Report of
ICANN 42
Dakar

23-28 October, 2011

by

Peter Van Roste

Wim Degezelle

Patrick Myles

Table of Contents

Executive summary

ccNSO

- Conflicts of Interest Policy: Triggered by the move by the former ICANN Chair of the Board to a future applicant of new gTLDs, many of the ICANN constituencies demanded that ICANN puts in place a Conflict of Interest policy. The discussion covered both the issues during and after employment by ICANN.
- New CEO hiring process: The discussions focussed on the skill set that the new CEO should possess. Amongst those skills most mentioned: excellent managing skills, people manager and international experience.
- Geographic regions: WG advised not to create an Arab region but add countries from that region to the European region in accordance with the RIPE model.
- Confusingly similar IDN strings: progress on one specific issue: when the IDN string is confusingly similar with its own ASCII string, then it can be approved on condition that both will be perpetually tied together. This seems to solve the .EU problem. No solution yet for the Bulgarian and Greek cases.
- IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO: the WG supported the 'one country/territory = one vote' principle. They should agree on who will cast that vote.

GSNO

- Cross Ownership – what will the status be for existing Registries/Registrars?
- Review of the UDRP – OK for a review but prefer to have a deliverable (eg Issues Report on rights protection mechanisms) after the proposed 18 months from first delegation. General agreement that as the policy is one of the oldest from ICANN, "it's due" for a review.
- Amendments to the RAA –Motion withdrawn however commitments made from Registrars to come up with amendment proposals in lead up to Costa Rica ICANN.
- CEO replacement and selection criteria (as well as conflicts of interest and ethics)
- The idea to reshape the Continued Operations Instrument (aka new gTLD risk fund) raised controversy: instead of providing a bank guarantee applicants would put 50k only in a joint 'insurance fund'. This benefits small applicants that would have trouble getting a guarantee, but disadvantages large applicants that would have no problem getting a guarantee, but don't want to spend another 50k on what might be a defensive registration.

GAC

- GAC updates its operating principles on 'GAC consensus' in preparation of providing GAC advice on new gTLD strings during the evaluation phase;
- 'GAC consensus' is now defined as 'adopting decisions by general agreement in the absence of formal objections';
- GAC warns that it will not be able to provide advice during the early warning period if the number of applications heavily exceeds 500;
- GAC is disappointed about the lack of progress on the registrar side in the implementation of the 2009 Law Enforcement Recommendations;
- Conflicts of Interest and Ethics: the GAC expects a clear timeline and actions by the end of the Dakar meeting or shortly after;
- (side issue) On 26 October the European Commission received a written response on its pre-Singapore letter on competition issues regarding registry /registrar cross ownership (a couple of hours before the GAC meeting with the Board).

Miscellaneous

- ICANN staff cannot accept cokes from community members any longer...
- Only just over 40% of ccTLDs have asked for login credentials for the automated rootzone changes AKA eIANA.
- Of all the ICANN meetings hosted in Africa, this Dakar one was by far the largest with over 1,200 registered participants.
- Mike Silber was re-elected to the Board for the seat 12 (ccNSO)
- Steve Crocker re-elected Chair of the ICANN Board, Bruce Tonkin vice-chair
- Joint Applicant Support: Board decision on JAS postponed. (JAS would provide needy and worthy applicants with support in their application for a community TLD)

ccNSO Meeting – Dakar 25-26 October 2011

Finance Working Group

Update on activities to date:

Timeline:
- WG produces report for ccTLD community review by the San Jose meeting.
- WG provides open session on report and solicits community feedback By Prague meeting
- Final report and recommendations submitted to ccNSO Council by Toronto meeting

The first meeting with the new CFO Xavier Calvez was very positive. Good news: New CFO has the required skills to address the complex issues. Bad news: new person in this role is facing a steep learning curve. Conclusion: The group is cautiously optimistic that things will change for the better.

The WG has analysed the different models:
1. Voluntary contributions based on self select banded model (current model)
2. Voluntary contributions based on self select banded model with weighted voting (CENTR model)
3. Variable level registration fee (fee per domain charge as used by Verisign)
4. Benefit based contribution (banded or open)
5. Case-by-case (directly negotiated between registry and ICANN)
6. Fixed registry level fee
7. Revenue neutral model (what does the ccNSO cost to ICANN)

The WG is creating a survey to better understand what ccNSO members think about current services, services levels and associated costs.

ccNSO – ICANN Board meeting

Topics:
- Finance WG update
    - Byron gave an update of the work of the Finance WG to the Board
    - CFO: challenge is to combine structural long-term changes with short term fixes
    - Steve Crocker: there is a risk that by only focussing on the costs that are visible to your community, you will not be able to adding up to the total bill. Shared costs need to be covered somehow and nobody will feel responsible.
    - Steve: a noticeable fraction of the total budget needs to be seen to be coming from the ccTLD community in order to balance the powers in the community.
    - Sabine Dolderer pointed out that the amount of services provided to ccTLDs by ICANN was never discussed
- Ethics
    - Bruce Tonkin: Board governance committee has asked for external advice.
    - Looking to establish best practice ethics policy
    - Updates to the conflicts policy in the timeframe of months rather than years (mid 2012)
    - About 10 ccTLDs in the room have their own ethics policy / Code of Conduct
    - Roelof asked if the Board assessed that something went wrong that needed to be fixed? Bruce: Board received questions on different situations in the past.
    - Mike Silber stated that the participation in the BoD directly from the community has as a consequence that after their term, Board members will go back to that community. That is very similar to Peter DT's situation.
    - Rod: conflict of interest policy will impact staff (it already does in relation to the new gTLD program – staff should not accept drinks/dinner from potential applicants)
    - Rod: this ethics policy will be one of the greatest challenges to the multistakeholder model. As those stakeholders have stakes and economic interests.
    - Bertrand de la Chapelle: Conflict of interest should not be confused with revolving door policy
    - Steve Crocker asked ccTLDs with an ethics policy to forward them to the Ethics committee
- FoI WG

- o Not discussed: folow-up by email
- CEO search
  - o George Sadowsky gave an update on the progress. All opinions submitted to ceo2012@icann.org will be taken into account.
  - o Byron: transparency should show in the process, not in the details of the candidates
  - o George confirmed that this comment is taken onboard
  - o Board is not putting current hiring processes on hold. (E.g. EU VP function)

SOP Session

Roelof gave an update of what happened since Singapore:
- 13 suggestions submitted to Kurt Pritz
- Constructive feedback from ICANN on these suggestions
- Community input requested on draft strategic plan 12-15 by November 30th
- Presentation available here: http://dakar42.icann.org/meetings/dakar2011/presentation-sop-wg-session-meijer-25oct11-en.pdf

Kurt Pritz
Looking forward to input on two questions:
What are the key challenges that ICANN faces over the next 3 years?
What strategies should ICANN develop to address these challenges?

Kurt's presentation: http://dakar42.icann.org/meetings/dakar2011/presentation-strat-plan-update-pritz-25oct11-en.pdf

Details of the Strategic Planning process: http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-6-03oct11-en.htm

The SOP 2013-2015: http://www.icann.org/en/strategic-plan/draft-strategic-plan-2012-2015-redline-03oct11-en.pdf

Updated "for discussion" strategic objectives:
- Maintain and drive DNS availability
- Enhance risk management & resilience of the DNS, IP addresses & parameters
- Promote broad DNSSEC adoption
- Enhance international DNS cooperation
- Improve response to DNS security incidents
- Strive to be an exemplary international multi-stakeholder organisation
- Increase stakeholder diversity and cross-stakeholder work
- World-class accountability and transparency (ATRT actions)
- Enhance trust in ICANN's stewardship
- Act in global public interest
- Ease of global participation

Jay Daley raised a concern that ICANN would be tempted to again try to take a leading role instead of relying on the experience/expertise in the community.

Session with Mike Silber (Candidate for ICANN Board seat)

Mike's key concerns:
- CEO succession
- Move to operational excellent (IANA, Finance, ...)
- More attention to developing countries needs
- Launch of a stable, well managed gTLD program

Kim Davies: Root Zone Workflow Automation

http://dakar42.icann.org/meetings/dakar2011/presentation-root-zone-workflow-automation-davies-25oct11-en.pdf

What is this about? : Workflow automation, system integration (Verisign/ICANN) and new web interface.

Web access invitations issued 1 August and 15 September
40.7% of ccTLDs claimed their credentials (within the available 30 days)

FoI update
http://dakar42.icann.org/meetings/dakar2011/presentation-foi-wg-update-burr-turcotte-25oct11-en.pdf
Public consultation on 'consent' is now open.

FoI progress report: http://www.ccnso.icann.org/node/27153

Geographic regions update
Presentation available: http://dakar42.icann.org/meetings/dakar2011/presentation-geo-regions-archbold-25oct11-en.pdf

Principle of geographic diversity is valuable and should be preserved.
Changing number of regions would cause significant financial and organisational issues
ICANN should adopt its own formal traditional top-down regional structure in addition to increased support for bottom-up structures on an ad hoc basis
Top-down structure based on RIR structure.
Those required to move have a one-off possibility to remain where they are – with support from their government
For Europe: +24 and -24 so status quo at 78 countries
No Arab region is created under the current proposal
Here is the list of proposed changes: http://www.icann.org/en/topics/geographic-regions/geo-regions-territories-countries-categorization-30sep11-en.pdf

IDN session
Confusingly similar evaluation process
(AKA IDNccPDPWG1)

Tasked to provide guidelines to improve the predictability of the confusingly similar string evaluation process
Overarching requirement: preserve security and stability of DNS
Emerging specific issues:
String confusingly similar with itself (.EU in Cyrillic and Greek)
Solution: if proposed manager of IDN and manager of ascii cctld is the same (and they will be tied forever) then the IDN ccTLD is deemed to be validated
This will be contractually enforced
This solution is only applicable to the situation where the IDN ccTLD is confusingly similar with its own ASCII version!

IDNPDPWG2
Hiro Hotta presented the Draft Final Report
It answers the question how IDN ccTLDs will fit into the ccNSO structure.
Comment period open until 15 December 2011
The following clusters of issues have been identified:
  1. Membership definition

2. Roles of Members
3. Quorum for voting
4. Initiation of PDP

Recommendation:
1-to-1 ratio should be maintained. So .RU and .RF will only count as one member in the ccNSO
All members should be able to call for the creation of an issue report
Majority of the group is in favour of one vote per territory
In the case of one vote per country an emissary has to be appointed to vote on behalf of that country
WG suggest that current quorum should be maintained

Address Supporting Organisation update

http://dakar42.icann.org/meetings/dakar2011/presentation-aso-update-lee-25oct11-en.pdf

Louis Lee stressed the openness of the ASO policy processes.
Jay Daley asked if policy consultation will be widened to end users as – even though they are open, the majority of participants in the process are RIRs themselves.
Axel Pawlik responded that e.g. business community sees the RIR as the plumber, if it works, nobody is interested.

DSSA Working Group update – Jörg Schweiger

http://dakar42.icann.org/meetings/dakar2011/presentation-dssa-update-schweiger-25oct11-en.pdf

WHOIS session

Jay Daley
Replacing WHOIS
http://dakar42.icann.org/meetings/dakar2011/presentation-replacing-whois-daley-25oct11-en.pdf

This has been discussed for a long time now.
SSAC has made recommendations in 2002, 2007, 2008 and 2011 with ever escalating concerns.
What's wrong with WHOIS?
-   There is no standardisation of data (what data or how it is represented)
-   No standardisation of protocol features
-   Lack of internationalisation: missing the following:
    o   Tell client character set of response
    o   Allow client to specify character set
-   Access control
-   No authentication standard
WHOIS actually consists of many different services.
1. Public lookup of "public register" details
2. Controlled access to public register with enhanced search services
3. Controlled access for availability checks
4. Controlled access to "private register" for law enforcement

Current work:
Internationalised registration data WG
IETF WEIRDS: looking at replacing WHOIS protocol, RIR driven

(IRIS tried to combine all services in one single protocol.)

Nacho Amadoz
http://dakar42.icann.org/meetings/dakar2011/presentation-changing-whois-cat-amandoz-25oct11-en.pdf
Goals:
        Changing policies with respect for users

Following recommendations of Art 29 WG
Need to adjust ICANN agreement with data protection laws
Avoid fines from data protection authorities...
AFNIC and CIRA were taken as the model for the new .CAT WHOIS

Mathieu Weill
http://dakar42.icann.org/meetings/dakar2011/presentation-afnic-whois-policy-weill-25oct11-en.pdf

Mathieu gave an overview of the .FR registry policy – dating from 2006, data disclosure introduced end of 2007.
Personal data is not shown any longer, but there is a data disclosure procedure.
About 300 data disclosure requests per year, most of the requests are granted (refusals mainly based on the fact that complaint was about content and not domain name itself)
Web form to contact admin-C: used about 100 times a month
Law Enforcement does not rely on AFNIC policy but on their investigated powers.
Assessment:
Reinforced trust from private registrants
Customer feedback suggests better accuracy
Expense impact on registry remains marginal

Security and Stability Review team
Draft report will be ready before the San José meeting.
http://dakar42.icann.org/meetings/dakar2011/presentation-dssa-update-schweiger-25oct11-en.pdf

ccNSO – GAC session
Becky Burr gave an overview of the work of the FoI WG.
GAC input requested by January 2012. (GAC response: "we're a bit busy here...")
Paper provided to GAC with timeline

Heather overview of GAC work:
- New gTLDs has been main focus
- ATRT follow-up in particular to explain what "GAC advice" means
- Suggested to build a register of GAC advice

JIG update
http://dakar42.icann.org/meetings/dakar2011/presentation-jig-wg-update-chung-26oct11-en.pdf
Common interest
- single character IDN TLDs
- IDN TLD variants
- universal acceptance of IDN TLDs
Single character IDN TLDs only available after the first round of new gTLDs (contrary to gNSO and ccNSO advice)
Significant progress made on Email Addressing Internationalisation.

VIP Update
IDN Variant Issues Project
http://dakar42.icann.org/meetings/dakar2011/presentation-idn-vip-update-jennings-26oct11-en.pdf
Public comments period open until November 14th

Registry updates

Update from .SN – Alioune Thioune
http://dakar42.icann.org/meetings/dakar2011/presentation-nic-thioune-26oct11-en.pdf
2500 names registered
150 second level domains and more coming

Switching Nigerians to .NG – Ope Odusan
http://dakar42.icann.org/meetings/dakar2011/presentation-switching-nigerians-ng-odusan-26oct11-en.pdf
The Nigerian .ng ccTLD management company NiRA, has embarked on a nationwide campaign with the theme switchto.ng

Opening up prefecture-SLD under the .jp ccTLD – Hiro Hotta
http://dakar42.icann.org/meetings/dakar2011/presentation-opening-up-prefecture-slds-hotta-26oct11-en.pdf
Problems:
Long (4 labels), complicated, only 1 domain can be registered by 1 registrant, local presence
Smaller communities will not benefit from new gTLDs – they wanted JPRS to come up with a solution.
Introduction of prefectures (an administrative area similar to a province) second level is the answer to that need.

Status of the last two years of regulation of .DK – Lise Fuhr
http://dakar42.icann.org/meetings/dakar2011/presentation-two-years-regulation-fuhr-26oct11-en.pdf
Lise illustrated the positive and negative sides of being regulated.
The renewal of the delegation to DIFO is very important as the cost for the tender were very high (800k Euro).
International engagement is part of the requirements.
Publication of two-year plan on website.

Sharing technical resources with other small registries - Nigel Roberts
http://dakar42.icann.org/meetings/dakar2011/presentation-sharing-technical-resources-registries-roberts-26oct11-en.pdf

Panel discussion new gTLDs.

Mathieu Weill
Elliot Noss (Tucows)
Lise Fuhr
Byron Holland (moderator)
Victor Abboud
John Matson (Architelos)

Just listing the new ideas:
In all these panel debates in ICANN and ccNSO, Byron is the first one to add the end-user to those impacted. (Unfortunately the issue has not been covered much during the debate.)

E.N.: ccTLDs have the enormous advantage over gTLDs to have meaning in their string. This will change.
Three important questions:
-    What is the competitive landscape I am going to face? (cc has the best vantage point here!)
What cities, what regions, what ethnic groups might be interested in new gTLDs)
-    Given that landscape, how should you position yourself?
-    How buy people your domain today and how might that might be affected?
Trying to buy you in as a hosting company into a local market does not work.

V.A.: Building a sound business is the best strategy. Growing your business now and making sure that it is well recognised. .EC went from 30% to 70% market penetration.

M.W.: Users want the domain name and additional services. Providing the service is where the registrar comes in. If new gTLDs are just going to replicate the existing models they will not make any significant difference.

J.M.: ccTLDs will need to start spending resources on marketing

L.F.: Prices won't be affected, but services will improve

E.N.: Lowering price is not the way forward for ccTLDs as it will be very hard to compensate the drop in price by growth. Don't give away the high price!

B.H.: What will be the importance of Search?

M.W.: If you want to implement changes in your registry system or policy, do it before the introduction of new gTLDs.

V.A.: gTLDs have always been cheaper than the ccTLDs. Price is not the most important thing. ccTLDs should not lower their prices.

B.H.: Pricing up to 25 USD does not affect volume

Sabine Dolderer: Most of the users keep their domain, so little impact from competition. We are only talking about the very small increase in the market (4%).

E.N.: There is still a huge market out there. 50% of US businesses still have no website. Similar in Europe. Domain names still matter.

M.W.: new applicants will focus exclusively on branding. Backend registry services will be outsourced.

E.N.: Spend your ccTLD surplus on extending broadband, internet penetration etc...

E.N. and J.M.: ccTLDs should strengthen their advantages. Do not try to become a gTLD.

Vika: New TLDs are an opportunity to improve and grow our business.

ccNSO Council meeting:
- Mike Silber re-elected to the ICANN Board
- Vika, Young-Eum, Patricia, Juhani and Byron elected to the ccNSO Council
- Jian Zhang is at the end of her term and leaves the Council
- Hong Xue is joining the Board as NomCom appointee

gNSO meeting – Dakar 24-27 October

PDP Updated Final Report
Update on the **Updated Final Report** from the Policy Development Process Working Team (which has been in process for around 2 years and submitted for approval to GNSO Council on 28th September 2011 – there was 48 recommendations, a new Annex A of ICANN Bylaws and proposed PDP Manual)

Motion put forward at GNSO Public Council Meeting
On Wednesday the GNSO unanimously voted in favour for the motion - adoption of the report and its recommendations.

Geo Regions Review
See ccNSO report

Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Review Continues
An update was given to the implementation of the adopted recommendations (GSNO adoption - June 2011) and recommendations requiring staff proposals
The adopted recommendations were:
- Requirement for Registrars to provide Transfer Emergency Contact
- Losing Registrar to notify name holder of the transfer out
- Modification of reason of denial #6
- Deletion of denial reason #7

A mention also was made to a call for volunteers for the PDP on IRTP Part C
On the topic of a 'Thick' WHOIS, it was noted that ICANN staff are to prepare a preliminary Issue Report for public comment on the requirement of thick WHOIS for all incumbent gTLDs. The timing is not yet known.

Discussion Paper on non-binding best practices in abusive registrations
The next steps were discussed based on the Issue Paper (submitted 28 September 2011) including; potential public comment forum, WG to establish framework for best practices, cross community technical group. Some of the issues which arose were discussion on what makes a practice a *best* practice, definition of 'non-binding' and even ICANN roles in regards to non binding best practices (considered part of ICANN's scope and core value).

Current state of UDRP issues report
After extensive comments from a public comment period on this report (after ICANN Singapore), a final issue report was published. Within the GNSO working group session, the question on whether a PDP is needed was discussed at length producing quite a varied response from the council members. Despite the low support of a PDP from ICANN staff and the GAC within the report, there was still some feeling that a PDP may be possible. The timing was also discussed as there had been mentioned (of waiting 18 months from the first new gTLD delegation (when a review of the URS would take place). Another point made was that the UDRP is one of ICANN first and defining policies and after 10 years and like other Policies, it should be reviewed.

GNSO and ICANN Board Discussion
In this session between the GNSO and the Board, discussion revolved essentially around; succession to the CEO position, conflict of interests (COI) issues, ethics and participation levels in the working groups. On the topic of CEO succession the GNSO outlined key points in its thoughts on the CEO applicant; to encompass high level private sector experience, international affairs, recognition that the organisation is still in an implementation phase and experience in operational management. The existence of a COO position was also added to that point to support the CEO.
The board generally was pleased with the GNSO points made and a discussion on salary took place where it was mentioned that an exercise in 'benchmarking' with other non-profits organisations would be underway to assess the salary question.
On the topic of conflicts of interest, the Board mentioned they were seeking external advice on this and that the advice would be made public in due course.
A big discussion on participation in the working groups took place with the GNSO council pointing out that there is in many cases quite a lot 'volunteer burnout'. Attracting new people to the working groups is an

issue as well as maintaining diversity. Many potential participants are not able to contribute as in many cases it is not economically viable for them to do so. This topic is likely to be further discussed and studied.

Whois Policy Review Team

The purpose of these sessions was to review the comments received from the public to date and to continue work on a draft report of recommendations and final review.

It was stressed by the Chair that the group is convened to 'review' the WHOIS policy – in other words to review its effectiveness and how best it fits the needs of the various users.

The group recognised via their findings (selected points only)
- The community "dawdled" over the years despite EC comments
- Data protection commissioner communiqués (including Article 29 WG) have told ICANN that natural non-trading persons need privacy protection under EU and other national laws.
- Protections of freedom of speech important and need to be taken into account.
- Proxy and Privacy services meet a market demand.
- Law Enforcement users have a difficult time finding those responsible for websites
- Technical contact information has special relevance and use for operational and security community
- There is a risk that in current privacy services regime, registration data could be seen as invalid on its face as inaccurate

Selected *proposed* recommendations (some of the wording will change):
- **Remove proxy services from RAA since the proxy, as an agent, is the registrant**
- **ICANN must develop and manage a system of clear, consistent and enforceable requirements for all privacy service providers**
  - Whois entry must clearly label that this is a private registration
  - Standardised relay and reveal processes and timeframes
  - There must be a balance between need for privacy and valid requests for disclosure (LE and security industry)
  - Rules for the appropriate level of publicly available information on the registrant
  - *(further points here with some still in contention)*
- **After consultation with community, ICANN may require publication of registrant technical contact for reasons of operational security**
- **ICANN should develop enforceable penalties for privacy service providers who violate the terms of their accreditation (...)**

Other points made from the sessions:
- Some feeling of a lack of consensus on any recommendation of a thick Whois policy
- The need to strive for standardisation of a data set is considered quite important
- Better Whois consumer trust may not be achieved with a Campaign
- Law enforcement is considered an essential group of users in the accessibility of Whois
- From user feedback it was noted that very few people are knowledgeable or aware about Whois services.
- IDN are recognised as a challenge for Whois policy however there are many other groups working on this topic.
- It's important that a balance be struck between Law Enforcement access and privacy – this point was made on several occasions

Note: The group plan to provide the draft on 30 November 2011 and do outreach to ICANN Board, GAC, SSAC, GNSO Council and the ICANN Community at the Costa Rica meeting as well as issue the final recommendations.

Extra:

For more information on European Data Protection Laws and their potential impacts on the WHOIS, see the CENTR report on Data Protection Policy

IDN Variant Issues Project (VIP) Update (Monday 24th October 2011)
6 Case Study Reports were produced on IDN Variants (Arabic, Chinese, Cyrillic, Devanagari, Greek and Latin) to which will form an integrated 'Issues Report' aimed at identification of issues in this area. Work on this report is scheduled to begin at the Dakar meeting first with a team members only session followed by a public session where the different teams will present their case studies. A final Issues Report is expected from this project by around mid December 2011 and is expected to be a good source of information on the issues (especially relating to user experience) relating to the 6 case studies in question as well as any other potential future variants.

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG)
In this session chaired by David Maher (PIR) the morning session focused on among other things new gTLDs. Within this topic the issue of cross ownership was discussed with interaction from ICANN (Kurt Pritz and John Jeffrey were present). It was mentioned that ICANN are in communication with competition authorities however the RySG wanted more information on this. ICANN staff added that there would be a response to the EC letter on this topic in the coming weeks.
Other points from this sessions:
- No opposition to motion on final report for PDP work team
- No opposition for motion on Outreach Task Force charter
- Support to have a review on the UDRP however as a compromise to the 18 months wait and see idea suggested by others, the RySG will suggest to the GSNO council to prepare and Issues Report after the 18 months on the effectiveness of all rights and protection mechanisms in place. This way there will be at least some sort of deliverable at the time (there was a consensus on this idea).
- Still concern on the review of RAA

Extra –
For a good account of the historical points of note in the cross ownership discussion, see this document

GNSO Whois Survey Working Group Meeting *(Wednesday 26th October 2011)*
The final report from this groups (published in late July 2011) lists 'potential new requirements of WHOIS' (see the report – page 31) such as: providing publicly accessible list of domains or IP locations of WHOIS servers (including ccTLDs), structured queries, standardised set of query capabilities, quality of domain registration data, internationalisation, authentication, thick vs thin and several others.
In the report conclusions and comments on 'next steps' technical experts made the following point : *"it is not clear if the intention is to update the WHOIS protocol to match the new requirements, in which case it should go through the IETF stardards process, or if ICANN intends to develop its own WHOIS protocol-like service".*

New gTLD update
Several aspects of the new gTLD system (TAS) as well as the evaluation process and Communications campaign were outlined in this session.
In respect to the guidebook the following changes were noted to have been made since ICANN Singapore:
- International Olympic Committee (IOC) and Red Cross names have been incorporated for protection
- There has been revised language in the GAC early warning advice processes to make it more flexible for the GAC
- The threshold for the 'loser pays' system has changed from 25 to 12 domains in dispute
Other general points to the program:
- The various evaluation processes are conducted by external organisations (eg for string similarity, DNS stability, Financial, Technical etc). It was noted that the Economist Intelligence Unit will provide the area of Geographic Names evaluation.
- On vertical integration it seems not yet known how it will apply for existing gTLDs.
- The JAS 'seed' fund is currently at 2 million to support developing orgs.
- In Communications campaigns, it was noted there is a Customer Support Portal is to be opened as from November 2011. Via the newgtlds.icann.org micro-site, substantial information can be found on the program including factsheets, videos, calendars etc. It is aimed at being a one-stop shop for information on the program
- Final date for application submissions is 12 April 2012

GNSO Public Council Meeting

A new aspect to the public meetings was incorporated in that Registry Stakeholder groups as well as some constituencies were invited to provide brief updates to their work at the beginning of the meeting. This method was seen as useful and will be practiced again at future meetings however it was noted that a list of questions and points of interest should be provided to the person updated their group before the meeting. This would allow for better potential interaction rather than a plain update.

Important points from this session:
- Agenda item 2 (Motion for amendments to the RAA); this motion was withdrawn by Kristina Rosette
- Agenda item 5 (Motion for Policy Development WT); this motion passed unanimously
- Cross community drafting team update; intended to have a final report by year end

During the session several councillors reached the end of their term and so made brief addresses before the new councillors joined the panel.

GAC Report

The GAC, the Board, the Community and the new gTLDs

The 40th ICANN meeting ended up being one big consultation round on new gTLDs. The normal schedule of Board, GAC and as a result of many of the Supporting Organisations was shacked up. Unfortunately this also meant that many of the meetings of the Board and the GAC with supporting organisations were cancelled.

Next steps:

> - March 25th: written GAC feedback to the Board
> - April 15th : changes to the Applicant Guidebook posted for public comment (30 days)
> - May 20th : consultation ICANN Board / GAC (conference call)
> - May 30th : Applicant guidebook posted
> - June 20th : Special Board meeting to approve the Applicant guidebook

Note: The GAC communiqué clearly asks the Board for revised version of the Applicant Guidebook in which track-changes clearly indicate how the GAC's advice has been taken into account.

Official bylaws consultation on .xxx

The GAC and the ICANN board met for a so-called bylaws consultation on the ICM registry application (.xxx).
The ICANN Bylaws prescribe that in the event that the ICANN Board takes an action that is not consistent with the GAC advice the Board has to inform the GAC why it decided not to follow the advice and try, in good faith and in a timely manner, to find a mutual acceptable solution. (Bylaws article XI, 2.1, j).

The GAC informed the Board that it didn't change its position it already stated at the Wellington meeting (March 2006). A statement was read out to inform the Board that there was no active support of the GAC for the introduction of .xxx. The GAC expressed its concern for the stability and universal solvability of the Internet since some governments might try to block access to the .xxx domain.
 The GAC asked for further clarification on ICANN's decision in December 2010 on .xxx (the Board's intention to enter into a registry agreement with ICM) and expressed concerns regarding the sponsorship criteria and registry agreement between ICANN and ICM.

Other GAC Business and the GAC communiqué

The GAC Communiqué of the San Francisco meeting can be found at
http://gac.icann.org/system/files/GAC-communique-SFO.pdf .

The new GAC secretariat was presented in San Francisco. The Secretariat is financed by the by the Brazilian, Dutch and Norwegian governments and will be based in Delft, the Netherlands. Currently it has two staff members Jeremy Beale (United Kingdom) and Ruth Puente (Uruguay).

ICANN Open Forum Open forum

The open forum on Thursday dealt with everything except new gTLDs since the community had already more than

* FY12 Operating Plan and Budget Framework
The FY12 foresees in the recovering of the historical costs of the introduction of new gTLDs. GNSO's Chuck Homes proposed to partially delay or delete this recovery operation and spend the money on support for new gTLD applicants and language community in developing countries in addition to report JAS working group.
He also asked for additional ICANN support for the GNSO (staff, policy support), since over 94% ICANN revenue comes from gTLD registrants.

Questions on the staffing
- business constituency remains concerned that that the ICANN staffing needs to be brought up to the FY10 budget levels of 15 staff in registry/registrar compliance

IANA contract

Nigel
In art 4 of
Asks Board to confirm whether or not 'relevant international law' as mentioned in ICANN's article of incorporation art 4, 'includes the universal declaration of human rights (1949) and/or the European Convention of Human Rights of 1950'

David Maher
What impact would a significant delay of failure to comply with the ATRT recommendations have on the IANA contract?

ATRT review
-> comment on appointment of ombudsmand appointmeny
Kieren McCarthy: suggests

.xxx
A series of representatives of the adult industry read statements against the introduction of .xxx .

ICANN Board meeting, 18 March 2011

The Board approved the .xxx application, approved the 2011-2014 strategic plan, adopted a timeline for the completion of the new gTLD Applicant Guidebook and the launch of the new gTLD process.

The Board ratified the decision to move the venue of the upcoming ICANN meeting (18-24 June 2011) to Singapore and approved Toronto as venue for the ICANN meeting 14-19 October 2012.
There is no decision yet on the venue of the Africa meeting at the end of October this year. Rumours are that Dakar (Senegal) would be in the lead but ICANN staff is still watching the local political stability.

Overview of the approved Board resolutions:

1.1. Approval of Minutes of 25 January 2011 ICANN Special Board Meeting
1.2. Approval of Changes to SSAC Membership
→ David Conrad (former IANA GM and ICANN VP for IT) appointed as SSAC member.
1.3. ccNSO Review – Receipt of Board WG Final Report and Dissolution of the WG
→ The Structural Improvements Committee now has to propose action by the Singapore meeting.
1.4. Approval of Revision of Bylaws re: Implementation of SSAC Review Working Group Report
1.5. Approval of Membership of IDN Variants Working Group
→ Members of the Board IDN Variant Working Group: Ram Mohan (Chair), Thomas Narten, Suzanne Woolf and Kuo-Wei
1.6. Approval of Location of ICANN Public Meeting in North America – October 2012
→ Venue an dates: Toronto, Canada from 14-19 October 2012
Budget: US$2.01 million.
1.7. ICANN Meeting in Singapore – June 2011
→ Change of venue ratified: Singapore, 18-24 June 2011
1.8. Approval of ICANN Public Meeting Dates for 2014-2016
1.9. Thanks to Departing ccNSO Council Volunteers
1.10. Thanks to Sponsors
1.11. Thanks to Scribes, Interpreters, Staff, Event and Hotel Teams
1.12. Thanks to Speakers
1.13. Thanks to Meeting Participants
2. Approval of the 2011-2014 Strategic Plan
3. Process for Completion of the Applicant Guidebook for New gTLDs
→ 15 April 2011: publication of DAG extracts with 'track changes'
→ 30 May 2011: Final Applicant Guidebook posted
→ 20 June 2011: extraordinary board meeting on the final Applicant Guidebook
Timeline at http://icann.org/en/minutes/draft-timeline-new-gtlds-18mar11-en.pdf
4. AOC Reviews, Including ATRT Recommendations
→ staff to post plans for the implementation of the ATRT recommendations
→ GAC and NomCom requested to implement the recommendations
→ staff to develop metrics to benchmark ICANN's accountability and transparency with international entities' best practices
5. Approval of ICM Registry Application for .XXX
→ .xxx Registry Agreement with ICM approved
→ publication of rationale for not following the GAC's advice
6. Approval of Expenses Related to Board-Directed Activities
→ approval of budget for AOC Reviews, 3rd Board Retreat, GAC meeting, IDN Variant panel, ATRT ecommendations
7. Technical Liaison Group (TLG) Review – Actions Based on Independent Reviewer's Final Report
→ establishment of a Board Technical Relations Working Group to consider measures to enhance the coordination and cooperation between ICANN and other members of the   Internet technical community

8. IDN ccTLD Fast Track Review
→ approval of the "ICANN Recommendations of Public Comment Received on the Review of the IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process"

9. Approval of VeriSign RSEP Request for Release of Numeric-Only Strings for .NAME
    → approval of numeric-only and numbers-and-hyphens domain names in .NAME
10. Appointment of Interim Ombudsman
    → Herb Waye appointed as interim Ombudsman while the search for an Ombudsman   continues
11. Engagement of Independent Auditor
    →Moss Adams LLP
12. ALAC-Related Bylaws Amendments: Posting for Public Comment
13. Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group Charter: Posting for Public Comment
14. Proposed Process for Recognition of New Constituencies in GNSO: Extension of Public Comment