GNSO gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group Statement

Issue: Formulation of 2012-2015 Strategic Plan

Date: 29 August 2011

Issue Document URL: http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-29jul11-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).

The RySG appreciates the opportunity to participate in this request for public comments to help complete ICANN's SWOT analysis for the formulation of the 2012-2015 Strategic Plan. Our comments are organized according to the seven key areas that ICANN leadership highlighted and are presented in the suggested SWOT format for each of these areas plus general comments on the strategic plan.

1. Policy development process (including, for example, Whois and IDNs)

Strengths	Opportunities
• The newly approved GNSO working group model and the nearly complete revised GNSO PDP provide opportunity for total community participation and tested guidelines for facilitating the process.	• Recent progress with regard to Board/GAC communications about new gTLDs hopefully sets the stage for exploring ways to involve the GAC earlier in the process.
Weaknesses	**Threats**
• An ongoing problem is the difficulty of getting early GAC involvement in the process.	• Many in the community judge the policy process to be a failure if no consensus is reached or if a less than 100% consensus is reached; this sometimes leads to working around the bottom-up process or threatening other actions that would invalidate the process.

2. Multi-stakeholder model (including new stakeholders, balancing of input)

Strengths	Opportunities
• The current GNSO Council model provides for balanced input from non-contracted and contracted parties so that parties who are required to implement consensus policies have a reasonable opportunity to participate in the process regarding implementation and business issues. • The PDP and working group model are open to any interested stakeholders.	• The new gTLD program offers the chance to expand contracted parties into areas of the world that have been seriously underrepresented in the GNSO. • Educational resources to help newcomers come up to speed could make it more realistic for them to participate (e.g., note the recommendations made by the GNSO Constituency & Stakeholder Group work team regarding outreach).
Weaknesses	**Threats**
• Participating in ICANN processes is time consuming and many stakeholders cannot afford to spend the time needed to effectively participate.	• Some stakeholders in certain parts of the world prefer a governmental model over the ICANN private sector led approach because their governments already have established mechanisms for participating in other forums.

3. Globalization/Internationalization of ICANN (including the role of governments)

Strengths	Opportunities
• The recent progress made in Board/GAC communications for new gTLDs provides a foundation for more effective involvement of governments going forward. • Introduction of IDN ccTLDs and pending introduction of IDN gTLDs meet a long standing need.	• Anything that can be done to expedite adoption of IDNA2008 in applications would be very welcome. • Cooperation with the IETF regarding IDN email standards should be encouraged. • It is critical to keep the momentum going regarding GAC/Board communications and to try to expand it into the policy development arena.

Weaknesses	Threats
• It may take years for the IDN user experience to be ideal at the application level; email is a key application.	• Some governments may continue to push for a governmental model instead of the ICANN model.

4. **Underdeveloped nation participation (including how to increase participation)**

Strengths	Opportunities
• Several underdeveloped nations have become active in the GAC. • The GAC provides a framework for all governments to participate.	• It might be useful to explore ways of collaborating with underdeveloped nations that have successfully integrated into the GAC with the goal of encouraging other underdeveloped nations to do the same. • Exploring ways to involve broader participation of more GAC members in GAC activities could be beneficial (e.g., ensuring that GAC working groups include more participants from underdeveloped nations). • Helping all GAC members, including underdeveloped nations, better understand ICANN processes and how governments can participate could make it easier for new players to participate.
Weaknesses	**Threats**
• GAC activity is often dominated by representatives from developed countries. • Some governments appear to have difficulty integrating into a global representative system where they are on a relatively level playing field with private sector organizations.	• Frustration coming from lack of understanding of ICANN processes and having insufficient resources (time, people, funding) may motivate some to support intergovernmental forums instead of the ICANN model.

5. DNS stability, security and resiliency (including DNNSEC adoption and RPKI deployment)

Strengths	Opportunities
• The DNSSEC progress made in the past few years lays a critical foundation. • The cooperation in the ICANN community with regard to SSR issues facilitates effective problem solving and planning.	• Providing SSR training and consulting services, including DDNSEC, can make it easier for implementing solutions by resource limited entities. • Cooperation with SSR organizations inside and outside the ICANN community is critical.
Weaknesses	**Threats**
• Because some SSR issues (including DNSSEC) involve significant costs without corresponding revenue opportunities, it can be challenging for smaller businesses and registrants to make the business case for implementing SSR solutions.	• Internet criminal conduct and other activities that challenge the structure of the Internet and trust in it will be an ongoing and ever-changing problem because of evolving techniques and avenues.

6. **Introducing more competition, building consumer trust and choice (including the stable launch of a timely, predictable, reliable new gTLD process)**

Strengths	Opportunities
- An extensive six-year process involving large numbers of diverse stakeholders got us to where we are for new gTLDs. - There are large numbers of checks and balances built into the new gTLD process. - The possibility for innovation that has been a characteristic of the Internet for the last two decades will be advanced further with new gTLDs. - Consumer choice will be significantly expanded through the addition of new gTLDs. - Competition at the registry level has the chance of expanding significantly beyond the artificial constraints that have existed for years.	- We will all have opportunity to participate in the process and thereby make it work better. - For the first time, we will be able to empirically evaluate the demand for new gTLDs. - We will have opportunity to make the new gTLD process better going forward. - We will be able to more effectively meet the demand of the majority of the world who do not use Latin scripts.
Weaknesses	**Threats**
- There is risk that the new gTLD guidebook may discourage maximum expansion of IDN gTLDs especially for underserved language communities. - The complication and costs of the new gTLD process may limit participation to mostly financially well-positioned organizations. - Support of smaller gTLDs by online vendors remains a problem potentially undermining trust in new gTLDs if that issue is not addressed.	- Some stakeholders in the community who did not get everything they wanted in the new gTLD process continue to search for new avenues to get their way without respect for those who have differing views or for the bottom-up process. - As with any large scale change, there are risks because of criminal activity and selfish interests. - Possibility of the failure of some new gTLDs could undermine consumer trust in investing in new gTLD domains as their primary Internet identity.

7. **Strategic metrics (to measure performance and ensure project goals are aligned with strategic objectives)**

Strengths	Opportunities
• The recommendations of the AoC ATRT contribute to the need for strategic metrics.	• The easiest and most meaningful metrics are comparisons of previous plans and budgets to actual results achieved, but this has never been done effectively; it is understood that one year's plan has to be approved before the previous year's results are finalized, but reporting results achieved over several years could provide helpful trend information.
Weaknesses	**Threats**
• There has been a lot of talk the last few years about the need for measurable objectives, but very little has happened. • It has never been easily possible to use previous year actual results for development of the next year's plan because of the time lag in reporting previous year actual.	• Without strategic metrics, it is too easy to spin results as successful, and that will lead to lack of confidence and provide less data to guide improvements. • Risk that different constituencies may develop different metrics to measure the same thing."

8. **General comments on Strategic Plan**

Strengths	Opportunities
• The strategic plan process was refined several years ago, has been implemented well for several years and syncs well with the operating plan and budget development process.	• There is lots of expertise in the community that could be used to develop process and reporting mechanisms that would facilitate evaluation of strategic objectives and assist in trend analysis.

Weaknesses	Threats
• It is not easy for community members to evaluate progress against strategic objectives and their related tactical goals because little public follow-up analysis is done after a FY is finished and a new FY started. • Has there been <u>any</u> substantive public review of results?	• Without thoughtful strategic planning, there is the risk that ICANN will function in primarily a reactionary manner and thereby be behind the power curve in adjusting to the fast changing Internet world.

RySG Level of Support

1. **Level of Support of Active Members**: Majority

    1.1. # of Members in Favor: 8

    1.2. # of Members Opposed: 0

    1.3. # of Members that Abstained: 0

    1.4. # of Members that did not vote: 6

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

General RySG Information

- Total # of eligible RySG Members[1]: 15

- Total # of RySG Members: 14

- Total # of Active RySG Members[2]: 14

---

[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

[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

- 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: 14
    1. Afilias (.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
    o Chair: David Maher, dmaher@pir.org
    o Vice Chair: Keith Drazek, kdrazek@verisign.com
    o Secretariat: Cherie Stubbs, Cherstubbs@aol.com
    o RySG representative for this statement: Chuck Gomes, cgomes@verisign.com

---

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.