

GNSO gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group Statement

Issue: Final GNSO Working Group Guidelines approved by the PPSC on 10 December 2010

Date: 8 February 2011

URL: - <http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-18jan11-en.htm>

The ICANN GNSO gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG) appreciates this opportunity to comment on the Final GNSO Working Group Guidelines approved by the Policy Process Steering Committee on 10 December 2010 (Guidelines). The comments that follow represent a consensus position of the RySG as further detailed at the end of the document. The RySG positions were arrived at through a combination of RySG email list discussion and RySG meetings (including teleconference meetings).

Note: If not otherwise mentioned, Guidelines sections are listed in parentheses for reference.

1. Introduction – The RySG compliments the members of the Working Group Work Team and the Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC) for the extensive efforts to develop the Guidelines and expresses appreciation and thanks for those efforts.
2. Endorsement of Particular Guidelines - The RySG specifically endorses the following elements of the Guidelines:
 - 2.1. The guidelines are written to apply to any chartering organization, not just the GNSO (1.3). While GNSO groups should benefit greatly from these Guidelines, their applicability should also prove useful for other groups in the ICANN community (e.g., cross SO groups and community working groups).
 - 2.2. The recommendation for regular review and revision of the Guidelines encourages continuous improvement as new lessons are learned (1.4).
 - 2.3. Reaching out and providing relevant WG information to as broad an audience of prospective volunteers as possible is important to increase the chances that a group will be representative of all impacted parties (2.1.1).
 - 2.4. Specifically enumerating roles and responsibilities for leaders, staff and working group members in Section 2 and describing norms in Section 3 should prove helpful in facilitating quicker startup as well as ongoing effectiveness of working groups.
 - 2.5. In addition to the specific procedures and requirements included in the Guidelines, it is helpful that they were also developed with considerable flexibility to accommodate the large variety of circumstances and challenges that working groups may face.
3. Suggested Edits – The following edits are suggested for possible consideration:
 - 3.1. It seems likely that the GNSO Council will make changes to the GNSO Council Operating Procedures that will eliminate the concept of Disclosures of Interest so it might make sense to modify Sections 2.1.2 and 6.2.3.4 in that regard.

- 3.2. The last two sentences of the first paragraph in Section 2.1.4.2 say: “If there are any objections to the selected Chair, the [Chartering Organization (CO)] will conduct a vote to establish whether there is majority support for the selected Chair. If there is no majority support, the Working Group will be requested to reconsider their choice for Chair and return to the CO with a new proposal.” To fit the GNSO bicameral voting thresholds while still orienting the Guidelines to other groups as well, these sentences could be changed to the following: “If there are any objections to the selected Chair, the CO will conduct a vote to establish whether there is **sufficient** support for the selected Chair **according to the voting procedures of the CO**. If **not**, the Working Group will be requested to reconsider their choice for Chair and return to the CO with a new proposal.”
4. Possible Areas of Clarification – The following areas may need clarification:
- 4.1. The description of the Liaison role in Section 2.2 says “The liaison is expected to play a neutral role, . . .” Does this mean that the liaison may not participate as a representative of his/her SG or constituency or as an individual participant separate from his/her liaison role? Would it work to rephrase this to say, “The liaison is expected to **fulfill the liaison role in a neutral manner**, . . .”? Note that this also applies to the first bullet on page 28 of Section 6.1. of the Charter Guidelines.
- 4.2. The first paragraph on page 21 of Section 4.1 says: “Apart from face-to-face sessions during ICANN meetings, WGs might decide that it is vital for its deliberations and/or reaching consensus to meet in person for a certain amount of time (e.g. day, two days). If funding is required to organize such a meeting (e.g. travel expenses), a request should be made to the Chartering Organization for approval with as much advance notice as possible.” It might be helpful to insert a footnote that briefly points out that the ICANN budget is finalized and approved in advance of each fiscal year so if general funds are not available for a need like this, it may be difficult to obtain funding.
- 4.3. Section 6.2.4.2 states that this section of the charter should “specify if there is a requirement for status updates at set times, e.g. two weeks prior to an ICANN meeting.” It might be a good idea to insert a footnote that explains the Board policy requiring 15 working day advance posting of documents that will be considered during ICANN international public meetings.

RySG Level of Support

- **Level of Support of Active Members:** Supermajority
 - # of Members in Favor: 9
 - # of Members Opposed: 0
 - # of Members that Abstained: 0
 - # of Members that did not vote: 4
1. **Minority Position(s):** N/A

General RySG Information

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

ⁱ 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 Articles of Operation, Article III, Membership, ¶ 1). The RySG Articles of Operation can be found at <<http://gnso.icann.org/files/gnso/en/improvements/registries-sg-proposed-charter-30jul09-en.pdf>>. The Universal Postal Union recently concluded the .POST agreement with ICANN, but as of this writing the UPU has not applied for RySG membership.

ⁱⁱ Per the RySG Articles of Operation, Article III, Membership, ¶ 6: 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 RySG meeting or voting process for a total of three consecutive meetings or voting processes or both. 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 RySG meeting or by voting.