10 February 2010

Draft Proposal on AoC Review Requirements and Implementation Processes

Go Daddy supports the Affirmation of Commitments (AoC) and welcomes this opportunity to comment on the draft proposal to meet the review requirements of the AoC.

Our comments are in line with the purpose of the AoC and commitments made within it by the DOC and ICANN, namely:

- To institutionalize and memorialize the technical coordination of the Internet's domain name and addressing system (DNS), globally by a private sector led organization.

- Commitment to a multi-stakeholder, private sector led, bottom-up policy development model for DNS technical coordination.

- The first review is to be performed by volunteer community members and will include the following (or their designated nominees): the Chair of the Government Advisory Committee (GAC), the Chair of the Board of ICANN, the Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information of the Department of Commerce (DOC), representatives of the relevant ICANN Advisory Committees (ACs) and Supporting Organizations (SOs) and independent experts. Composition of the review team will be agreed jointly by the Chair of the GAC (in consultation with GAC members) and the Chair of the Board of ICANN.

1. The Current Timeline for Review Team Member Selection is too Short

1.1. Slightly more than a month has been allowed for response to the call for volunteers for the first review team. One month does not allow sufficient time for the SOs and ACs to develop appropriate processes to receive applications and endorse applicants. We suggest that a more appropriate deadline for response is within thirty days following the Nairobi meeting, or approximately 12 April 2010. The composition of the review team is an important factor to its success and sufficient time should be allowed for the selection process.

1.2. The later date will also allow for interested parties to become aware of this opportunity and have time to respond. This is especially important since there is currently some confusion regarding an apparent conflict between the public call for volunteers released by Staff and the proposal itself that states, "…the process for endorsing candidates should be left to the governing rules and practices of each SO/AC." At the very least, this conflict needs to be resolved or explained as soon as possible.

2. Size and Composition of the Review Teams

2.1. We fully support the comments of the GNSO Council in regards to the size and composition of the review teams and the need for broader membership from the stakeholders represented by the GNSO. In addition, we believe the gender and geography requirements should not be set in stone. It is more important that all stakeholders are represented and that team members have the necessary skills and qualifications. Gender and geography should be considerations, but not a determining factor. No one should be excluded based solely on their gender and/or geographic background.

2.2. Once the team members have been chosen, the selectors should have no more influence than any other member on the review team. In fact, selectors should serve primarily as observers and liaisons. This will ensure that the review team reflects the model committed to in the AoC - multi-stakeholder, private sector led, and bottom-up.

Conclusion

We look forward to the next draft of the proposal and to further discussions in Nairobi.

Sincerely,
GoDaddy.com, Inc.

Tim Ruiz
Vice President
Corporate Development and Policy

Go Daddy reserves the right to future comments on this issue, and our positions include, but are not necessarily limited to those expressed herein.