

## **GNSO gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group Statement**

Issue: Final Report of the Board of Directors / Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) Joint Working Group (JWG) on the Review of the Role of the GAC, 19 June 2011 (Report)

Date: 30 July 2011

Issue Document URL: <http://www.icann.org/en/committees/board-gac-2009/board-gac-jwg-final-report-19jun11-en.pdf>

This statement on the issue noted above is submitted on behalf of the gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG). The statement that follows represents a consensus position of the RySG as further detailed at the end of the document. The RySG statement was arrived at through a combination of RySG email list discussion and RySG meetings (including teleconference meetings).

The comments that follow are organized sequentially by the objectives in the Report.

### Objective 1 GAC Advice to the Board

The last sentence under the heading “Policy Development Process” says: “It is also worth noting that the Bylaws call for GAC advice to go solely to the Board, rather than to the other Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees.” The RySG believes that a modification of this requirement in the Bylaws would facilitate earlier involvement of the GAC in policy development efforts.

The RySG supports all four of the recommendations for objective 1.

### Objective 2 GAC Liaisons to the ICANN Board and Nominating Committee

The last sentence of the paragraph that ends at the top of page 6 says: “This representational function appears to differ from other SOs and ACs, whose members often participate in deliberations in their personal capacities.” We would like to note that in the GNSO Council, the RySG representatives are required by the RySG charter to represent the RySG views as directed by the membership. In cases where they have no direction, they are required to abstain and/or request a delay of the action. This does not prevent them from sharing personal opinions, but they are required to make that clear if they do.

The RySG supports the recommendations for objective 2, except:

- (a) In recommendation 5, we suggest that the purpose “to ensure that all ICANN staff are more cognizant of GAC perspectives and concerns” be expanded “to ensure that all ICANN staff, **SOs and other ACs** are more cognizant of GAC perspectives and concerns”.
- (b) With regard to recommendation 6, we would like to know who “ICANN Public Policy staff” are; are there specific ICANN staff dedicated to public policy in contrast to SO policy?
- (c) With regard to recommendation 7, we would modify it to say: “Ensure that all briefing material prepared for the Board, **SOs and other ACs** clearly identify those issues of interest/relevance to the GAC.”

Option 3 that begins at the bottom of page 7 suggests “. . . considering amending the current confidentiality procedures for the NomCom that inhibit discussions between the “GAC liaison” and the GAC membership.” The RySG believes that this would be a good idea for SOs and other ACs as well.

### Objective 3 GAC Liaisons to the ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees

In a policy development process, whether it happens via GAC Liaisons or some other manner, the RySG believes that it would be very helpful if, fairly early, the GAC could identify possible issues that may involve public policy.

The last sentence of the third full paragraph on page 9 says: “The JWG notes that the GAC-GNSO exchange in San Francisco raised the concept of “reverse” liaisons, such that the GNSO would identify representatives from each of its constituencies to serve as liaisons to the GAC . . .” We request some clarification regarding the meaning of the term ‘constituencies’. Is it meant to refer specifically to SOs and ACs or more broadly to SOs and ACs and their associated sub-organizations? For example, the GNSO is made of Stakeholder Groups and some of those Stakeholder Groups have multiple constituencies. We support the concept of “reverse” liaisons.

The RySG supports the recommendations for objective 3, and in particular, strong support for Recommendation 8.

### Objective 4 Support of GAC Activities

The RySG supports the recommendations for objective 4:

Under Recommended GAC Selection Criteria, item (1) suggests: “no cap on the number of GAC delegates selected for travel assistance per meeting . . .” We suggest that this be subject to available budgeted funds.

Under Secretariat Support, the first sentence says: “The experience to-date of hosting countries for the GAC Secretariat indicate two to five people dedicated to the task on a full or part time basis.” There is a huge difference between 5 part time people and 5 full time people. We are not qualified to judge the GAC needs, but we can say that the GNSO with a very heavy workload is able to function with 1 full time and 1 part time people in the Secretariat function so 5 full time staff seems like it might be overkill.

The RySG definitely supports this recommendation on page 14: “At a minimum, the JWG recommends that ICANN provide the GAC with support comparable to that provided to other SOs and ACs.”

### Objective 5 Ways for governments to be informed about ICANN

The RySG supports the recommendations for objective 5, and in particular strongly supports recommendation 1.

### Objective 6 GAC interaction with the ICANN Board and Community

The RySG believes that effective GAC interaction with the GNSO requires more than one hour sessions at in-person meetings three times a year. We also believe that, in cases where there are issues of strong interest to the GAC involving particular GNSO Stakeholder Groups and/or Constituencies, special meetings between the affected parties would be useful.

## **RySG Level of Support**

### **1. Level of Support of Active Members: Unanimous**

1.1. # of Members in Favor: 14

- 1.2. # of Members Opposed: 0
- 1.3. # of Members that Abstained: 0
- 1.4. # of Members that did not vote: 0

2. **Minority Position(s):** N/A

### **General RySG Information**

- Total # of eligible RySG Members<sup>1</sup>: 15
- Total # of RySG Members: 14
- Total # of Active RySG Members<sup>2</sup>: 14
- Minimum requirement for supermajority of Active Members: 10
- Minimum requirement for majority of Active Members: 8
- # of Members that participated in this process: 14
- Names of Members that participated in this process:
  1. Afiliias (.info & .mobi)
  2. DotAsia Organisation (.asia)
  3. DotCooperation (.coop)
  4. Employ Media (.jobs)
  5. Fundació puntCAT (.cat)
  6. ICM, Inc. (.xxx)
  7. Museum Domain Management Association – MuseDoma (.museum)
  8. NeuStar (.biz)
  9. Public Interest Registry - PIR (.org)
  10. RegistryPro (.pro)
  11. Societe Internationale de Telecommunication Aeronautiques – SITA (.aero)
  12. Telnic (.tel)
  13. Tralliance Registry Management Company (TRMC) (.travel)
  14. VeriSign (.com, .name, & .net)
- Names & email addresses for points of contact
  - Chair: David Maher, [dmaher@pir.org](mailto:dmaher@pir.org)
  - Vice Chair: Keith Drazek, [kdrazek@verisign.com](mailto:kdrazek@verisign.com)
  - Secretariat: Cherie Stubbs, [Cherstubbs@aol.com](mailto:Cherstubbs@aol.com)
  - RySG representative for this statement: Chuck Gomes, [cgomes@verisign.com](mailto:cgomes@verisign.com)

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 (RySG Charter, Article II, RySG Membership, Sec. A). The RySG Charter can be found at [http://www.gtldregistries.org/sites/gtldregistries.org/files/Charter\\_for\\_RySG\\_6\\_July\\_2011\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.gtldregistries.org/sites/gtldregistries.org/files/Charter_for_RySG_6_July_2011_FINAL.pdf).

<sup>2</sup> Per the RySG Charter, Article II, RySG Membership, Sec. D: Members shall be classified as “Active” or “Inactive”. An active member must meet eligibility requirements, must be current on dues, and must be a regular participant in RySG activities. 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 three consecutively scheduled RySG meetings or voting processes or both. An Inactive member shall continue to have membership rights and duties except being counted as present or absent in the determination of a quorum. An Inactive member immediately resumes Active status at any time by participating in a RySG meeting or by voting.