**GNSO gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group Statement**

**Issue: Community Input and Advice Process**

Date: October 25, 2012

Issue Document URL: http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/input-advice-function-24sep12-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).

**Community Input & Advice Function**

In fulfillment of Accountability and Transparency Review Team Recommendation No. 6, a document was produced that specifically set forth the topics that are subject to policy development processes, and those that are generally within the ICANN Board level Organizational Administration Function. While Recommendation 6 has been completed, the work performed identified an area in which improvement is required – how the Board obtains the advice that it needs from the ICANN community beyond the traditional public comment process. Recently, issues have surfaced where the Board has sought in-depth input or advice from the community, and has specifically requested portions of the community to come together for that purpose.

In order to guide advice from the community, the Board has posted the [Community Input and Advice Function Paper](http://www.icann.org/en/news/in-focus/accountability/input-advice-function-24sep12-en.pdf) that includes the questions set forth below. The answers of the RySG are indicated in red.

**Questions:**

**In order to clarify this function, here are some initial questions for community discussion:**

* Should standardized processes be created for the Board’s receipt of community input and advice?
	+ Yes, a standardized process or processes would ensure the transparent and predictable handling of:
		- requests from the Board for community input and advice
		- community responses to Board requests
		- unsolicited community input and advice to the Board
		- Board responses to community input and advice
* If so, should such a procedure be standardized across ICANN SOs/ACs, aligned with the current existing procedures, or should there be some flexibility among the SOs/ACs (certain parts are required for all, while other parts may be developed by the respective SOs/ACs).
	+ To what ‘existing procedures’ does this question refer? Generally speaking, flexibility might be warranted but we need further clarification around the referenced ‘existing procedures’ to be able to consider and respond more effectively.
* How should the Board request this input and advice?
	+ Board requests for community input and advice should be made in a public manner while allowing sufficient time for the community to respond.
	+ It should also be possible for community groups to submit advice directly, i.e., not responding to a Board request.
* What is most effective and efficient method to deal with the issue topic identified? Should it be a working group, could current procedures be used? Who determines which method will be used?
	+ A working group can be effective in developing consensus among parties with divergent views, but, as in the case of the Vertical Integration WG, may not always succeed in reaching an agreed-to position.
	+ To what ‘current procedures’ does this question refer?
* Should working groups be chartered for each initiative?
	+ Not necessarily. Working groups can be effective but may not be efficient in every case.
* How are different parts of the ICANN community expected to work together in these efforts?
	+ The example of the Cross-Community Working Groups could be a good model for consideration.
	+ It would be helpful if a Cross-Community Working Group process were developed that contained guidelines to facilitate collaboration across multiple ICANN SOs and ACs.
* What minimum public consultation requirements, if any, should be required within this function?
	+ There should be a reasonable opportunity for public consultation, perhaps similar to the new reply period associated with existing formal public comment periods. This is particularly important in the event the community is divided or any working group is unable to reach consensus on input and advice to the Board.
	+ The Board should provide a timely reply to the advice received not only to acknowledge receipt of the input but also to explain how and why the advice was used or not used.
* Are there any topics that should not be subject to this function?
	+ Any topics that belong in a PDP should not be subject to a separate community input and advice process.
* Who within ICANN lead this effort?
	+ Without more detail about the process, it’s premature to determine who within ICANN should lead the effort. The answer will likely depend on the nature of the issue. It also remains to be determined whether the process should be “led” by ICANN the organization or led by participants in the ICANN community in a bottom-up consensus process, with the support of ICANN Staff.

**Sample Process (to date):**

**Used For:**

Circumstances where the outcome generally impacts the broader ICANN community, and the Board identifies that community input or guidance may be of use in further refinements or gathering expert opinion. An SO recommendation for a binding Consensus Policy (one that becomes applicable immediately through ICANN’s contracts) cannot be developed through this Process.

Some examples of where this Function has already been used within ICANN:

• Development of implementation guidelines to clarify, modify, or fill in gaps in newly adopted policies, such as the work of the Special Trademark Issues (STI) team and the Limited Public Interest Objection working group for the New gTLD Program

• Cross-community Working groups such as the Joint Applicant Support Working Group and joint work on single character internationalized domain names

• The ICANN Board’s call for community input on the definition, measures and targets for the promotion of competition, consumer trust and consumer choice to help guide further work under the Affirmation of Commitments

**RySG Level of Support**

1. **Level of Support of Active Members**: [Supermajority]
	1. # of Members in Favor: 13
	2. # of Members Opposed: 0
	3. # of Members that Abstained: 0
	4. # of Members that did not vote: 1
2. **Minority Position**(s): N/A

**General RySG Information**

* + - Total # of eligible RySG Members[[1]](#footnote-1): 14
		- Total # of RySG Members: 14
		- Total # of Active RySG Members[[2]](#footnote-2): 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. Afilias (.info, .mobi & .pro)
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. Societe Internationale de Telecommunication Aeronautiques – SITA (.aero)
11. Telnic (.tel)
12. Tralliance Registry Management Company (TRMC) (.travel)
13. Universal Postal Union (.post)
14. VeriSign (.com, .name, & .net)
* Names & email addresses for points of contact
	+ Chair: Keith Drazek, kdrazek@verisign.com
	+ Alternate Chair: Paul Diaz, pdiaz@pir.org
	+ Secretariat: Cherie Stubbs, Cherstubbs@aol.com
	+ RySG representative for this statement: Keith Drazek, kdrazek@verisign.com
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 (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 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)