More Information

- Explanation of wildcards and synthesized DNS responses  
<http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac015.htm>
- SAC032, "Preliminary Report on DNS Response Modification"  
<http://www.icann.org/committees/security/sac032.pdf>
- SAC041, "Recommendation to prohibit use of redirection and synthesized responses by new TLDs"  
<http://www.icann.org/committees/security/sac041.pdf>
- Board resolution prohibiting synthesized responses by TLDs  
<http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-26jun09.htm#7>



## Staff Contact

[Bart Boswinkel](#), Senior Policy Advisor, ccNSO

---

# Delegation/Re-delegation WG Expects Substantive Discussion in Nairobi

## At a Glance

*Re-delegation refers to the process of changing the designated manager(s) of a country code top-level domain (ccTLD). The standards for doing so have been the same since 1999, so a ccNSO Working Group is reexamining how country codes are delegated, re-delegated, and even retired.*

## Recent Developments

The duration of the WG under the current charter will need to be adjusted to accommodate the working method and schedule the group has proposed. Now that the Seoul meeting is past, the group can begin its substantive work. The first area they will review is delegation, followed by retirement and finally re-delegation.

## Next Steps

The group expects to lead substantive discussion on delegation practices with the community at the ICANN meeting next March, in Nairobi.

## Background

Currently, the ICANN policy and practices for delegation and re-delegation are reflected in established [IANA](#) processes. In carrying out these processes, IANA follows the list of [country codes](#) published by the ISO 3166 Maintenance Agency. For more information about establishing new ccTLDs, see IANA's Procedures for Establishing ccTLDs and [IANA's delegation reports](#).

*Re-delegation* of a ccTLD is conducted according to the principles described in [ICP-1](#) and [RFC 1591](#). The policy and process are also reflected in IANA reports that illustrate many of the considerations made in deciding whether or not to re-delegate. In light of the changed environment and circumstances since RFC 1591 was last revised in 1999, the ccNSO considered it time to review the current policies. The ccNSO wants a better understanding of any issues relating to the current policies, before taking possible further steps.

## More Information

- ccNSO Delegation & Redelegation Working Group  
<http://www.ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/drddwg.htm>

## Staff Contact

[Bart Boswinkel](#), Senior Policy Advisor, ccNSO

---

# Incident Response Planning WG Plans Its Work, Works Its Plan

## At a Glance

*An Incident Response Planning Working Group (IRP WG), newly chartered in August, is helping country code operators develop a coordinated response to global Internet threats. They've drafted a work plan.*

## Recent Developments

The WG discussed the draft plan with the ccTLD community at the October meeting in Seoul, both on Tech Day and during the ccNSO meeting. The ccNSO Council amended the group's charter to enable implementation of the proposals in close cooperation with the Security, Stability and Resilience department of ICANN. Norm Ritchie of .CA was appointed chair of the WG.

## Next Steps

In subsequent phases, the WG will add detail to the plan. Then the plan will enter an implementation phase.

## Background

At its meeting in August, the ccNSO Council adopted the IRP WG charter and issued a call for volunteers. The purpose of the IRP WG is to develop and propose to the ccTLD community mechanisms and structures for coordinated response to incidents potentially affecting the DNS. The Conficker worm, which spread earlier this year, provides an example of the kind of threat the IRP WG intends to address.

## More Information

- Incident Response Working Group home page  
<http://www.ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/erpwg.htm>

## Staff Contact

[Bart Boswinkel](#), Senior Policy Advisor, ccNSO

---

## GNSO Seats New Council in Seoul

### At a Glance

*The Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) community is working to implement a comprehensive series of organizational and structural changes designed to improve the efficiency, effectiveness and accessibility of the organization. To become familiar with the GNSO's new structure and organization, please see the discussion and diagrams on the [GNSO Improvements webpage](#).*

### Recent Developments

*New Council Seated.* After many months of substantial preparation, on 28 October, 2009 the newly structured GNSO Council formally convened in Seoul, South Korea. The new Council, which has 22 individual voting and non-voting members, reflects a *bicameral*, or two-house, voting structure, comprised of four general Stakeholder Groups. Eight of the 22 members are new to the Council. A diagram listing Council members and their roles is available [online](#).

As its first order of business, the Council unanimously approved a new set of [Operating Procedures](#) recommended by a GNSO sub-group. As its second order of business the new Council elected Chuck Gomes (VeriSign) as the Council Chair. Stéphane van Gelder (Indom) and Olga Cavalli (Nominating Committee Appointee) were named as Council Vice Chairs respectively by the Contracted Party and Non-Contracted Party houses.

Seating of the new Council is a significant accomplishment and paves the way for the community to now focus its efforts on finishing development of a new policy development process, and the creation of a new working group model for policy development. Additional work will also continue on improving the GNSO's internal and external communications capabilities (including a revised web site); strengthening the Council's operating procedures; and completing efforts to create a level playing field for all the GNSO community's formal Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies. Working teams spearhead all these efforts, and their current status is described below.

*New GNSO Constituencies Remain Under Consideration.* ICANN Board members conducted substantial discussions in Seoul regarding the proposals for four new GNSO Constituencies, but took no formal action. All four of the proposed new GNSO Constituency charters (CyberSafety, Consumers, City TLDs and IDNgTLD) remain "pending." The process also remains available for

other interested parties to develop proposals for new GNSO Constituencies and to submit them to the Board.

*Existing GNSO Constituency “Re-confirmation” Efforts to Resume.* The seating of the new GNSO Council also frees up resources to address the “re-confirmation” of the existing GNSO Constituencies. Back in August 2008, the ICANN Board determined that if new GNSO Constituencies were going to be subject to a certification process, then it was appropriate to set up a system by which existing GNSO Constituencies could be regularly evaluated as well. The Board adopted a concept (documented in minutes from their [meeting](#)) of re-confirming the charters and operational mechanisms of each Constituency every three years.

The initial Constituency re-confirmation process was slated for earlier this year, but the process took a back seat as the Board focused its efforts on evaluation and approval of the new GNSO Stakeholder Group structures and approval of the processes and recommended Bylaws changes necessary for seating the new GNSO Council. Now that the Board has resolved those issues, it has set a deadline of March 2010 for formal re-submission of any revised re-confirmation proposals by the existing GNSO Constituencies and has directed the ICANN Staff to assist constituency leaders to develop those submissions.

*Permanent Stakeholder Group Charters.* When the Board approved the four new GNSO Stakeholder Group structures earlier this year it acknowledged that the Commercial Stakeholder Group charter and the Non Commercial Stakeholder Group charters were to be transitional/temporary and that permanent charters were to be developed over the course of the coming year. The Board is already examining options being considered by the community for what permanent charters might look like. Based on discussions in Seoul, the Staff will be working to develop opportunities for dialogue and further community discussion of these important matters.

*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, processes and mechanisms for implementing the GNSO Improvement Recommendations endorsed and adopted by the Board. These five Work Teams have made significant progress on the following activities:

**Policy Process Efforts:**

1. PDP Team

The GNSO’s PDP Work Team is developing recommendations for a new policy development process (PDP), which they have split into five distinct phases. The team continues its drafting work, meeting weekly.

2. Working Group Team

The GNSO's Working Group Model Work Team is developing two new guidebooks, "Working Group Implementation and Charter Drafting Guidelines" and "Working Group Operating Model Guidebook." Both have been drafted and are now in iterative cycles of being reviewed, having comments incorporated, and being reviewed again.

### **Operations Efforts:**

- The [GNSO Operations Work Team](#) met in person in Seoul and discussed how to make the additional changes to the GNSO Council Operating Procedures required to implement more complex issues (for example, how to handle absentee ballots).
- 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. The team provided a draft document to the OSC prior to the Seoul meeting, which the OSC subsequently approved (with minor changes) then sent to the GNSO Council to consider. The Work Team also met in Seoul to discuss plans to finalize its recommendations on three tasks: 1) a framework for participation in any ICANN Constituency that is objective, standardized, and clearly stated; 2) operating principles that are representative, open, transparent, and democratic; and 3) recommendations for creating and maintaining a database of all constituency members (and other participants not formally a part of any constituency).
- The GNSO [Communications Coordination Work Team](#) (CCT) met in Seoul and approved a draft of recommendations to enhance the GNSO's ability to solicit meaningful community feedback, to improve GNSO's coordination with other ICANN structures, and proposals for making [gnso.icann.org](http://gnso.icann.org) more usable. The Work Team provided its recommendations to the OSC for review and consideration.

### **Next Steps**

The community implementation Work Teams will continue their efforts to develop 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.

ICANN Staff has also been fielding several new queries about potential new GNSO Constituencies and will be providing information to interested parties on developing proposals. 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 are a culmination of 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  
<http://gns0.icann.org/en/improvements/>
- Latest public documents on proposals for new constituencies  
<http://gns0.icann.org/en/improvements/newco-process-en.htm>
- Complete Package of New Bylaws relevant to the New GNSO Council  
<http://www.icann.org/en/general/bylaws-amendments-27aug09.pdf>
- New GNSO Council Operating Procedures --  
<http://gns0.icann.org/drafts/public-comment-draft-17sep09-en.pdf>

## Staff Contact

[Robert Hoggarth](#), Senior Policy Director

---

## GNSO to Evaluate Trademark Protections for the New gTLD Program

### At a Glance

*The GNSO Council is reviewing proposals in the New gTLD Program to provide the ICANN Board with feedback on solutions proposed in the Draft Applicant Guidebook Version 3 for combating cybersquatting.*

### Recent Developments

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

The ICANN Board has requested that the GNSO evaluate certain of these proposals on an expedited basis to determine whether they are consistent with

the GNSO's policy recommendations. In response, the GNSO Council has convened a select group of representatives from each Stakeholder Group and Constituency to respond to the Board by 14 December 2009.

### **Next Steps**

The GNSO has convened a work team, referred to as the Special Trademarks Issues Drafting Team (STI), to analyze and respond to the Board letter by its requested deadline of 14 December 2009.

### **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, including:

- The creation of a Trademark Clearinghouse, which would serve as a database of authenticated trademark rights for use in Sunrise Periods and IP Claims Services
- The creation of a Uniform Rapid Suspension procedure for expedited take-downs of clear-cut instances of trademark infringement.

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 implementable than the current proposal.

### **More Information**

- To understand more about trademark issues in the New gTLD Program, please refer to <http://www.icann.org/en/topics/new-gtlds/gnso-consultations-reports-en.htm> and provide comments during the public comment period by 22 November 2009.
- More information on the Board's Letter <http://gnso.icann.org/mailling-lists/archives/council/msg07609.html>
- Email archives for the GNSO's STI Drafting Team <http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnso-sti/>

### **Staff Contact**

[Margie Milam](#), Senior Policy Counselor

---

## Request for Proposals on Two Whois Study Areas Close Soon

### At a Glance

*Whois is the data repository containing registered domain names, registrant contacts and other critical information. Questions persist concerning the use and misuse of this important resource. The GNSO Council continues its inquiries into the suitability of Whois as the Internet evolves.*

### Recent Developments

From public comments and from the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC), suggestions in 2008 outlined two dozen areas worthy of study. These “hypotheses” have since been grouped into broad areas.

The first three study areas are:

- **Whois Misuse.** The Misuse studies focus on the extent to which public Whois information is used for harmful purposes. A Request for Proposals (RFP) has been issued, asking any knowledgeable and qualified researchers to estimate the costs and feasibility of conducting these studies. Responses are due by 27 November.
- **Whois Registrant Identification.** Previously referred to as “Misrepresentation Study,” this effort will examine the extent to which domain names registered by legal persons or for commercial purposes are not clearly represented in Whois data. An RFP has also been issued asking for responses by researchers by 22 December.
- **Whois Proxy and Privacy Services.** These studies will examine the extent to which privacy and proxy registration services are abused to: 1) obscure the source of illegal or harmful communication; and 2) may delay source identification. Staff is defining the Terms of Reference (TOR) for this area of study, and hopes to release an RFP for this study area by the end of 2009.

During June’s international meeting in Sydney, the ICANN Board passed a resolution asking the GNSO and the SSAC to form a joint Working Group, which would look at the feasibility of introducing display specifications so that the increasing prevalence of non-ASCII registration data does not compromise the accuracy of Whois. The community is in the early stages of convening this technical Working Group. There is still time to join the group; those who are interested (and especially those with technical expertise) are encouraged to do so by emailing at [policy-staff@icann.org](mailto:policy-staff@icann.org).

A workshop on Internationalized Registration Data, held in Seoul, was well-attended. Dave Piscitello gave an overview of the issue. Board member Bruce Tonkin moderated an open mike session, where substantive considerations and



perspectives were offered, touching on how some ccTLD operators have addressed the issue, and how best to address the concern in terms of standardization.

The fifth important study area, separately requested by the GNSO in May, would compile a comprehensive list of Whois service requirements, based on current policies and previous policy discussions. ICANN staff members are tackling the issue; expect to see this work continue into 2010.

## Background

The GNSO Council specified study areas related to Whois, involving data misuse, use of non-ASCII character sets, proxy and privacy services, and the provision of inaccurate information. [Click here](#) for background details.

Staff intends to release study assessment information serially (as specific analyses on the individual study areas are complete). However, the initial feasibility assessments and cost determinations will take several months to complete. Staff will keep the GNSO Council informed of progress, so that the GNSO can then consider next steps.

## More Information

- Whois misuse RFP announcement  
<http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-28sep09-en.htm>
- Whois registrant identification RFP announcement  
<http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-23oct09-en.htm>
- SSAC Reports  
<http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/ssac-documents.htm>
- GNSO Whois policy development page  
<http://gns0.icann.org/issues/whois/>
- ICANN Board Resolution regarding display and usage of internationalized registration data, approved in Sydney, 26 June 2009  
<http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-26jun09.htm#6>
- Updated cross reference table for Whois studies under consideration  
<http://gns0.icann.org/issues/whois/whois-requested-studies-chart-25sep09-en.pdf>
- Internationalized Data Registration Working Group charter  
<http://gns0.icann.org/drafts/internationalized-data-registration-wg-draft-charter-27sep09.pdf>

## Staff Contact

[Liz Gasster](#), Senior Policy Counselor

---

## Inter-Registrar Transfer Policies WG Reviews Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy

### 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 possible modifications could be devised in response to charter question a: whether a process for urgent return/resolution of a domain name should be developed.

### Next Steps

The Working Group is expected to start reviewing the comments received during the public comment period, as well as responses they received to the Constituency / Stakeholder Group Statement Template they developed and circulated. For further information, please consult the [IRTP Part B Working Group Workspace](#).

### Background

As part of a broader review of the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy, the first in a set of five distinct policy development processes (PDPs) has now been completed (click [here](#) for background details) and a second one, IRTP Part B, has begun. The IRTP Part B Working Group addresses five issues, specified in the August issue of Policy Update and also in their [Charter](#). The IRTP Part B Working Group has been meeting bi-weekly.

### More Information

- IRTP Part B Public comment period (closed 5 October 2009)  
<http://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/#irtp-b>
- IRTP Part B Issues Report  
<http://gnso.icann.org/issues/transfers/irtp-report-b-15may09.pdf>
- Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy  
<http://www.icann.org/en/transfers/>
- PDP Recommendations  
<http://gnso.icann.org/drafts/transfer-wg-recommendations-pdp-groupings-19mar08.pdf>

## Staff Contact

[Marika Konings](#), Policy Director

---

# Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery WG Considers Comments, Survey Responses

## 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

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.

## Next Steps

ICANN staff will continue to gather feedback needed to finalize the registrar survey by reviewing registrar web sites and reaching out to registrars to obtain additional information that cannot be found online. In addition, the Working Group will continue meeting to discuss and address the questions outlined in its [charter](#).

## 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 comments on the questions outlined in the [PEDNR WG Charter](#).

### More Information

- GNSO Issues Report on Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery <http://gns0.icann.org/issues/post-expiration-recovery/report-05dec08.pdf>
- Translations of the GNSO Issues Report on Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery: <http://gns0.icann.org/policies/>
- ICANN Staff response to GNSO request for clarifications: <http://gns0.icann.org/mailing-lists/archives/council/msg06162.html>
- PEDNR Public Comment Period <http://forum.icann.org/lists/pednr-wg-questions/>

### Staff Contact

[Marika Konings](#), Policy Director

---

## Registration Abuse Policies Group Asks, Would Contract Uniformity Provide Benefits?

### 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 take a closer look at registration abuse policies.*

### Recent Developments

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

## Next Steps

The Working Group will continue meeting every two weeks and has developed a timeline with the aim of delivering its Initial Report for review at the ICANN meeting to be held this March in Nairobi, Kenya.

## Background

The RAP Working Group addresses the issues outlined in its charter, such as: defining the difference between registration abuse and domain name use abuse; the effectiveness of existing registration abuse policies; and which areas, if any, would be suitable for GNSO policy development to address registration abuse. 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 has been meeting regularly to review existing abuse provisions in registrar and registry agreements and to discuss questions related to the uniformity of contracts. The sub-team is pondering issues such as, would there be a benefit to having more uniformity in contracts? How effective are existing provisions in dealing with registration abuse?

Click [here](#) for further background.

## More Information

- Registration Abuse Policies Issues Report, 29 October 2008  
<http://gnso.icann.org/issues/registration-abuse/gnso-issues-report-registration-abuse-policies-29oct08.pdf>  
and translation of summary <http://gnso.icann.org/policies/>
- Registration Abuse Policies WG Charter  
[https://st.icann.org/reg-abuse-wg/index.cgi?action=display\\_html;page\\_name=registration\\_abuse\\_policies\\_working\\_group](https://st.icann.org/reg-abuse-wg/index.cgi?action=display_html;page_name=registration_abuse_policies_working_group)
- Registration Abuse Policies Mexico City Workshop Transcript  
<http://mex.icann.org/files/meetings/mexico2009/transcript-gnso-registration-abuse-policies-workshop-03mar09-en.txt>
- Registration Abuse Policies Working Group Workspace (Wiki)  
[https://st.icann.org/reg-abuse-wg/index.cgi?registration\\_abuse\\_policies\\_working\\_group](https://st.icann.org/reg-abuse-wg/index.cgi?registration_abuse_policies_working_group)

## Staff Contacts

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

---

## Policy Proposal for Recovered IPv4 Addresses Inches Along

### At a Glance

*Regional Internet Registries (RIRs) are currently 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. The proposal remains in the discussion stage in ARIN and RIPE, who contemplate modifications. At a recent ARIN meeting, no consensus was reached and discussions continue, while RIPE is awaiting the outcome in ARIN before acting on the proposal.

### 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  
<http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-12may09-en.htm>
- [Global Policy Proposal for Handling Recovered IPv4](#)

## Staff Contact

[Olof Nordling](#), Director Services Relations

---

# Postpone Transition to 32-Bit ASN? Proposal Makes Final Call in Four RIRs

## At a Glance

*Regional Internet Registries (RIRs) are currently 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 in the discussion phase in AfriNIC, has entered final call in ARIN, has passed final call in 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  
<http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-04sep09-en.htm>

## Staff Contact

[Olof Nordling](#), Director Services Relations

# Joint Efforts

---

## Geographic Regions WG Set to Survey the World

### At a Glance

*The Geographic Regions Review Working Group works toward ensuring that representation in ICANN remains fair and geographically diverse, despite shifts in geopolitics. The group published its Initial Report for community review and comment and is now working on the second phase of its review efforts.*

### Recent Developments

The Working Group completed its Initial Report in late July and published the document in all six UN languages for community review and comment. The 35-day public comment forum closed on 4 September 2009 and the group is now looking to develop its Interim Report. Community participation in the initial report [comment forum](#) was minimal. As a result, the Working Group is taking additional time to develop the second phase of its project. WG members intend to use that additional time to seek further input from members of their individual communities. The Working Group is also developing a community survey in an effort to glean extra insights about the applicability of the ICANN Geographic Regions framework on individual communities and community members.

### Next Steps

Using its anticipated survey, the Working Group hopes to spur additional community input about ICANN's geographic regions framework and its impact on the community. The Working Group's Interim Report will now be prepared for community review and comment before the next international ICANN meeting in Nairobi, Kenya early next year.

The Interim Report will address three specific areas: (1) confirm the foundation elements set forth in the Initial Report; (2) review the underlying objectives of ICANN's geographic regions framework; and (3) identify specific matters to be addressed in the ultimate Final Report to be produced next year.

The third "Final Report" that will include the working group's recommendations (if any) is now expected to be published later next year.



## Background

[Click here](#) for more details.

## More Information

- ICANN Board Resolutions: November 2007  
<http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-02nov07.htm>
- ICANN Board Resolution; November 2008  
<http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-07nov08.htm>
- WG Charter  
<http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-26jun09.htm> - 1.2
- Public Comment Forum on Initial Report of Working Group  
<http://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/public-comment-200909.html#geo-regions-review>

## Staff Contact:

[Robert Hoggarth](#), Senior Policy Director

---

## GNSO / ALAC RAA Joint Group Digests Public Comments on Registrant Rights

### At a Glance

*In order to be accredited by ICANN, registrars sign a Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) that commits them to certain performance standards. ICANN community groups are drafting a charter identifying registrant rights and discussing further amendments to the RAA that address malicious conduct and ICANN's enforcement capabilities.*

### Recent Developments

The RAA Drafting Team received suggestions from the ICANN community on ways in which the RAA can be improved to address areas of concern related to the domain registration system. Submissions representing a wide range of interests, from the law enforcement community, the Intellectual Property Constituency, ICANN Staff, and others, highlighted areas for further consideration. Comments included suggestions to enhance responses to malicious conduct, to protect registrant rights, and to provide ICANN with additional compliance tools. Some suggestions sought to clarify ambiguities in the RAA.

## Next Steps

The Drafting team will evaluate these comments to identify an appropriate list of amendment topics for further action by ICANN and the registrars.

## Background

The RAA is the document that describes the relationship between ICANN and its accredited registrars, and is signed by all accredited registrars. The GNSO Council and ALAC have convened a joint team tasked with drafting a registrant rights charter and identifying further amendments to the RAA that may be desirable. As part of this joint effort, the Drafting Team solicited and received suggestions for amendments from a broad range of interests to address areas of concern and improvement.

## More information

- If you have an interest in identifying improvements to the RAA, or in drafting the Registrant Rights charter, and have time to dedicate to this important task, please contact Glen de Saint Gery at [gnsso.secretariat@gnsso.icann.org](mailto:gnsso.secretariat@gnsso.icann.org) to join this work team.
- Policy work related to the RAA <http://www.icann.org/en/topics/raa/>
- Joint Working Group [wiki page](#)

## Staff Contacts

[Margie Milam](#), Senior Policy Counselor

---

## Joint GNSO / ccNSO IDN WG Readies for More Work

### At a Glance

*The Generic Names Supporting Organization and the Country Code Names Supporting Organization are working together to bring Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs) to reality. In Seoul, they cleared some administrative hurdles.*

### Recent Developments

Under its existing charter, the WG was to close at Seoul, unless both GNSO and ccNSO Councils agreed to extend the duration. The ccNSO Council adopted an updated charter that extended the proposed duration until the WG can make IDN ccTLD policy development process recommendations, or until the ICANN Board adopts a new gTLD implementation plan.

## Next Steps

Though the joint group's charter was amended by the ccNSO Council, the duration of the group is not officially extended unless the GNSO Council also adopts the updated charter. The GNSO Council's decision is pending.

## Background

At the ICANN meeting in Sydney, the GNSO and ccNSO Councils discussed the timing of launching the new gTLD process and the IDN ccTLD Fast Track. Differences remain with regard to the timing of the launch dates. The GNSO and ccNSO Councils stated that they have shared interests and open issues (for instance, the policy implications of the completion of the Internationalized Domain Names in Applications protocol), but a willingness to resolve these issues in a joint effort. At the joint meeting, the chair of the GNSO and the chair of the ccNSO requested Jian Zhang, NomCom member of the ccNSO, and Edmon Chung, member of the GNSO Council, to explore and report the goal(s) and scope of activities of a joint WG effort.

## Staff Contact

[Bart Boswinkel](#), Senior Policy Advisor, ccNSO

# At-Large

---

## Report: At-Large Activities Jumped in Quantity and Diversity during 2009

### At a Glance

*At the 36th International ICANN meeting in Seoul on 30 October, the Chair of the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) reported increased level of activities and growth of engagement of the At-Large community during 2009.*

### Recent Developments

In a report to the Board and public at ICANN's international meeting in Seoul, Cheryl Langdon-Orr highlighted the continuing growth in ALAC activities noting that between January and October 2009, ALAC submitted 22 Advisories to the Board, public comments from the community, or other official communications, representing an increase of 69% from activities in 2008.

In the same time period, 12 individual Internet user groups, known as At-Large Structures (ALSs), joined ICANN's At-Large community, with three more applications pending. This represents a 10% increase in the number of ALSs in ICANN in the last year. A map showing the geographic diversity of ALSs is available [online](#).

The dramatic increase in engagement can be attributed in part to the enthusiasm generated by the At-Large Summit held in Mexico City in March 2009, as well as to the extraordinary group of volunteers involved in the At-Large community, including ALAC Members, Officers and Liaisons. The following outgoing ALAC Members were recognized for their efforts: Fatimata Seye Sylla (Senegal) - NomCom appointment for AFRALO; Nguyen Thu Hue (Vietnam) - NomCom appointment for APRALO; Vanda Scartezini (Brazil) – NomCom appointment for LACRALO; and José Ovidio Salgueiro (Venezuela) – elected by LACRALO.

### **Next Steps**

The incoming ALAC Members, Officers and Liaisons are: Dave Kissoondoyal (Mauritius) – NomCom appointment for AFRALO; James Seng (Malaysia) – NomCom appointment for APRALO; Carlton Samuels (Jamaica) – NomCom appointment for LACRALO; and Sylvia Herlein Leite (Brazil) – elected by LACRALO.

Elected officers of the ALAC for the coming year are: Chair – Cheryl Langdon-Orr; Vice-Chairs - Sébastien Bachollet and Alan Greenberg; and Rapporteur - Carlton Samuels. An AFRALO member will be appointed to the Executive Committee by the ALAC during their meeting of 24 November.

ALAC Liaisons for the coming year are: Board – Vanda Scartezini; ccNSO – Rudi Vansnick; GNSO – Alan Greenberg; SSAC – Patrick Vande Walle; IDN Policy – James Seng; and GNSO NCUC Constituency – Wolf Ludwig (also EURALO Chair).

### **More Information**

- A transcript of the report, and those of the other SO and AC chairs, may be found at <http://sel.icann.org/node/6750>.
- At-Large Report to ICANN 36 [[PDF](#), 348K]

### **Staff Contact**

, [At-Large Secretariat](#)

---

## At-Large Takes a Stand on ICANN's Public Consultation Process

### At a Glance

*The At-Large community has long maintained that ICANN's public consultation process needs to be more user friendly, transparent, and accountable to allow volunteers to effectively participate in ICANN's bottom-up, consensus-based policy processes. A recently published ALAC Statement points out the obstacles to volunteer participation and provides recommendations for how they could be removed.*

### Recent Developments

The Advisory was originally composed by the At-Large Staff for consideration at the At-Large Summit held in Mexico City in March 2009. The text was based upon comments and suggestions made by members of the At-Large community over the course of time and provided ideas on possible changes that could improve the public consultation process.

The document was then published for comments from the wider At-Large community. The present document (Rev1 of the text) incorporates those comments. In a recent online vote, the ALAC decided to ratify the Statement and transmit it to the Board of ICANN. The ratified Statement has been transmitted to the Board Public Participation Committee.

### Next Steps

The ALAC and the Public Participation Committee will discuss the Statement at their next bilateral meeting.

### More Information

- [ALAC Statement on the Public Consultation Process \(English\)](#)
- ALAC Vote to ratify the Statement:  
<https://www.bigpulse.com/pollresults?code=2jGGUy2CDHpcpvvCdiGH>

### Staff Contact

, At-Large Secretariat

---

## ALAC Comments on “Improving Institutional Confidence”

### At a Glance

*At-Large continues to advocate that ICANN must strengthen its institutional framework to improve confidence in its operations and processes. A recently submitted ALAC document summarizes At-Large’s view on “Improving Institutional Confidence,” a set of recommendations by the President’s Strategy Committee (PSC).*

### Recent Developments

On 1 June 2009, ICANN Staff published “Improving Institutional Confidence –The Way Forward,” which is an evaluation of the work of the President’s Strategy Committee. The ALAC Advisory Statement on Improving Institutional Confidence comments and elaborates on the recommendations outlined in that document.

The original version of the ALAC Advisory Statement was drafted by the Chair of the At-Large working group on the Future Structure and Governance of ICANN, Sébastien Bachollet, and was made available for comments from the wider At-Large Community. Sébastien then incorporated the comments received on the Draft Statement and submitted the revised version to the ALAC for ratification.

The ALAC ratified the Statement with a 10-0-0 vote during its recent session in Seoul and transmitted it to the ICANN Board of Directors and the Public Consultation Process on Proposed Bylaw Changes to Improve Accountability.

### Next Steps

The At-Large community will continue to be involved in the discussions on the IIC Process and express its view in the coming Public Consultations on the issue.

### More Information

- [ALAC Advisory Statement on "IIC - The Way Forward Proposals" \(English\)](#)
- [Improving Institutional Confidence: The Way Forward](#)  
(Document produced by ICANN Staff)

### Staff Contact

, At-Large Secretariat

---

## SSAC Presentations from Seoul Available On Line

### At a Glance

*The Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) supported several key meetings on security and related matters at the ICANN Annual Meeting in Seoul, South Korea. Slides from the presentations are available for download.*

### Recent Activities

The SSAC organized and supported the following meetings at the ICANN Annual Meeting in Seoul, South Korea. These meetings, which were open to the public, helped provide information and guidance on several key security-related issues.

- *SSAC Open Meeting.* Topics: SSAC Retreat, DNS Redirection, Root Scaling Study, Orphaned Name Servers, SSAC Activity: Follow Through and Outreach. Presentations are posted at: <http://sel.icann.org/node/6754>
- *DNSSEC Workshop.* Topics: Deployment of DNSSEC at the Root (NTIA, ICANN, VeriSign); Update from ccTLDs: Korean Internet & Security Agency (KISA), South Korea; Japan Registry Services Company (JPRS), Japan; Infocom Development Authority (IDA), Singapore; .my Domain Registry Project, Malaysia; AusRegistry, Australia; NA-NiC, Namibia; Nominet, United Kingdom; Extending DNSSEC Deployment: .com, .net, .com, .edu, .org, .biz, registry/registrar lessons learned; ARIN. Presentations are posted at: <http://sel.icann.org/node/7089>
- *Root Scaling Study Briefing.* Topics: Study Team Report Results and an Explanation of the TNO Model. Presentations are posted at: <http://sel.icann.org/node/7084>
- *Display and Usage of Internationalized Registration Data.* Given 28 October. Presentation is posted at: <http://sel.icann.org/node/6709>
- *Measures to Protect Domain Registration Services Against Exploitation or Misuse.* Presented during the Abuse of the DNS workshop. Presentation is posted at: <http://sel.icann.org/node/6961>
- *Internationalized Registration Data.* Presented during the ccNSO members meeting. Presentation is posted at: <http://sel.icann.org/node/6760>
- *Root scaling study.* Presented during the ALAC Policy Issues Discussion. Presentation is posted at:

<http://sel.icann.org/meetings/seoul2009/presentation-root-scaling-study-27oct09-en.pdf>

**Staff Contact**

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