

GNSO gTLD Registry Constituency Statement

Issue: Release of Single Character at the Second Level

Date: 14 December 2007

General RyC Information

- Total # of eligible RyC Members¹: 15
- Total # of RyC Members: 15
- Total # of Active RyC Members²: 15
- Minimum requirement for supermajority of Active Members: 10
- Minimum requirement for majority of Active Members: 8
- # of Members that participated in this process: 13
- Names of Members that participated in this process:
 1. DotCooperation (.coop)
 2. Employ Media (.jobs)
 3. Fundació puntCAT (.cat)
 4. Global Name Registry (.name)
 5. mTLD Top Level Domain (.mobi)
 6. Museum Domain Management Association – MuseDoma (.museum)
 7. Public Interest Registry (.org)
 8. Societe Internationale de Telecommunication Aeronautiques – SITA (.aero)
 9. VeriSign (.com & .net)
- Names & email addresses for points of contact:
 - Chair: David Maher, dmaher@pir.org
 - Vice Chair: Jeff Neuman, Jeff.Neuman@Neustar.us
 - Secretariat: Cherie Stubbs, Cherstubbs@aol.com
 - RyC rep. for this statement: Ray Fassett, ray@goto.jobs

¹ All top-level domain sponsors or registry operators that have agreements with ICANN to provide Registry Services in support of one or more gTLDs are eligible for membership upon the “effective date” set forth in the operator’s or sponsor’s agreement (Article III, Membership, ¶ 1). The RyC Articles of Operations can be found at http://www.gtldregistries.org/about_us/articles.

² Per the RyC Articles of Operations, Article III, Membership, ¶ 4: Members shall be classified as “Active” or “Inactive”. A member shall be classified as “Active” unless it is classified as “Inactive” pursuant to the provisions of this paragraph. Members become Inactive by failing to participate in a Constituency meeting or voting process for a total of three consecutive meetings or voting processes or both, or by failing to participate in meetings or voting processes, or both, for six weeks, whichever is shorter. An Inactive member shall have all rights and duties of membership other than being counted as present or absent in the determination of a quorum. An Inactive member may resume Active status at any time by participating in a Constituency meeting or by voting.

Regarding the issue noted above, the following position represents the views of the ICANN GNSO gTLD Registry Constituency (RyC) as indicated. Unless indicated otherwise, the RyC position was arrived at through a combination of RyC email list discussion and RyC meetings (including teleconference meetings).

Summary of voting:

Total Eligible Members: 15

In Support: 9 (Employ Media, , SITA, MuseDoma, VeriSign, Fundació puntCAT, Global Name Registry, mTLD Top Level Domain, DotCooperation, Public Interest Registry)

Non-Support: 0

Non-Voting: 6 (Neustar, Tralliance, Telnic, RegistryPro, DotASIA, Afiliats)

1. Position 1

1.1. Position Description:

This statement responds to the request from ICANN for comments on potential allocation methods for single-letter and single-digit domain names at the second level in gTLD registries and on the potential uses for revenue that may result.

I. Constituency Position

The background of this forum is set forth at:

<http://www.icann.org/announcements/announcement-16oct07.htm>.

Currently, all 16 gTLD sponsorship and registry agreements (.AERO, .ASIA, .BIZ, .CAT, .COM, .COOP, .INFO, .JOBS, .MOBI, .MUSEUM, .NAME, .NET, .ORG, .PRO, .TEL, and .TRAVEL) provide for the reservation of single-letter and single-digit names at the second level.

The gTLD Registry Constituency (RyC) supports the recommendation in the report of the GNSO Reserved Names Working Group (RN-WG) that "single letters and digits be released at the second level in future gTLDs, and that those currently reserved in existing gTLDs should be released." The reservation of single-digit domains is a contractual condition for each of the existing 16 gTLD registries and we support the RN-WG's removal of this contractual condition in future gTLDs. Adoption of this recommendation would be in accordance with the principles of equity and fairness that should guide ICANN's contractual relationships with all registries.

Due to the fact that there are significant differences amongst the existing 16 gTLD registries, the RyC recognizes that finding an appropriate allocation method (or methods) and determining potential uses of revenue is not an easy task. It is for this reason that there are significant differences that we strongly oppose a one-size fits all allocation method, both for existing registries and for future gTLD registries.

For existing registries, the RyC believes that the best approach is to allow each operator or sponsor to choose its own method of allocation. We note that the Registry Services Technical Evaluation Process exists as one method for each registry to develop a fair, predictable and timely procedure for ICANN to handle requests for authorizations, approvals or consents required by our contracts or related contractual amendments. In short, we believe a process exists today to enable each existing gTLD registry or sponsor to implement an allocation method of single-digit domains in a manner most likely to be consistent to its individually delegated purpose and mission.

- 1.2. **Level of Support of Active Members:** Majority
 - 1.2.1. # of Members in Favor: 9
 - 1.2.2. # of Members Opposed: 0
 - 1.2.3. # of Members that Abstained: 0
 - 1.2.4. # of Members that did not vote: 6
- 1.3. **Minority Position(s):** none
- 1.4. **General impact on the RyC:** See Position Description
- 1.5. **Financial impact on the RyC:** See Position Description
- 1.6. **Analysis of the period of time that would likely be necessary to implement the policy:** See Position Description