



Report of ICANN 46 Beijing

6 – 11 April 2013

Contents

ICANN 46 – Beijing – Exec Summary.....	4
Highlights from the stakeholder groups:	4
ccNSO Report	5
1. Finance Working Group update.....	5
2. Meeting with the ICANN BoD	6
3. IANA update.....	6
4. FoI WG.....	7
5. Update form the council workshop	7
6. Study group on country and territory names	7
7. ccNSO Election Review Study Group Update.....	7
8. Meeting Strategy Working Group.....	8
9. Update on the replacement of WHOIS.....	8
10. ICANN outreach initiatives.....	8
11. Ops plan and budget.....	8
12. ITU – WCIT and next steps	9
13. IDN Variant TLD Program	9
14. IDN ccPDP update	9
15. ccNSO discussion with the ccNSO appointed board members.....	10
16. Registry updates.....	10
17. ICANN Reputation Audit – Interim findings	12
18. Strategic Priorities Debate	13
GAC report	15
1. The long way to a GAC advice on new gTLD applications.....	15
2. GAC secretariat	16
3. GAC meeting with ICANN global engagement team	16
4. GAC meeting with ICANN Board	17
5. AoB.....	17
GNSO Report.....	18
GNSO Highlights and other	18
New gTD program status update	18

Expert Working Group on Whois	19
Domain Trade association.....	19
Locking of domain subject to UDRP proceedings	19
IGO/INGO PDP.....	19
IRTP Part D	20
Thick Whois.....	20
Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation (SCI)	20
SSAC activities	20
Policy and Implementation Discussion	21

ICANN 46 – Beijing – Exec Summary

The largest ever ICANN meeting (2600 delegates) was also one of the busiest and most revealing since the launch of the new gTLD process in Singapore. But more than ever, the divergences in opinion, scope and speed between the different stakeholder groups point out the importance of a well managed and carefully respected stakeholder model.

Highlights from the stakeholder groups:

GAC:

- After a long and intense week of not-public deliberations the GAC agreed on its advice only just in time before the end of the ICANN week
- The GAC advice will probably considerably delay the new gTLD process
- Successful 2nd CENTR drink for European GAC members and their ccTLD operators

gNSO:

- The GNSO met in its working sessions and public meetings with many other sessions relating to the gTLD space surrounding. Without surprise, new gTLDs still tend to dominant discussions however in contrast to previous meetings has started to become a vaguely less controversial subject with somewhat less opposition and frustration. Perhaps this is due to the program's more advanced stage or perhaps simply due to general 'topic fatigue'. There are of course still many elements that cause significant concern to varying stakeholders.
- Other topics over the week included the RAA/RA, IRTP, IGO/INGO names, Thick Whois and locking domains subject to UDRP among others.

ccNSO:

- Finance Working group makes significant progress, but still significant challenges ahead, in particular on the development of a fair distribution model
- Regional Organisations present first ever global ccTLD report which shows many commonalities across the different regions
- IDN PDP working groups finalise work and close down

Miscellaneous:

- The ICANN reputational study (not to be confused with The General DNS Industry reputational study or the ccTLD reputational study) reveals appalling stats (see ccNSO report for more info)
- First ICANN 'engagement Centre' in Asia will be in Beijing
- ICANN 46 is noted to be the largest ever with 2,600 attendees (700 from China)
- The new 'Domain Trade Association' met canvassing for new members and the new expert group looking at Whois with a 'fresh approach' engaged with the community on their work
- Fadi receives more than 3,000 emails a month. He has a Graduate Masters student employed purely to go through and keep him up to date
- CNNIC set a new benchmark as host of this ICANN meeting. Flawless organisation and an impressive social event. Many thanks from the whole CENTR community for your warm hospitality!

1. Finance Working Group update

Byron provided an overview of recent activities.

Confident we see significant progress and end of this project is in sight.

ICANN claim that ccNSO contributions needed to increase.

Finance WG was formed to look into this request.

Group's efforts included looking into the distribution

Contribution is and will also be voluntary. It has never been questioned that the ccTLDs should contribute.

From 12 Million USD via expense area grouping and accounting errors to 10 Million.

Thinking was at first that the idea is to give a fee for a service.

Later the thinking changed to the value exchange model.

This was a fundamental shift. Cash is only a part of that exchange.

The new CFO understands that there are different expenses associated with the ccNSO.

Specific (cost of the secretariat), shared and global (support Internet Eco system).

That last type of expense balances with the work that ccTLDs do locally.

It is now accepted that both efforts can be considered to be equal and therefore are not longer taken into account.

Fadi's blogpost (march 18th) underlined that the amount of ccTLD contributions is not longer an issue.

999K Specific costs

2700K shared costs (Board, Meetings, IANA, IDNs)

WG will now prepare a proposal for Durban and aim for conclusion for Buenos Aires.

Key achievement of this group is the value exchange concept.

Very positive feedback from the room.

Lesley Cowley: "A meal so long that one might forget that the bill will come at the end."

Next step: banded model (update from the old model)

Lesley Cowley: Voluntary model. Not being able to pay does not exclude participation.

Peter Vergote: this could put ccTLDs in a difficult position: there might be a wide gap between the EoL and the ccNSO recommendation.

Annebeth Lange: Still many questions, this is not the end.

Byron: Indeed, allocation is still a big question.

Sabine: Very good work. Supports Peter's statement. What happens with the EoL amounts? Suggests to have different models which people can choose from.

Argentina asked how they would be affected as they don't charge for domain names.

Byron underlined that the model is voluntary and that if you are different from the majority (which this model is supposed to fit) than it is obvious that deviating from the model is perfectly acceptable.

Chile commented that even free domains should include the ICANN fee in their budget (next to electricity and HR)

Peter Vergote asked if the 3.7 million figure is a realistic goal and how ICANN would react if we don't get there.

Byron responded that he believes ICANN wants to see a model that would work if everyone contributed, but that it would not be realistic to expect everyone would.

The Working group has discussed how ccTLDs can be persuaded to pay or pay more.

2. Meeting with the ICANN BoD

- IDN PDP
 - o PDP is reaching its final stages after 6 years
 - o Council will decide on recommendations
 - o Then members will have a vote
 - o By Durban passed on to the Board for implementation
 - o Two components:
 - Policy to replace fast track
 - Inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO
- Finance WG update
 - o Byron explained the notion of value exchange (ccTLD's local level efforts balance ICANN's global efforts)
 - o Shared and specific costs have been identified/quantified
 - o Fadi's blog and Xavier's numbers have allowed to make significant progress
 - o Next step: how to distribute that number equitably.
 - o Granular detail discussions to be held over the next couple of months
- Working methods in the ccNSO
 - o Lesley announced the introduction of the Triage group concept to deal with incoming requests
 - o Prioritization model
 - o Goal: improving efficiency and effectiveness
 - o
- Changing working models
 - o How can we retain the good bits of the multistakeholder model while being able to make quick decisions
 - o Roundtables are regarded by some as a way to short circuit the model
 - o Steve Crocker: strong defense of bottom-up model, but these expert groups discussing a well-framed question are not undermining it
 - o No word about the follow-up request from ICANN to a dozen ccTLDs to sign a support letter for registrants rights and obligations.
- Strategy post WCIT
 - o No response
 - o Bill Graham: we're making progress
 - o Erika Mann: Strong participation from ICANN
 - o Keith: we know ICANN is fully engaged but we want to know what the strategy is.
 - o Fadi: we have a strategy, but we don't have a form to share it with the community yet
 - o Fadi: Proposal for a channel to share strategies and reports from government relations efforts
 - o Chris: that's a report, not a strategy

3. IANA update

- Contractual reviews
 - o Contract with NTIA was renewed as of Oct. 1 2012
 - o Detailed deliverables including large number of public consultations
 - o 6 consultations up for review
 - Rootzone KSK rollover
 - How should the DNSSEC key used to sign the root zone be changed?
 - Getting close to five years – so input requested on how to do it.
 - Customer Complaint Resolution Process
 - Unawareness emerged about the IANA complaint escalation process
 - Performance standards for ccTLD delegation and redelegation

- Key input: delegations and redelegations should not be held to timebound KPIs
 - Performance standards for delegation and redelegations for gTLDs
 - Performance standards for internet number resources
 - Key input: clarification needed of definition, introduce KPI for policy implementation, data made available in computer and human readable format
 - Secure notification process
 - Upcoming consultations
 - User documentation on various IANA functions
 - Sources of policies and procedures
 - dashboards
- Business excellence
 - After 4 self-assessments and external assessment is planned for August 2013
 - So far only improvement in performance (with a big jump in performance measurement in 2012)
 - Based on the EFQM model
- Preparations for new gTLD delegations
 - IANA is the last step in new gTLD delegation process
 - Focused on streamlining the process
 - Improvements to automation system
 - Smooth automated handoff between TAS and RzM using a delegation token given to successful applicants
 - Move to checklist approach based on Applicants Guide Book evaluation factors and contract language
 - 1 Additional staff & staffing flexible to deal with workload peaks in root zone management tasks
 - Reassurance that there will be no impact on the service levels for ccTLDs

4. FoI WG

Current topic: Unconsented redelegations (revocation)

Working group has agreed on the basic principles but hasn't agreed yet on the text

It might not be possible to get unanimous consent

Work in progress: Building comprehensive glossary of terms

Final report on consent is available online <http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/foi wg.htm>

5. Update form the council workshop

See report from Sunday April 7

Appointed study group to look into election guidelines

Study group on the balancing the workload of ccNSO and participation of volunteers

Review of roles and responsibilities

6. Study group on country and territory names

Paul Szyndler provided the following update:

The end is near – final report is being prepared

Analysis on how country names are used now in ICANN process

Not to decide what is and what isn't a country or territory name

7. ccNSO Election Review Study Group Update

Katrina Sataki

Based on report from election manager after last elections the group identified the following additional issues:

- Regions and representation: initially it was established that there is a need for regional representation. But at the moment North America: 4 members, Asia: 40 members. Is this still needed?
- At the moment: 18 councilors. Is this too much?
- Activity level of members: very hard to get the necessary number of votes.
- Size vs votes. Large registries have the same weight as small registries. Should we keep this principle?

Some of these issues would require a PDP to change.

Conclusion from the discussion:

No appetite to abandon regions. Geo diversity is necessary.

18 councilors is not efficient but necessary to be representative.

Quorum is useful to underline the importance of involvement

1 member one vote remains a strongly supported principle

The ccNSO council decided to start a working group to look into the quorum requirement. One member voted against as he felt a quorum is a necessary requirement to underline the importance of democratic participation.

8. Meeting Strategy Working Group

This group is looking at a number of issues related to the organization of ICANN meetings. (How many per year?, Where?, Hubs?, Rotation?, Regional Meetings?,...)

Any potential changes will only come into effect as of 2015.

Jay Daley shared some strong arguments in favour of issue based meetings to replace community based meetings.

Interesting thoughts from Nigel to have trade conference days before the ICANN meeting to deal with the commercial aspects of the business.

Peter Vergote warned for too high expectations of regional meetings: they probably wouldn't allow for much progress.

The working group asks for input and feedback from the community.

9. Update on the replacement of WHOIS

Olaf Kolkman WEIRDS working group chair – IETF

<http://beijing46.icann.org/meetings/beijing2013/presentation-weirds-update-kolkman-09apr13-en.pdf>

10. ICANN outreach initiatives

John Crain

Are these training sessions still useful?

All feedback from the room confirmed that they still are.

Strong support from AFTLD, LACTLD and APTLD

But the community needs to do a better job of advertising their existence, in particular to governments.

11. Ops plan and budget

FY14 operational plan and budget

Community feedback requested on myicann.org/plan

No cost allocation yet in that overview

Draft budget available on May 13

Public comments: 14/5

New 5-year strategic plan:

Join the conversation on myicann.org/plan

Public comments October 2013

Final strategic plan: January 2014

12. ITU – WCIT and next steps

Panel discussion with Byron Holland, Tarrek Kamel and Keith Davidson

Byron:

WCIT is one stop along a longer journey in the search of the line between the responsibilities of the ITU and other organisations such as ICANN

Even with in the Canadian delegation there was an internal debate on where that line is.

13. IDN Variant TLD Program

Naela Sarras - ICANN

No delegation of variants until all the detail have been worked out

6 case studies to study effects in Arabic, Chinese, Cyrillic, Devanagari, Greek and Latin

From the studies the following report emerged:

Procedure to develop and maintain the label generation rules for the DNS root zone in respects of IDNA labels, the “IDN Root LGR Procedure.”

User experience implications of active variant TLDs

These lead to three projects:

Implement the procedure to develop and maintain the label generation rules for the DNS Root Zone in respect of IDNA Labels

Finalize the LGR tool format specification

Collaborate with sponsoring organizations and advisory committees for their input and guidance on the implementation

Anticipated that the project will be completed by mid 2014.

Further reading:

<http://www.icann.org/en/resources/idn/variant-tlds/draft-lgr-procedure-20mar13-en.pdf>

<http://www.icann.org/en/resources/idn/variant-tlds/active-ux-21mar13-en.pdf>

14. IDN ccPDP update

Bart Boswinkel - ICANN

The IDN ccPDP has two parts:

Recommendation overall policy selection of IDN ccTLD strings

Selection policy builds on Fast Track methodology

String contains at least one non-ASCII character (e.g. España would be included)

Confusingly similarity issue addressed

Placeholder IDN variant management (see above)

Update and clarification of processes

Other recommendations include:

Review every 5 years

Creation of advisory group to assist in implementation and operations

ccNSO to adopt and monitor the implementation plan

Inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO (which are currently excluded because of the ccNSO bylaws)

Bylaws can only be changed via a PDP

Notes and comments in the recommendations are not policy but give more explanation as to the intention of each recommendation

Main goal: ASCII and IDN TLDs need to be treated similar

Adjust membership definition

One vote per territory

Next steps:

ccNSO to adopt final report & closure of working groups

implement two confusingly similarity expert panels

GAC has formally asked for advice

Recommendation to the Board by the Durban meeting

Giovanni Seppia underlined the importance of the inclusion of a scientific review in the process and thanked Bart Boswinkel for bringing this mission impossible to a good end.

Final report: <http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/idn-ccpdp-final-29mar13-en.pdf>

15. ccNSO discussion with the ccNSO appointed board members

Finances:

Tension out of the room: the Board supports the idea of exchange of value.

The Board has a vague idea of what this is about but has not confirmed that it agrees with it. The advice is to move forward with the work and awaiting the completion, produce a one-pager that summarizes the progress and the change in the thought-process.

Suggestion from Mike Silber to offer ICANN location for the engagement officer in your region.

Chris: repetitive requests from the ccNSO about the lack of ICANN strategy for Internet Governance are much appreciated

Registrant charter: if there is stakeholder support there is a reason for a fast track process

Chris: this initiative is not a board issue

Started as gTLD initiative

ccTLDs wanted to be involved to

communications team thought it was a good idea if the ccTLD community (or reps) supported the gTLD initiative

the request was there to get some ccTLD buy in and not to undermine any existing process

Fadi acknowledges that some people feel excluded.

On ethics: one recommendation for improvement: introduction of a standing panel

Standing panel?

Suggestion to collaborate on ccTLD reputational study

16. Registry updates

16.1 Less is more?

Lise Fuhr - .DK

Under the Danish domain name act the administration of .dk is to be put to tender every 6 years (with an option of 2 years extension).

Current term started in 2009.

Main principles:

Non-profit

Transparent, accountable and non-discriminatory

Self-regulation

Pay for UDRP

Act needs to be revised before 2014

Goal is to keep act up to date.

It will be done earlier as there is no authority currently to deal with new gTLD requests.

Applies only to new tenders – not to current .DK assignment.

Should be finalized by early 2014.

Plan is to use more executive orders to specify regulation. This will affect the new tender for .DK in 2015.

Will this mean less regulations?

Probably not. It will also increase the uncertainty about the future tender.

Expected status quo:

Warehousing banned by law

Non-profit

Public tender

Principle of non-regulation
New regulations?

16.2 The Leading Force of Chinese Domain Name Market

Hongbin Zhu

Domain count: 73,1% increase

56% of all domains registered in China are .cn, 36% is .com, IDN is 2.1%

Whois data accuracy is currently at 99%+

Two policy changes were instrumental in the recent surge:

Individuals are now allowed to register

Application cooperation strategy implementation

Tencent (largest social network) uses domain names as personal gateway for customers service.

There is no concern that their new gTLD application would affect the growth as these are two completely different product ranges.

50 new anycast nodes planned across the world in 2013

16.3 The release of second level domain in Guatemala

Alejandra Reynoso - .gt

This presentation should become the template for any ccNSO new comer presentation that follows!

50% of Guatemalan domain names use .gt

Fees 3rd level: 30 USD per year, 2nd level: 60 USD/year

Second level introduced with sunrise (two weeks) only for current domain holders; (March 2012)

In case of conflicts between domainholders (e.g. pinacolada.net.gt and pinacolada.com.gt) the oldest domain prevailed

Total domains; 13089 domains (up from 10K before the introduction of second level domains)

Domains can be reserved for 4 days

Same fights as in other ccTLDs with entities that are trying to mimic the ccTLD operators identity (dominios.com.gt)

Issues with the IDN domains as they were not aware that the users should set the right permissions in their browser

Firefox didn't include .gt as an IDN enabled domain from the start

Lessons learned:

Find better ways to target public

More time for sunrise: two weeks is not enough

IDNs are not particularly popular – so far only registrations for trademark reasons.

This is confirmed by .AG

16.4 Small registry cooperation

Nigel Roberts – Stephen Deerhake

Migrate to platform that allowed for EPP

Couple of issues (malformed postal address, non-recognized characters in the datasets, ...)

Channel Island brought to the table:

CoCCA expertise

Active accredited registrars

AS brought to the table:

Needs

Active accredited registrars

Little registrars in common.

Registrars are migrating in both directions.

16.5 Domain dispute resolution resolved through general competition law

Jens Petur Jensen, .IS

First registration in 1986

Dispute between holders of identical .IS and .COM names. (Nordurflug)

Dispute was handled by consumer agency

Use of misleading information (such as a domain) is forbidden in business practices.

The fact that the name sits in a different zone doesn't matter.

The fact that the registration was not done in good faith showed as well that the law was violated in this case. (nordurflug.com referred to helicoptericeland.com)

16.6 Regional Organisation update

The Regional organisations presented the first ever global ccTLD survey. The survey looked into all operational aspects of the ccTLD registries. The results show that - despite the cultural and geographic diversity – ccTLDs gain much from sharing experiences. Structure and policies show many similarities.

More can be found at: <https://www.centri.org/article/inter-regional-similarities-between-ctlds-era-commercialisation>

17. ICANN Reputation Audit – Interim findings

Goal:

Establishing a reputational baseline as ICANN's presence in the world expands.

What do we right, what wrong, what to improve.

Part of a survey series

4 objectives

Imagine and reputation of ICANN (int. and ext. view)

Uncover perceptions with respect to the management team

Establish baseline metrics

Deliver evidence based insights and recommendations

Reputation audit model (I3) based on:

Identity

Image

influence

Methodology:

Start in Toronto

14 senior internal stakeholders interviews

25 External interviews

Data synthesized

Survey instrument based on that synthesis

327 respondents

525 media items analyzed and pushed through rating system

Summary of results

Multi-stakeholder: very favorable

Internationalization, communication and new gTLD services have most room for improvement; big difference in perception between internal and external stakeholders.

Influencers (media etc.) are neutral in most categories which would lead externals to fall back to their own (biased perceptions)

Very favorable media coverage on the international aspects of ICANN by the media

Numbers are in general pretty low

37% of internal and 40% of external stakeholders say that they are critical of ICANN

Media coverage is more or less 33% for unfavourable, favourable and neutral with a slight tendency towards positive

Trust and ethics rate higher amongst external stakeholders than internal stakeholders (54% thinks 'ICANN is a company I trust')

Very interesting (but too detailed to report) overview of the engagement perception: especially the order is essential

Is ICANN truly global? About 25% says yes

61% does not think the ITU is an alternative

The perception on the new gTLD services is very, very, very poor. Both internal and external perception ratings hover around 65-70% Just Fair/Poor

Internal stakeholders find direct contact (meetings) most valuable communication channel for corp comm. External stakeholders prefer indirect channels (newsletters etc.)

18. Strategic Priorities Debate

Key question:

What are the priorities with a 3-5 year horizon?

Panelists

Jeff Moss (ICANN)

Andrei Kolesnikov (.RU)

Roelof Meijer (.NL)

Jörg Schweiger (.DE)

2010 survey reviewed:

Implementation of IDNs on top of the list

Implementation of new gTLDs the lowest

What is the impact of the new gTLDs in the near future?

Roelof: Impact of new gTLD space rollout depends on success or failure. Three factors come in play: added value (to the end-users), trust and understanding (will users still understand the DNS)

Best case: the three goals (choice, competition, innovation) are all realized – geo, brand and surprises – DNS stays stable – no TLDs fail – at least a second round

Worst case: three goals will never be mentioned again – two subscenarios: 1. Violent end (in court) – ITU wins 2. Quiet death – many applicants stop process ICANN and community lose trust – No second round

Most likely: some results on three objective - less than 150 TLDs will be success – few innovative surprises – brands on defensive mode but not used – ccTLDs remain market leaders – ICANN challenged in court – 60 million used in court – no second round in near future

In addition to applicants who didn't get an approval, categorisation discussion is vulnerable for litigation. Principle of 'one size fits all' is applied across all applicants.

Impact to the root?

Jeff Moss:

This is not a significant or massive change. It is just more entries. Adding DNSSEC records added much more to the zone than what we'll experience now.

Overlay of policy on top of new gTLDs (.bank requiring DNSSEC and SSL) is an interesting and new aspect. Might be an interesting study case for ccTLDs to see how new gTLDs implement IPV6.

How will gTLDs impact large ccTLDs

Jörg Schweiger doesn't believe there will be any significant impact on ccTLDs.

There might be an impact on the industry as a whole as some of these gTLDs will fail. Customers don't see the difference between ccTLDs and gTLDs.

Is there a plan to mitigate any negative effects of new gTLD failure?

Byron: change in registrar behavior. Especially on payment terms (pay in advance is hard to maintain) credit for 30 to 45 days is not uncommon. In addition access to prime real estate is hard (and becoming expensive).

Andrei Kolesnikov: New ideas and process might also inspire ccTLDs to improve some of theirs.

Lesley Cowley: economic factors might have an even larger impact than issues discussed so far.

Roelof: Could be the perfect time for registries to offer more free models (domains) or models that provide free services (Google model).

How is the changing eco system going to affect us?

Andrei: Governments started paying attention since the internet affects their citizens life. ICANN should stand above the discussions and do not get involved in the political aspects. ICANN's purpose is managing naming and numbering, not internet governance. ICANN could gain much recognition.

Kieren McCarthy: It would be wonderful if ICANN could avoid getting involved, but the problem is that the essence of the risk of these debates for us is that it is about ICANN's scope and mandate.

Security, stability and resilience issues:

Jeff: open recursive resolvers are being targeted by governments to lower the impact of DDOS attack, at the same time IP spoofing is being addressed on an Internet Exchange level.

Jörg: recently the main issue was not DDOS but registrar and registry vulnerabilities. Our industry should encourage improvements to security mechanisms. Only we have the knowledge, the implementation should be done by the operators.

Roelof: If solutions are so simple, hasn't our industry been waiting for too long to solve it?

Jeff: Yes, practical solutions are simple, but politically it might be much harder.

Jeff: Start anycasting as much as you can – don't let unwanted traffic end up in your country.

How do we act as a community?

Cristian Hesselman: We should liaise more with ISPs

1. The long way to a GAC advice on new gTLD applications.

The Beijing meeting will be remembered as at longest ever GAC meeting (so far?). The government representatives assembled already on Thursday 4th of April, two days earlier than usual and had meetings every day, sometimes till late in the evening. GAC members had to miss the Gala dinner on Wednesday evening and some rebooked their flights as discussions to find an agreement on the new gTLD advice continued until the last moment on Thursday.

The GAC Communiqué, containing the GAC Advice to the ICANN Board on new gTLDs became available on Thursday afternoon during the ICANN Open Forum. The GAC was immediately criticised for delaying the new gTLD process with several months and for asking things that are outside the role of ICANN (running the DNS) by bringing content into the discussion.

- Negative GAC advice against 2 strings:

There is a consensus within the GAC that one of the two the applications for .africa (ic the application not supported by the African Union Commission¹) and the application for .gcc (GCC is a known abbreviation for Gulf Cooperation Council²) should not be approved by the ICANN Board.³

- No consensus but recognition that religious terms are sensitive

There is no consensus against .islam or .halal however the GAC recognizes that these are sensitive strings for some of its members.

- GAC puts the process on hold for 14 strings

ICANN should not go further than the initial evaluation of the applications for .shenzhen (IDN in Chinese), .persiangulf, .guangzhou (IDN in Chinese), .amazon (and IDNs in Japanese and Chinese), .patagonia, .date, .spa, .yun, .thai, .zulu, .wine, .vin .

The GAC will discuss these strings again during the next meeting in Durban (July 2013) and may still come up with an advice.

- Strings that may require additional safeguards (+/- 190 strings)

The GAC identified specific groups of strings that need additional safeguards to obtain consumer trust and mitigate the risk of consumer harm. These strings are linked to Consumer Protection, Regulated Markets or are considered as Sensitive Strings. The non-exhaustive list contains amongst others strings linked to children (for example .kids), the environment (for example .bio), finance (for example .lease), intellectual property (for example .data).

- Generic terms with exclusive (61 strings) or restrictive access

The GAC advises the ICANN Board that Generic terms (for example .baby or .blog) should only become closed domains if such serves the public interest.

The GAC acknowledges that in some cases it might be appropriate to restrict access but requires that this happens in a transparent way and does not favour or disadvantages specific registrars or registrants.

- singular vs plural

The GAC advises that singular and plural versions of the same string are potentially confusingly similar and asks not to allow both versions together as a gTLD.

¹ This application was originally for .dot africa .

² The GCC is a political and economic union of the Arab states bordering the Arabian Gulf, namely Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates.

Earlier in the process, the evaluation panel that had looked at the visual confusability of strings did not have a problem with plural and singular versions of the same word.

- Intergovernmental Organisations

The discussion on the protection of the names of IGO's (and their acronyms) at the top-level is still ongoing. Therefore, and pending a solution, the GAC wants that these names get a preventative protection before the launch of new gTLDs.

List of strings mentioned in the GAC Communiqué:

Negative advise: .africa, .gcc - *Sensitive religious:* .islam, .halal - *Safeguard advice:* .kid, .kids, .kinder, .game, .games, .juegos, .play, .school, .schule, .toys, .earth, .eco, .green, .bio, .organic, .care, .diet, .fit, .fitness, .health, .healthcare, .heart, .hiv, .hospital, .med, .medical, .organic, .pharmacy, .rehab, .surgery, .clinic, .healthy (IDN Chinese equivalent), .dental, .dentist, .doctor, .dds, .physio, .capital, .cash, .cashbackbonus, .broker, .brokers, .claims, .exchange, .finance, .financial, .fiancialaid, .forex, .fund, .investments, .lease, .loan, .loans, .market, .markets, .money, .pay, .payu, .retirement, .save, .trading, .autoinsurance, .bank, .banque, .carinsurance, .credit, .creditcard, .creditunion, .insurance, .insure, .ira, .lifeinsurance, .mortgage, .mutualfunds, .mutuelle, .netbank, .reit, .tax, .travelersinsurance, .vermogensberater, .vermogensberatung, .versicherung, .bet, .bingo, .lotto, .poker, .spreadbetting, .casino, .care, .gives, .giving, .charity (and IDN Chinese equivalent), .degree, .mba, .university, .audio, .book (and IDN equivalent), .broadway, .film, .game, .games, .juegos, .movie, .music, .software, .song, .tunes, .fashion (and IDN equivalent), .video, .app, .art, .author, .band, .beats, .cloud (and IDN equivalent), .data, .design, .digital, .download, .entertainment, .fan, .fans, .free, .gratis, .discount, .sale, .hiphop, .media, .news, .online, .pictures, .radio, .rip, .show, .theater, .theatre, .tour, .tours, .tvs, .video, .zip, .abogado, .accountant, .accountants, .architect, .associates, .attorney, .broker, .brokers, .cpa, .doctor, .dentist, .dds, .engineer, .lawyer, .legal, .realtor, .realty, .vet, .corp, .gmbh, .inc, .limited, .llc, .llp, .ltda, .ltd, .sarl, .srl, .sal, .town, .city, .capital, .reise, .reisen, .weather, .engineering, .law, .army, .navy, .airforce, .fail, .gripe, .sucks, .wtf, - *Generic terms with proposed exclusive access:* .antivirus, .app, .autoinsurance, .baby, .beauty, .blog, .book, .broker, .carinsurance, .cars, .cloud, .courses, .cpa, .cruise, .data, .dvr, .financialaid, .flowers, .food, .game, .grocery, .hair, .hotel, .hotels, .insurance, .jewelry, .mail, .makeup, .map, .mobile, .motorcycles, .movie, .music, .news, .phone, .salon, .search, .shop, .show, .skin, .song, .store, .tennis, .theater, .theatre, .tires, .tunes, .video, .watches, .weather, .yachts, .クラウド [cloud], .ストア [store], .セール [sale], .ファッション [fashion], .家電 [consumer electronics], .手表 [watches], .書籍 [book], .珠宝 [jewelry], .通販 [online shopping], .食品 [food].

2. GAC secretariat

There are two candidates to run the GAC's (ICANN-)independent secretariat. Both organisations were invited to present their offer in Beijing. Negotiations will start shortly after the meeting. As a reminder: the secretariat will be funded by Norway, the Netherlands and Brazil.

3. GAC meeting with ICANN global engagement team

The GAC received an overview of ICANN's new global engagement strategy. Special attention was given to the strategy for the African and the Latin American continents.

Tarek Kamel (ICANN) also announced that ICANN plans to double its financial contribution to the IGF secretariat.

Several GAC members asked for the rationale behind the choice for Istanbul and Singapore as regional hubs. It was explained that the main reason was to spread the operational staff over the different time zones, so that regardless of the time or national/seasonal holidays always one ICANN office would be in full operation.

Some African countries asked that ICANN as soon as possible would consider opening an additional operational hub in Africa.

The US representative was interested in the outreach ICANN was doing towards countries not yet involved in the ICANN model and towards Intergovernmental organisations. There was the request that the GAC would be fully involved and aware of the steps and initiatives ICANN was taking.

4. GAC meeting with ICANN Board

The GAC meeting with the ICANN was almost completely dedicated to new gTLDs. These were some of the points that were raised:

.IDN

The GAC received the confirmation that the .IDN application had been rejected during the initial evaluation process. The reason for the negative evaluation was that IDN is also the ISO 3-letter code for Indonesia.

IGO names protection

Chris Disspain (ICANN Board) declared that the GAC advice requesting the protection of the names of Intergovernmental organisations (IGOs) and their acronyms was problematic. However he said that the ICANN Board understood that these names could create problem and invited the GAC to cooperate and solve the issue by the Durban meeting.

Singular/plural of some strings

Cherine Chalaby (ICANN Board) explained that the independent panel had decided that there was no confusion and that the Board had no intention to go against the panel. He suggested that the GAC would include this in its advice if it was considered an issue.

(As described, it was included in the GAC advice. During the Public Forum, Fadi Chehade (ICANN CEO) commented that in his personal opinion he agreed that singular and plural strings could lead to confusion.)

.(dot)africa/.africa

GAC members, were also aware of the open and public discussion between the applicants of the two .africa projects and wondered if there was a reason why this hadn't been solved. (GAC members said that only one application had the necessary community support – ic from the African Union).

The ICANN staff assured that the normal procedure was followed and that both applications would be evaluated in function of their priority number (.dotafrica/.africa has priority no. 307; the original .africa no. 1005)

Timelines

Fadi Chehade (ICANN) told the GAC that by 23rd April the first contracts with new gTLD registries would be signed except if more evaluation was needed.

(One of first things Fadi Chehade did during the Public Forum at the end of the ICANN week was announcing that the April Board meeting was cancelled to give more time for proper review and comment on the new gTLD registry contracts. The 23rd April was ditched.)

5. AoB

For the second time CENTR invited its members and their GAC representatives for an informal get together during the ICANN meeting. Over 80 people attended the cocktail, more than 1 out of 3 were GAC members. The event reminds the GAC members that there is a vibrant ccTLD community and it is an opportunity for individual CENTR members to reach out to their national government representative.

The Beijing GAC communiqué can be found at:

https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/27132037/Beijing%20Communique%20april2013_Final.pdf

Register of GAC Advice:

<https://gacweb.icann.org/display/GACADV/GAC+Register+of+Advice>

GNSO Highlights and other

- Fadi Chehade: There is no deadline on the gTLD program. Work is going fast and it will be done. GNSO affirms “PDP is not broken” despite concerns from the GAC that there are problems.
- Some GNSO counsellors believe policy is being circumvented within ICANN policy process – key issue spawned from ‘strawman solution’ in the Trademark clearinghouse.
- Communication issues between GNSO and GAC. An idea discussed in GNSO is to have a liaison between the two. Work with the BGRI working group may be an outcome in moving forward.
- GNSO feel joint sessions between GNSO and other AC meeting could improve. Eg. “Joint ccNSO/GNSO didn’t really get off the ground”. Quicker presentations (with backing documents) may be a more efficient use of time to allow for better discussion.
- SSAC confirms they will not use SAC057 report to push for new gTLD program delay

New gTD program status update “steady and consistent progress”

The ICANN VP of the new gTLD program gave an overview of its status and ongoing work. Selected points made are below which came from this and other related sessions.

Initial Evaluation - Evaluations are being performed manually based on applicant guidebook criteria. To date, 93 have passed and results are being released weekly ramping up in the coming weeks. 39 applications have been withdrawn

Contracting – Registry agreement modifications expected during the week with ICANN board to approve shortly after. Contracting could begin as early as April 23 (for applicants with no pending objections, no string contention and have passed IE)

Pre-delegation testing – A System pilot has been recently tested with some lessons/observations (eg. additional and more detailed applicant prep materials needed). Pre delegation testing is expected to begin 29 April.

Extended Evaluations - Applicants who for some reason can’t go to contracting will have a 15 day window to elect for extended evaluation (expected to commence in October 2013).

Dispute Resolution - To date, 220 objections have been validated by providers (most are community objections followed by legal objections).

String contentions – To resolve string contention, mechanisms to be used are the Community Priority Evaluation (to begin in September) or in last resort an auction.

URS – System of Rapid relief for trademark holders in clear cases at lower cost and faster than UDRP. National Arbitration Forum is the first announced provider. By July, URS will be running and a demonstration will be given in ICANN Durban.

Operation support – SLA monitoring to ensure Registries are providing the required baseline level of service in three primary areas; DNS, RDNS and EPP. Centralised zone data access program – mechanism to access zone file data in standardised and consistent program. To be launched in June.

EBERO – recently announced providers – Neustar, Nominet and CNNIC.

Customer support - Next week a new CRM system will be launched to support applicants – case management and ticketing tools included.

Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH) – The TMCH went live 26 March 2013. Account types in the clearinghouse are the ‘trademark holder’ and ‘trademark agent’ (Trademark agent: “individual or entity submitting a trademark record and receiving notifications on behalf of trademark holder”). Currently there are 71 active trademark agents in the system and 450 trademarks registered. Trademarks can be registered for period of 1, 3 or 5 years with possibility to re-register after. ‘Proof of use’ declarations needed when wanting to participate in a sunrise and when submitting a registered trademark. There is a Central database currently in Europe with further 2 to be set up in Singapore and the U.S

Expert Working Group on Whois

Late in 2012, ICANN initiated the expert working group to look at the long discussed and sometimes *controversial* topic of Whois. The group was formed to assess data directory needs and make recommendations which are expected to form foundations for policy development in the GNSO. The group presented (in a public session) options and recommendations on a set of items based on a needs analysis; data requirements, usage requirements, storage and performance, privacy requirements, accuracy requirements and access and accountability requirements. A blueprint for a gTLD directory system is expected ideally before ICANN Durban meeting. Selected points;

Access to data - From audience comments and based on a question from the group, it was felt that access to data could be differentiated between users - tiered access to the database. On that point there were concerns that it's not only about domain holder privacy but the privacy of the requesting parties.

Storage and performance requirements - Discussion on two potential models distributed and centralised database.

GNSO views on the Expert Working Group –“ Is the Working Group working extraneously to the GNSO?” GNSO feels the need to improve links to the Working Group.

[Click for presentation slides](#)

Domain Trade association

In a session held at a separate location to the ICANN conference, this new trade association met to invite and inform potential members and interested stakeholders of the project. The session was led by Adrian Kinderis of ARI Registries and was attended by around 50 individuals. Most audience questions were fairly supportive and curious of the idea. Selected points from the session;

- The group are aiming for a 23 April launch (to link with ICANN DNS Summit of same date)
- Adrian stressed that although Google were helpful, it is not a Google project.
- Membership was described rather loosely to stakeholders in the 'Domain Name Industry' – eg Registry operators, registrars, resellers, back end (inclusive of ccTLDs).
- Activities of the group; promoting via word of mouth at industry gatherings and collecting interested participants via www.whatdomain.org
- Interim board in place. When Association is launched there will be an election process.
- Next steps to translate the ideas into formal founding docs. Formation docs will be broad to allow for many possibilities. Main things are promoting, universal acceptance of domain names etc...
- Adrian wants the association to be 'the' industry association not 'an' industry association.
- Marketing – create an educational website as well as awareness campaign in May/June
- Next steps – interim board will draft governance documents, charter and formation docs.
- Adrian mentioned that ccTLDs are very welcome to the association and would be valued.

Locking of domain subject to UDRP proceedings

Michele Neylon gave an update stated the group have produced an [initial report](#) for [public comment](#) containing 11 recommendations to clarify/standardise the procedures for locking. Public comment is open until 26 April 2013. Within a GNSO council meeting, it was discussed whether the principles and recommendations from the report could/would be included in URS proceedings. This so far remains unclear as work so far has been directed only at UDRP cases. Michele stressed that comments should be constructive with ideas rather than simple objections to the recommendations.

IGO/INGO PDP

Thomas Rickert presented on this topic. The PDP charter mandate: whether there is a need for special protection at top and second level in all existing and new gTLDs for names and acronyms of IGO's and INGOs receiving protections under treaties and statutes under multiple jurisdictions, specifically including Red Cross/Red Crescent. From research conducted by ICANN General Counsel, it was found that (apart from Mexico and Brazil) there were no international treaty or national law that specifically prohibits the allowing of a domain name registration of an IGO or INGO identifier by a third party – however certain international treaties may allow for possibilities to challenge such registrations (eg trademark infringement). The group are discussing;

- Quantifying entities to be considered for special protection
- Scope of existing protections under international treaties/laws for IGO, RCRC and IOC names
- Qualification criteria for special protection – some proposals were outlined.
- Distinguishing differences between RCRC and IOC from other international organisations.

For more details and the working proposals, [see presentation slides](#)

IRTP Part D

The group are addressing 6 charter questions relating to IRTP (eg. Reporting requirements for Registries and dispute providers, provisions in TDRP, dispute options for registrants, the need for FOAs). There has been a work plan adopted and Initial assessment of charter questions under way. Initial report aimed to be published for public comment by 22 July and Final report aimed for ICANN November meeting

[Click for presentation slides](#)

Thick Whois

A short presentation was provided to the GNSO council on the topic of Thick Whois. A working group was formed on this in late 2012 and since has created several sub-teams to tackle charter questions. An important question is whether or not thick whois should be a requirement for gTLD Registries. If they reach consensus that it should be a requirement, they will also consider cost implications and guidelines to conduct a transition and any special exceptions. An initial report is expected prior to ICANN Durban meeting.

[Click for presentation slides](#)

Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation (SCI)

The SCI is responsible for reviewing and assessing the effective functioning of recommendations resulted from the GNSO improvements process. Some of the work done by this group;

- Deferral of motions – no need for formal procedure (leave to GNSO Chair discretion)
- Raising an issue – recommendation to maintain current procedure which is only council or a group chartered by council can raise and issue
- Termination and suspension of PDP (work done and comment period closed recently)
- Working group guidelines survey – ready for distribution to working groups
- Jonathon Robinson - GNSO recognises the “need to do things fast but also the value of doing things thoroughly”

SSAC activities

Patrik Fältström gave an overview of SSAC and mentioned there were 20 (out of 38) SSAC members present in Beijing. Some of the work in 2013 relates to; identifier abuse metrics, root key rollover, SSAC meeting with Law enforcement, IGF workshop (eg what if too many recursive servers on the net), new gTLD success metrics, abuse of the DNS for dDoS attacks.

Report SAC057 – advisory on internal name certificates

- There is a Certificate Authority (CA) practice that if exploited could pose a significant risk to privacy of secure internet communications. The practice could impact new gTLDs
- The practice for issuing internal name certificates allows a person, not related to an applied for TLD, to obtain a certificate for the TLD with little to no validation and launch a man in the middle attack. Vulnerability window to new gTLDs is at least 3 years and CA Browser Forum is aware and taking action.
- ICANN took immediate action to reduce the risk with interaction with CA/Browser Forum
- It was confirmed by Patrik that SSAC will not use the report to advise ICANN Board to delay the new gTLD launches

Policy and Implementation Discussion

A session was held on the topic of policy and implementation within ICANN processes. The issue was presented as having risen from tensions and lack of clarity between different Supporting Organisations and Advisory committees (eg. Who signs off on policy implementation?). A [framework](#) was presented identifying several steps, criteria and principles as well as short term improvement suggestions. From a panel discussion, it seems this issue may continue however unsure yet if it will be GNSO initiated or be the foundation of a cross-community working group. As a result of discussions, the GNSO intends to invite other SO/ACs to contribute on the issues and discussions.