

## GNSO gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group Statement

Issue: **ICANN's Draft Vision, Mission & Focus Areas for a Five-Year Strategic Plan**

Date: **7 Jan 2014**

Public Comment URL:

<http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/strategic-29oct13-en.htm>

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).

### **Vision & Mission**

There is one key element that is missing in the descriptions of ICANN's vision and mission: using bottom-up multi-stakeholder processes.

### **Focus Areas for the Next Five Years**

The RySG supports four of the five listed focus areas:

- I. Evolving ICANN's implementation of the **multi-stakeholder** approach for coordination
- III. Supporting a healthy **unique identifier ecosystem**
- IV. Striving towards **technical and operational excellence**
- V. Defining role clarity for ICANN in the **Internet governance ecosystem**

For **Focus Area I** we have a few suggestions about the description in the paper:

- The first paragraph ends by saying that there was no ccNSO in 1998; note that there was no ASO or GNSO either. It might be better to simply point out how many ccTLDs there were at that time.
- The fourth bullet under "We seek to:" says "Evolve ICANN Meetings to better support the global community's changing needs." We suggest changing this to "Evolve ICANN Meetings to better support the global community's changing needs within its existing charter, including continually improving remote participation capabilities". It is important that this bullet cannot be interpreted as authorization for staff to expand ICANN's mission.

Regarding **Focus Area II** (Developing a world-class **public responsibility** framework), we need to better understand what a 'public responsibility framework' is. The paper says that the purpose

of the framework is to promote “the global public interest vis-à-vis ICANN’s mission and core values”, but there is no commonly agreed-to definition of ‘the global public interest’. The public is a hugely diverse community so different subsets have different interests. When we add ‘global’ we encounter additional diversity because of the very wide range of interests from country to country and jurisdiction to jurisdiction.

The paper goes on to say, “The framework will clarify ICANN’s roles, objectives and milestones in promoting the public interest through capacity building, and increasing the base of internationally diverse, knowledgeable, and engaged ICANN stakeholders.” We are fully supporting of increasing the base of stakeholders within ICANN but think that more clarification is needed with regard to what is meant by ‘capacity building’. The paper later says that “ICANN seeks to . . . (e)ngage in capacity building at a regional level to engage and develop the Community globally for ICANN involvement.” If this is what is meant, rather than what is often meant by ‘capacity building’ with regard to Internet infrastructure, then this focus area may be okay. On the other hand, if ‘capacity building’ relates to Internet infrastructure, then we think that may be out of scope for ICANN’s mission.

Also under focus area II, the paper says that “ICANN seeks to . . . (a)ddress the challenges faced by developing countries seeking inclusion and development, consistent with ICANN’s mission and core values.” We are curious why ‘development’ is mentioned here because that once again appears to be beyond the scope of ICANN’s mission.

Under **Focus Area III** the paper says that ICANN seeks to:

- “Plan for emerging changes in the use of domain names and other identifiers.” - ‘Other identifiers’ sounds like scope creep. If other identifiers refers to identifiers that ICANN currently coordinates such as Internet numbers, then say that instead of using the general, wide open term ‘other identifiers’.
- “Develop a technology roadmap for domain names and other identifiers to help guide ICANN activities and inform the Internet ecosystem.” – ‘Other identifiers’ again sounds like scope creep; see the previous comment.
- “Coordinate a responsible opening of the DNS for “creative disruption” and innovation.” – What is meant by opening the DNS? If this means adding new gTLDs, we suggest you say that. We also think that it would be good to explain what is meant by ‘creative disruption’ because this is a term that has not been used much in the community.

Under **Focus Area IV** we suggest that a seventh bullet be added that says “ICANN seeks to be fiscally responsible in using community resources, i.e., using community provided funds in a cost effective manner, one where value-add justifies the amount spent. In addition, we suggest adding an eighth bullet that says “Funds intended for specific purposes shall not be commingled with general operational funds.”

Under **Focus Area V** the paper says that ICANN seeks to:

- “Clarify ICANN’s role with respect to the coordination of the global Internet’s systems of unique identifiers to ensure we keep pace with an evolving Internet ecosystem, including in key areas relating to: consumers, security, compliance / regulatory, public

interest, business innovation, and intellectual property rights.” If intellectual property rights are listed, shouldn’t individual user rights be added as well? Also, we question whether ‘consumers’ should be listed. Certainly consumers of Internet domain names and numbers are part of the ecosystem so in that sense it is fine but would probably be better named as ‘domain name and number holders’ and it would be appropriate to include Internet users in general. We think it is wise to avoid any implication that ICANN should be a consumer protection agency, something that some in the community want but something that is outside of ICANN’s mission.

- “Ensure ICANN’s role is clear, recognized, and well understood worldwide.” – We fully support this.
- “Develop a stable framework for Internet governance.” – We suggest adding “as it relates to ICANN’s mission.”

Thanks for the opportunity to submit comments. We look forward to collaborating on the development of a 5-year strategic plan and are available if you have any questions.

## RySG Level of Support

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

1.1 # of Members in Favor:	18
1.2 # of Members Opposed:	0
1.3 # of Members that Abstained:	1
1.4 # of Members that did not vote	5

### 2. Minority Position(s): None

## General RySG Information

- Total # of eligible Voting RySG Members<sup>1</sup>: 24
- Total # of Voting and Non-voting RySG Members: 29
- Total # of Active Voting RySG Members<sup>2</sup>: 24

---

<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 (Article III, Membership, ¶ 1). The RySG Articles of Operations can be found at [http://gtdregistries.org/sites/gtdregistries.org/files/Charter\\_of\\_the\\_gTLD\\_Registries\\_Stakeholder\\_Group.pdf](http://gtdregistries.org/sites/gtdregistries.org/files/Charter_of_the_gTLD_Registries_Stakeholder_Group.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> Per the RySG 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

- Minimum requirement for supermajority of Active Voting Members: 16
- Minimum requirement for majority of Active Voting Members: 13
- # of Members that participated in this process: 29
- Names of Members that participated in this process:
  1. Afilias, Ltd.
  2. Charleston Road Registry (non-voting member)
  3. .CLUB Domains LLC
  4. CORE (non-voting member)
  5. Donuts Inc.
  6. DotAsia Organisation
  7. dotBERLIN GmbH & Co. KG
  8. dotCooperation
  9. Dot Kiwi Ltd.
  10. Dot Latin, LLC
  11. DotShabaka Registry
  12. dotStrategy Co.
  13. Employ Media LLC
  14. GMO Registry, Inc. (non-voting member)
  15. ICM Registry LLC
  16. Neustar, Inc.
  17. Public Interest Registry (PIR)
  18. Punkt.wien GmbH
  19. Societe Internationale de Telecommunication Aeronautiques (SITA)
  20. Telnic Limited
  21. TLDH Limited
  22. Top Level Design LLC
  23. Tralliance Registry Management Company (TRMC)
  24. Uniregistry Corp. (non-voting member)
  25. United TLD Holdco Ltd. (non-voting member)
  26. Universal Postal Union (UPU)
  27. VeriSign
  28. XYZ.COM LLC
  29. Zodiac
  
- Names & email addresses for points of contact
  - Chair: Keith Drazek, [kdrazek@verisign.com](mailto:kdrazek@verisign.com)
  - Alternate Chair: Paul Diaz, [pdiaz@pir.org](mailto:pdiaz@pir.org)
  - Secretariat: Cherie Stubbs, [Cherstubbs@aol.com](mailto:Cherstubbs@aol.com)
  - RySG representative for this statement: Chuck Gomes, [cgomes@verisign.com](mailto:cgomes@verisign.com)

---

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.