

ICANN 16 OCTOBER 2014 BOARD MEETING  
Board Papers

---



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**Agenda Table**.....p. 2-4

**Consent Agenda**

Redelegation of .MK ccTLD and delegation of the .mқд domain.....p. 5-16

Delegation of the ზ Ⴁ (“ge”) domain representing Georgia.....p. 17-26

Appointment of 2015 Nominating Committee Chair-Elect.....p. 27-29

Registrars Stakeholder Group Charter Amendments.....p. 30-31

**Main Agenda**

Introduction of Two-character Domain Names in New gTLD Namespace.....p. 32-40

ICANN Strategic Plan for fiscal years 2016-2020.....p. 41-44

**Draft Resolutions Document**.....p. 45-73

**Notice**.....p. 74-75

## AGENDA – 16 OCTOBER 2014 REGULAR BOARD Meeting – 60 minutes

Last Updated 6 October

Time, etc.	Agenda Item	Shepherd	Expected Action	Move/Second Speak
<b>Recognize Departing Community Members on Stage</b>  10 min	Prior to official call to order of Public Board Meeting, Brief Acknowledgement of Departing Community Members via recognition ceremony during break (brief remarks and group photo) – led by Policy Dept.	Policy Department (brief remarks by Steve Crocker)	Recognition Photo	
<b>Assembly, Roll Call &amp; Consent Agenda Vote</b>	<b>1. Consent Agenda</b>			Introduce/Move Consent: TBD Second: TBD
20 min	1.a. Approval of Minutes of 9 September 2014 Board Mtg.	Steve Crocker	Approval	
	1.b. Redlegation of .MK ccTLD and delegation of the .mkd domain representing the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	Kuo-Wei Wu	Approval	
	1.c. Delegation of the გე (“ge”) domain representing Georgia	Kuo-Wei Wu	Approval	

## AGENDA – 16 OCTOBER 2014 REGULAR BOARD Meeting – 60 minutes

Last Updated 6 October

Time, etc.	Agenda Item	Shepherd	Expected Action	Move/Second Speak
	1.d. Appointment of 2015 Nominating Committee Chair-Elect	Bruce Tonkin	Approval	
	1.e. Registrars Stakeholder Group Charter Amendments	Ray Plzak	Approval	
	1.f. ICANN Meeting dates 2016-2020	Sébastien Bachollet, Chris Disspain	Approval	
	1.g. Thank You to Departing Community Members (recognized prior to start of public board meeting)	Steve Crocker	Approval	
	1.h. Thank you to Sponsors of ICANN 51 Meeting	Steve Crocker	Approval	
	1.i. Thank you to Interpreters, Staff, Event and Hotel Teams of ICANN 51 Meeting	Cherine Chalaby	Approval	
	<b>2. Main Agenda</b>			

## AGENDA – 16 OCTOBER 2014 REGULAR BOARD Meeting – 60 minutes

Last Updated 6 October

Time, etc.	Agenda Item	Shepherd	Expected Action	Move/Second Speak
<b>Discussion &amp; Decision</b>	2.a. Thank you to the 2014 Nominating Committee Members	Bruce Tonkin	Approval	Move - Second - Speak -
	2.b. Introduction of Two-character Domain Names in the New gTLD Namespace	Cherine Chalaby	Approval	Move - Second - Speak -
<b>Discussion &amp; Decision (cont'd)</b>	2.c. ICANN Strategic Plan for fiscal years 2016 – 2020	Steve Crocker	Approval	Move - Second - Speak -
	Item Removed From Agenda			
30 min	Item Removed From Agenda			
	2.f. Thank you to Sébastien Bachollet for his service to the ICANN Board	Steve Crocker	Approval	Move - Second - Speak -
	2.g. Thank you to Bill Graham for his service to the ICANN Board	Steve Crocker	Approval	Move - Second - Speak -
	2.h. AOB			

**ICANN BOARD PAPER NO. 2014.10.16.1b**

**TITLE:** **Redelegation of the .MK domain and delegation of the .мкд domain representing the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the Macedonian Academic Research Network Skopje**

**PROPOSED ACTION:** **For Board Approval**

**IANA REFERENCE:** **754990 and 754991**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

As part of ICANN's responsibilities under the IANA Functions Contract, ICANN has prepared a recommendation to authorize the redelegation of the country-code top-level domain .MK, and delegation of .мкд top-level domain comprised of the ISO 3166-1 code representing the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the Macedonian Academic Research Network Skopje.

Sensitive Delegation Information

**PROPOSED RESOLUTION:**

Resolved (2014.10.16.xx), as part of the exercise of its responsibilities under the IANA Functions Contract, ICANN has reviewed and evaluated the request to redelegate the .MK country-code top-level domain and delegate the .мкд IDN country-code top-level domain to Macedonian Academic Research Network Skopje. The documentation demonstrates that the proper procedures were followed in evaluating the request.

Resolved (2014.10.16.xx), the Board directs that pursuant to Article III, Section 5.2 of the ICANN Bylaws, that certain portions of the rationale not appropriate for public distribution within the resolutions, preliminary report or minutes at this time due to contractual obligations, shall be withheld until public release is allowed pursuant to those contractual obligations.

## **PROPOSED RATIONALE:**

### **Why the Board is addressing the issue now?**

In accordance with the IANA Functions Contract, the ICANN staff has evaluated two requests for ccTLD redelegation and delegation, and is presenting its report to the Board for review. This review by the Board is intended to ensure that ICANN staff has followed the proper procedures.

### **What is the proposal being considered?**

The proposal is to approve two requests to IANA to assign and change the sponsoring organization (also known as the manager or trustee) of the .mkд and .MK country-code top-level domains to the Macedonian Academic Research Network Skopje.

### **Which stakeholders or others were consulted?**

In the course of evaluating a delegation and redelegation applications, ICANN staff consults with the applicant and other interested parties. As part of the application process, the applicant needs to describe consultations that were performed within the country concerning the ccTLD, and their applicability to their local Internet community.

### **What concerns or issues were raised by the community?**

Staff are not aware of any significant issues or concerns raised by the community in relation to this request.

### **What significant materials did the Board review?**

The Board reviewed the following IANA staff evaluations:

- The domains are eligible for continued delegation, as MK is an assigned alpha-2 code that is listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard for the country of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and mkд is the approved internationalized domain name string for the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia;
- The requests are consented by the existing sponsoring organization, Ministry of Foreign Affairs;

- The relevant government has been consulted and does not object;
- The proposed sponsoring organization and its contacts agree to their responsibilities for managing these domains;
- The proposals have demonstrated appropriate local Internet community consultation and support;
- The proposals do not contravene any known laws or regulations;
- The proposals ensure the domains are managed locally in the country, and are bound under local law;
- The proposed sponsoring organization has confirmed they will manage the domains in a fair and equitable manner;
- The proposed sponsoring organization has demonstrated appropriate operational and technical skills and plans to operate the domains;
- The proposed technical configuration meets IANA's various technical conformance requirements;
- No specific risks or concerns relating to Internet stability have been identified; and
- Staff have provided a recommendation that these requests be implemented based on the factors considered.

These evaluations are responsive to the appropriate criteria and policy frameworks, such as "Domain Name System Structure and Delegation" (RFC 1591) and "GAC Principles and Guidelines for the Delegation and Administration of Country Code Top Level Domains".

As part of the process established by the IANA Functions Contract, the "Delegation and Redelegation Report" will be published at <http://www.iana.org/reports> .

**What factors the Board found to be significant?**

The Board did not identify any specific factors of concern with these requests.

**Are there positive or negative community impacts?**

The timely approval of country-code domain name managers that meet the various public interest criteria is positive toward ICANN's overall mission, the local communities to which country-code top-level domains are designated to serve, and responsive to ICANN's obligations under the IANA Functions Contract.

**Are there financial impacts or ramifications on ICANN (strategic plan, operating plan, budget); the community; and/or the public?**

The administration of country-code delegations in the DNS root zone is part of the IANA functions, and the delegation action should not cause any significant variance on pre-planned expenditure. It is not the role of ICANN to assess the financial impact of the internal operations of country-code top-level domains within a country.

**Are there any security, stability or resiliency issues relating to the DNS?**

ICANN does not believe these requests pose any notable risks to security, stability or resiliency.

This is an Organizational Administrative Function not requiring public comment.

**SIGNATURE BLOCK:**

Submitted by:	Kim Davies
Position:	IANA Function Liaison for Root Zone Management
Date Noted:	26 September 2014
Email:	kim.davies@icann.org







## **Report on the Redlegation of the .MK domain and Delegation of the .мкд domain representing the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to Macedonian Academic Research Network Skopje**

26 September 2014

This report is being provided under the contract for performance of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) function between the United States Government and the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN). Under that contract, ICANN performs the “IANA functions”, which include receiving delegation and redelegation requests concerning TLDs, investigating the circumstances pertinent to those requests, making its recommendations, and reporting actions undertaken in connection with processing such requests.

### **FACTUAL INFORMATION**

#### **Country**

The “MK” ISO 3166-1 code is designated for use to represent the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

#### **String**

This report discusses two strings:

1. The “MK” string, under consideration for redelegation, represents the ISO 3166-1 alpha-2 code for the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.
2. The “мкд” string, under consideration for delegation, is represented in ASCII-compatible encoding according to the IDNA specification as “xn--d1alf”. The individual Unicode code points that comprise this string are U+043C U+043A U+0434. The string transliterates to “mkd” in English. The string is expressed using the Cyrillic script.

#### **Chronology of events**

The following report presents findings on the request to redelegate the .MK country code top-level domain and the request to delegate the “мкд” string as a country code top-level domain representing the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. The report combines both requests, as most of the documentation presented for each is identical.

The currently designated manager for the .MK top-level domain is the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, as described in the IANA Root Zone Database.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs was the designated domain manager when the ccTLD .MK was delegated, however, the Macedonian Academic Research Network (MARnet), a department of the Computer Center at the Saints Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje, who performed the actual operations and management of .MK.

In January 2011, as the responsibilities for managing the .MK ccTLD grew, a new public entity named Macedonian Academic Research Network Skopje was formed. Macedonian Academic Research Network Skopje is the proposed sponsoring organization in this request. As a separate public entity, the Macedonian Academic Research Network Skopje is responsible for developing, organizing and managing the telecommunication network in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, as well as managing the .MK top-level domain.

The Macedonian Academic Research Network Skopje continued the work of MARnet in managing the .MK ccTLD with the same technical and administrative staff.

In its efforts to establish the IDN ccTLD for the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the Macedonian Academic Research Network Skopje facilitated a consensus-building process that resulted in the selection of .мкд as the string to represent the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. The string “мкд” in the Cyrillic script represent the letters “mkd” in the Latin script. The string selection process had a suggestion-gathering period from 29 November 2012 to 3 December 2012, and a voting period from 15 December 2012 to 15 January 2013.

On 3 September 2013, Macedonian Academic Research Network Skopje applied for string .мкд to represent the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia through the IDN ccTLD Fast Track process.

On 14 April 2014, review by the IDN Fast Track DNS Stability Panel found that “the applied-for strings ... present none of the threats to the stability or security of the DNS identified in [the IDN Fast Track implementation plan] ... and present an acceptably low risk of user confusion”. The request for the string to represent the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia was subsequently approved.

In April 2014, the Macedonian Academic Research Network Skopje commenced a request to ICANN for the redelegation of the .MK top-level domain and the delegation of the .мкд top-level domain.

### **Proposed Sponsoring Organization and Contacts**

The proposed sponsoring organization and contacts are the same for both .mk and .мкд.

The proposed sponsoring organization is the Macedonian Academic Research Network Skopje, a public entity established in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

The proposed administrative contact is Sasho Dimitrijoski, Director of the Macedonian Academic Research Network Skopje. The administrative contact is understood to be based in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

The proposed technical contact is Novak Novakov, Responsible in the DNS department, Macedonian Academic Research Network Skopje.

## **EVALUATION OF THE REQUEST**

### **String Eligibility**

The .MK string is eligible for continued delegation under ICANN policy, as the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia is presently listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard with the assigned code MK.

The .mkд string has been deemed an appropriate representation of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia through the ICANN Fast Track String Selection process.

### **Public Interest**

Support statements for the applications to redelegate .MK and delegate .mkд were provided by Ivo Ivanovski, the Minister of Information Society and Administration. Additional statements in support of both the redelegation and delegation requests were provided by the following:

- Zoran Petrov, the Deputy Minister of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs;
- Sinisha Naumoski, a representative of Academy of Banking and Information Technology Skopje;
- Gjore Dimov, director of PROCESS IN, an agency of intellectual and IT services and marketing;
- Blage Petrusevski, manager of MKhost, a web hosting company who also engages in domain registration and web development;
- Aneta Antova Peseva, CEO of ULTRANET DOO Skopje, an Internet service provider;
- Nenad Fidanovski, CEO of Global Net, a company specializes in software development; and
- Zoran Sapkarev, IT manager of ONE Telecommunications, a telecommunications service provider.

The applications are consistent with known applicable local laws in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

The proposed sponsoring organization undertakes responsibility to operate the domains in a fair and equitable manner.

### **Based in country**

The proposed sponsoring organization is constituted in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. The proposed administrative contact is understood to be resident in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. The registry is to be operated in the country.

### **Stability**

The redelegation request is deemed uncontested, with the currently listed sponsoring organization consenting to the transfer.

Based on the information submitted, ICANN staff has not identified any stability issues that would warrant a transfer plan given the substantive operation is not changing. Macedonian Academic Research Network Skopje has been managing the .MK ccTLD since its initial delegation, at first under the name of “Macedonian Academic Research Network (MARnet)”, and later on as the Macedonian Academic Research Network Skopje after its establishment as a public entity. The latter continued managing this domain with the same technical and administrative staff..

### **Competency**

The application has provided satisfactory details on the technical and operational infrastructure and expertise that will be used to operate the .MK and .MKD domains. Proposed policies for management of the domains have also been tendered.

## **EVALUATION PROCEDURE**

ICANN is tasked with coordinating the Domain Name System root zone as part of a set of functions governed by a contract with the U.S. Government. This includes accepting and evaluating requests for delegation and redelegation of top-level domains.

A subset of top-level domains are designated for the local Internet communities in countries to operate in a way that best suits their local needs. These are known as country-code top-level domains (ccTLDs), and are assigned by ICANN to responsible trustees (known as “Sponsoring Organizations”) that meet a number of public-interest criteria for eligibility. These criteria largely relate to the level of support the trustee has from its local Internet community, its capacity to ensure stable operation of the domain, and its applicability under any relevant local laws.

Through ICANN’s IANA department, requests are received for delegating new ccTLDs, and redelegating or revoking existing ccTLDs. An investigation is performed on the circumstances pertinent to those requests, and, when appropriate, the requests are implemented and a recommendation for delegation or redelegation is made to the U.S. National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA).

### **Purpose of evaluations**

The evaluation of eligibility for ccTLDs, and of evaluating responsible trustees charged with operating them, is guided by a number of principles. The objective of the assessment is that the action enhances the secure and stable operation of the Internet’s unique identifier systems.

In considering requests to delegate or redelegate ccTLDs, input is sought regarding the proposed new Sponsoring Organization, as well as from persons and organizations that may be significantly affected by the change, particularly those within the nation or territory to which the ccTLD is designated.

The assessment is focused on the capacity for the proposed sponsoring organization to meet the following criteria:

- The domain should be operated within the country, including having its sponsoring organization and administrative contact based in the country.
- The domain should be operated in a way that is fair and equitable to all groups in the local Internet community.
- Significantly interested parties in the domain should agree that the prospective trustee is the appropriate party to be responsible for the domain, with the desires of the national government taken very seriously.
- The domain must be operated competently, both technically and operationally. Management of the domain should adhere to relevant technical standards and community best practices.
- Risks to the stability of the Internet addressing system must be adequately considered and addressed, particularly with regard to how existing identifiers will continue to function.

### **Method of evaluation**

To assess these criteria, information is requested from the applicant regarding the proposed sponsoring organization and method of operation. In summary, a request template is sought specifying the exact details of the delegation being sought in the root zone. In addition, various documentation is sought describing: the views of the local internet community on the application; the competencies and skills of the trustee to operate the domain; the legal authenticity, status and character of the proposed trustee; and the nature of government support for the proposal. The view of any current trustee is obtained, and in the event of a redelegation, the transfer plan from the previous sponsoring organization to the new sponsoring organization is also assessed with a view to ensuring ongoing stable operation of the domain.

After receiving this documentation and input, it is analyzed in relation to existing root zone management procedures, seeking input from parties both related to as well as independent of the proposed sponsoring organization should the information provided in the original application be deficient. The applicant is given the opportunity to cure any deficiencies before a final assessment is made.

Once all the documentation has been received, various technical checks are performed on the proposed sponsoring organization's DNS infrastructure to ensure name servers are properly configured and are able to respond to queries correctly. Should any anomalies be detected, ICANN staff will work with the applicant to address the issues.

Assuming all issues are resolved, an assessment is compiled providing all relevant details regarding the proposed sponsoring organization and its suitability to operate the relevant top-level domain.



**ICANN BOARD PAPER NO. 2014.10.16.1c**

**TITLE:** **Delegation of the ჯჯ (“ge”) domain representing Georgia in Georgian (Mkhedruli) script to the Information Technologies Development Center**

**PROPOSED ACTION:** **For Board Approval**

**IANA REFERENCE:** **773166**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

As part of ICANN’s responsibilities under the IANA Functions Contract, ICANN has prepared a recommendation to authorize the delegation of the country-code top-level domain ჯჯ (“ge”), comprised of the IDN ccTLD Fast Track approved string representing Georgia, to the Information Technologies Development Center (ITDC).

Sensitive Delegation Information

## **PROPOSED RESOLUTION:**

Resolved (2014.10.16.xx), as part of the exercise of its responsibilities under the IANA Functions Contract, ICANN has reviewed and evaluated the request to delegate the 80 country-code top-level domain to the Information Technologies Development Center (ITDC). The documentation demonstrates that the proper procedures were followed in evaluating the request.

Resolved (2014.10.16.xx), the Board directs that pursuant to Article III, Section 5.2 of the ICANN Bylaws, that certain portions of the rationale not appropriate for public distribution within the resolutions, preliminary report or minutes at this time due to contractual obligations, shall be withheld until public release is allowed pursuant to those contractual obligations.

## **PROPOSED RATIONALE:**

### **Why the Board is addressing the issue now?**

In accordance with the IANA Functions Contract, the ICANN staff has evaluated a request for ccTLD delegation and is presenting its report to the Board for review. This review by the Board is intended to ensure that ICANN staff has followed the proper procedures.

### **What is the proposal being considered?**

The proposal is to approve a request to IANA to create the country-code top-level domain and assign the role of sponsoring organization (also known as the manager or trustee) to Information Technologies Development Center (ITDC).

### **Which stakeholders or others were consulted?**

In the course of evaluating a delegation application, ICANN staff consults with the applicant and other interested parties. As part of the application process, the applicant needs to describe consultations that were performed within the country concerning the ccTLD, and their applicability to their local Internet community.

### **What concerns or issues were raised by the community?**

Staff are not aware of any significant issues or concerns raised by the community in relation to this request.

### **What significant materials did the Board review?**

The Board reviewed the following IANA staff evaluations:

- The domain is eligible for delegation, as it is a string that has been approved by the IDN ccTLD Fast Track process, and represents a country that is listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard;
- The relevant government has been consulted and does not object;
- The proposed sponsoring organization and its contacts agree to their responsibilities for managing this domain;
- The proposal has demonstrated appropriate local Internet community consultation and support;
- The proposal does not contravene any known laws or regulations;
- The proposal ensures the domain is managed locally in the country, and is bound under local law;
- The proposed sponsoring organisation has confirmed they will manage the domain in a fair and equitable manner;
- The proposed sponsoring organisation has demonstrated appropriate operational and technical skills and plans to operate the domain;
- The proposed technical configuration meets IANA's various technical conformance requirements;
- No specific risks or concerns relating to Internet stability have been identified; and
- Staff have provided a recommendation that this request be implemented based on the factors considered.

These evaluations are responsive to the appropriate criteria and policy frameworks, such as "Domain Name System Structure and Delegation" (RFC 1591) and "GAC Principles and

Guidelines for the Delegation and Administration of Country Code Top Level Domains".

As part of the process established by the IANA Functions Contract, the "Delegation and Redefinition Report" will be published at <http://www.iana.org/reports>.

**What factors the Board found to be significant?**

The Board did not identify any specific factors of concern with this request.

**Are there positive or negative community impacts?**

The timely approval of country-code domain name managers that meet the various public interest criteria is positive toward ICANN's overall mission, the local communities to which country-code top-level domains are designated to serve, and responsive to ICANN's obligations under the IANA Functions Contract.

**Are there financial impacts or ramifications on ICANN (strategic plan, operating plan, budget); the community; and/or the public?**

The administration of country-code delegations in the DNS root zone is part of the IANA functions, and the delegation action should not cause any significant variance on pre-planned expenditure. It is not the role of ICANN to assess the financial impact of the internal operations of country-code top-level domains within a country.

**Are there any security, stability or resiliency issues relating to the DNS?**

ICANN does not believe this request poses any notable risks to security, stability or resiliency.

This is an Organizational Administrative Function not requiring public comment.

**SIGNATURE BLOCK:**

Submitted by: Kim Davies  
Position: IANA Function Liaison for Root Zone Management  
Date Noted: 26 September 2014  
Email: kim.davies@icann.org



## EXHIBIT A TO ICANN BOARD SUBMISSION NO. 2014-XX-XX-XX

# Report on the Delegation of the გე (“ge”) domain representing Georgia in Georgian (Mkhedruli) script to the Information Technologies Development Center (ITDC)

26 September 2014

This report is being provided under the contract for performance of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) function between the United States Government and the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN). Under that contract, ICANN performs the “IANA functions”, which include receiving delegation and redelegation requests concerning TLDs, investigating the circumstances pertinent to those requests, making its recommendations, and reporting actions undertaken in connection with processing such requests.

## FACTUAL INFORMATION

### Country

The “GE” ISO 3166-1 code is designated for use to represent Georgia.

### String

The domain under consideration for delegation at the DNS root level is “გე”. This is represented in ASCII-compatible encoding according to the IDNA specification as “xn--node”. The individual Unicode code points that comprise this string are U+10D2 U+10D4.

In Georgian language, the string has a transliteration equivalent to “ge” in English. The string is expressed using the Georgian (Mkhedruli) script.

### Chronology of events

In 2001, the Information Technologies Development Center (ITDC) was founded as a hosting service provider specializing in hosting servers management, IT consultations and development of custom web-based solutions.

On 4 June 2010 an application was made to the “IDN Fast Track” process to have the string “გე” recognised as representing Georgia. The request was supported by the Head of the Administration of the President of Georgia and seven ISPs in Georgia.

On 7 January 2011, review by the IDN Fast Track DNS Stability Panel found that "the applied-for string ... present none of the threats to the stability or security of the DNS

identified in Module 4 of the Fast Track implementation plan, and present an acceptably low risk of user confusion". The request for the string to represent the Georgia was subsequently approved.

On 11 August 2011, the Information Technologies Development Center (ITDC) commenced a request to ICANN for delegation of ".ge" as a top-level domain. Over the next three years, several delegation requests were submitted to IANA but none met all the delegation criteria.

In August 2012, a delegation report was submitted to the Board IANA Committee. The Committee reviewed it, but had questions about the operational and technical capabilities of the proposed operator. That request was administratively closed as ICANN staff waited for the applicants to gather the necessary supporting documentation.

On 2 May 2014, the applicants submitted an updated implementation plan, as this was one of the elements missing in the previous unsuccessful delegation request.

On 22 July 2014, the Information Technologies Development Center (ITDC) commenced the current request for delegation of ".ge" as a top-level domain.

### **Proposed Sponsoring Organisation and Contacts**

The proposed sponsoring organisation is Information Technologies Development Center (ITDC), an entity established in 2001 specializing in hosting servers management, IT consultation and development of custom web-based solutions.

The proposed administrative contact is George Garsevanishvili, Co-Owner/IT Director, ITDC. The administrative contact is understood to be based in Georgia.

The proposed technical contact is Konstantine Karosanidze, Technical Lead Administrator, ITDC.

## **EVALUATION OF THE REQUEST**

### **String Eligibility**

The top-level domain is eligible for delegation under ICANN policy, as the string has been deemed an appropriate representation of Georgia through the ICANN Fast Track String Selection process, and Georgia is presently listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard.

### **Public Interest**

The applicant states that Information Technologies Development Center (ITDC) was selected to become a manager of ".ge" as a result of consultations with the Administration of President of Georgia and with Georgian National Communications Commission.

Explicit government support for the application was provided in a letter signed by the former GAC representative Irakli Chikovani, the Chairman of the Georgian National

Communications Commission, the regulatory authority for electronic communications and broadcasting in Georgia.

Additional support was provided in a letter from JSC Silknet, a local company specializing in providing telecommunications packages.

The application is consistent with known applicable local laws in Georgia. The proposed sponsoring organisation undertakes to operate the domain in a fair and equitable manner.

### **Based in country**

The proposed sponsoring organisation is constituted in Georgia. The proposed administrative contact is understood to be resident in Georgia. The registry is to be operated in the country.

### **Stability**

The application does not involve a transfer of domain operations from an existing domain registry, and therefore stability aspects relating to registry transfer have not been evaluated.

The application is not known to be contested.

### **Competency**

The application has provided information on the technical and operational infrastructure and expertise that will be used to operate the proposed new domain. The provided information is mostly limited to a basic top-level overview of operations. The proposed operator is not the current manager of .GE country-code top-level domain for Georgia and lacks specific experience in operating a domain name registry. The applicants have asserted they have sufficient expertise in order to run a country code top-level domain. While the proposed operator lacks specific experience in operating a domain name registry, they have asserted they have sufficient comparable expertise. The small anticipated size of the registry is not expected to present scalability challenges that would necessitate further skills at delegation time.

Proposed policies for management of the domain have also been tendered.

## **EVALUATION PROCEDURE**

ICANN is tasked with coordinating the Domain Name System root zone as part of a set of functions governed by a contract with the U.S. Government. This includes accepting and evaluating requests for delegation and redelegation of top-level domains.

A subset of top-level domains are designated for the local Internet communities in countries to operate in a way that best suits their local needs. These are known as country-code top-level domains (ccTLDs), and are assigned by ICANN to responsible trustees (known as “Sponsoring Organisations”) that meet a number of public-interest



criteria for eligibility. These criteria largely relate to the level of support the trustee has from its local Internet community, its capacity to ensure stable operation of the domain, and its applicability under any relevant local laws.

Through ICANN's IANA department, requests are received for delegating new ccTLDs, and re delegating or revoking existing ccTLDs. An investigation is performed on the circumstances pertinent to those requests, and, when appropriate, the requests are implemented and a recommendation for delegation or redelegation is made to the U.S. National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA).

### **Purpose of evaluations**

The evaluation of eligibility for ccTLDs, and of evaluating responsible trustees charged with operating them, is guided by a number of principles. The objective of the assessment is that the action enhances the secure and stable operation of the Internet's unique identifier systems.

In considering requests to delegate or redelegate ccTLDs, input is sought regarding the proposed new Sponsoring Organisation, as well as from persons and organisations that may be significantly affected by the change, particularly those within the nation or territory to which the ccTLD is designated.

The assessment is focused on the capacity for the proposed sponsoring organisation to meet the following criteria:

- The domain should be operated within the country, including having its sponsoring organisation and administrative contact based in the country.
- The domain should be operated in a way that is fair and equitable to all groups in the local Internet community.
- Significantly interested parties in the domain should agree that the prospective trustee is the appropriate party to be responsible for the domain, with the desires of the national government taken very seriously.
- The domain must be operated competently, both technically and operationally. Management of the domain should adhere to relevant technical standards and community best practices.
- Risks to the stability of the Internet addressing system must be adequately considered and addressed, particularly with regard to how existing identifiers will continue to function.

### **Method of evaluation**

To assess these criteria, information is requested from the applicant regarding the proposed sponsoring organisation and method of operation. In summary, a request template is sought specifying the exact details of the delegation being sought in the root

zone. In addition, various documentation is sought describing: the views of the local internet community on the application; the competencies and skills of the trustee to operate the domain; the legal authenticity, status and character of the proposed trustee; and the nature of government support for the proposal. The view of any current trustee is obtained, and in the event of a redelegation, the transfer plan from the previous sponsoring organisation to the new sponsoring organisation is also assessed with a view to ensuring ongoing stable operation of the domain.

After receiving this documentation and input, it is analysed in relation to existing root zone management procedures, seeking input from parties both related to as well as independent of the proposed sponsoring organisation should the information provided in the original application be deficient. The applicant is given the opportunity to cure any deficiencies before a final assessment is made.

Once all the documentation has been received, various technical checks are performed on the proposed sponsoring organisation's DNS infrastructure to ensure name servers are properly configured and are able to respond to queries correctly. Should any anomalies be detected, ICANN staff will work with the applicant to address the issues.

Assuming all issues are resolved, an assessment is compiled providing all relevant details regarding the proposed sponsoring organisation and its suitability to operate the relevant top-level domain.

## ICANN BOARD SUBMISSION NO. 2014.10.16.1d

**TITLE:** Appointment of 2015 Nominating Committee Chair-Elect

**PROPOSED ACTION:** For Board Approval

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

The Board is being asked to consider the Board Governance Committee's (BGC) recommendation for the 2015 Nominating Committee (NomCom) Chair-Elect.

On 9 September 2014 the Board approved Stéphane Van Gelder as the 2015 Nominating Committee (NomCom) Chair. (See <https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#1.a>). At that same meeting, the Board acknowledged that the BGC was still in the process of interviewing some candidates for the 2015 Nominating Committee (NomCom) Chair-Elect; that process has now concluded.

### **BOARD GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:**

The BGC recommends that the Board appoint [INSERT NAME HERE] as the 2015 NomCom Chair-Elect.

### **PROPOSED RESOLUTION:**

Whereas, the Board Governance Committee (BGC) reviewed the Expressions of Interest from candidates for the 2015 Nominating Committee ("NomCom") Chair and Chair-Elect, considered the results of a 360-degree evaluation of the 2014 NomCom leadership, and evaluated responses to questions posed by the BGC to each candidate.

Whereas, on 9 September 2014 the Board appointed Stéphane Van Gelder as the 2015 NomCom Chair, and deferred appointing a Chair-Elect pending interviews of some of the candidates.

Whereas, the since 9 September 2014, the BGC has interviewed the top candidates for the 2015 NomCom Chair-Elect position and has recommended that the Board appoint [INSERT NAME HERE] as the Chair-Elect.

Resolved (2014.10.16.xx), the Board hereby appoints [INSERT NAME HERE] as the 2015 Nominating Committee Chair-Elect.

**PROPOSED RATIONALE:**

ICANN's Bylaws require the Board to appoint the Nominating Committee (NomCom) Chair and NomCom Chair-Elect. *See* Article VII, sections 2.1 and 2.2 at <http://www.icann.org/en/general/bylaws.htm#VII>. The Board has delegated the responsibility for recommending the NomCom Chair and Chair-Elect for Board approval to the Board Governance Committee (BGC). *See* BGC Charter at <http://www.icann.org/en/committees/board-governance/charter.htm>. The BGC twice posted a call for expressions of interest (EOI) (see <https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2-2014-07-01-en>), received and reviewed EOIs, oversaw a 360-degree evaluation of the 2014 NomCom leadership and conducted interviews with some of the candidates for the 2015 NomCom Chair-Elect.

On 9 September 2014, the Board appointed Stéphane Van Gelder as the 2015 Nominating Committee (NomCom) Chair. (See <https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#1.a>). The Board acknowledged at that time that the BGC was still in the process of interviewing some candidates for the 2015 Nominating Committee (NomCom) Chair-Elect, so the Board deferred its appointment of this position pending completion of the process, which has now concluded.

The BGC made its recommendation after careful consideration and discussion. The Board has considered and agrees with the BGC's recommendation for the 2015 NomCom Chair –Elect. The Board would like to thank all who expressed interest in becoming part of the NomCom leadership.

Appointing a NomCom Chair-Elect identified through a public EOI process positively affects the transparency and accountability of ICANN, as well as supports ICANN's overall mission. Adopting the BGC's recommendation has no financial impact on ICANN that was not otherwise anticipated, and will not negatively impact the security, stability and resiliency of the domain name system.

Submitted by: Amy A. Stathos  
Position: Deputy General Counsel  
Date Noted: 25 September 2014  
Email: amy.stathos@icann.org

**ICANN BOARD PAPER NO. 2014.10.16.1e**

**TITLE:** Registrars Stakeholder Group Charter Amendments

**PROPOSED ACTION:** Adopt Resolution to Approve the Proposed Registrars Stakeholder Group Charter Amendments

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

The ICANN Bylaws (Article X, Section 5.3) state, "Each Stakeholder Group shall maintain recognition with the ICANN Board." To provide a methodology for compliance with that requirement, the ICANN Board approved (Sep 2013) a [Process For Amending GNSO Stakeholder Group and Constituency Charters](#) (*hereinafter "Process"*), which establishes four phases to be executed prior to formal adoption of changes to an organizational charter (see Reference Material).

Earlier this year, the Registrars Stakeholder Group (RrSG) of the GNSO approved amendments to its governing documents and availed itself of the *Process*. The RrSG has adopted language changes and added new sections to its governing document to address and/or clarify leadership requirements; member voting rights; officer elections (one candidate); vacating offices due to subsequent ineligibility; directed voting of GNSO Councilors; and geographic diversity of GNSO Council representatives.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:**

The Structural Improvements Committee (SIC) has (a) reviewed the charter amendments and evaluated their consistency with ICANN principles as well as potential fiscal concerns; (b) confirmed that all necessary steps of the *Process* have been satisfied - including a Public Comment solicitation in which no community objections were received; and (c) adopted a formal SIC resolution recommending Board approval.

**PROPOSED RESOLUTION:**

Whereas, the Registrars Stakeholder Group (RrSG) of the GNSO has proposed a series of amendments to its governing Charter document;

Whereas, the RrSG, ICANN Staff, and the Structural Improvements Committee (SIC) have completed all requirements associated with the Board [Process For Amending GNSO Stakeholder Group and Constituency Charters](#);

Resolved (2014.10.16.xx), that the ICANN Board approves the Registrars Stakeholder Group Charter Amendments as documented in this paper and directs the Registrars Stakeholder Group and ICANN Staff to provide access to the new governing document on the appropriate web pages for the group.

**PROPOSED RATIONALE:**

The ICANN Bylaws (Article X, Section 5.3) state, "Each Stakeholder Group shall maintain recognition with the ICANN Board." The Board has interpreted this language to require that the ICANN Board formally approve any amendments to the governing documents of Stakeholder Groups (SG) and/or Constituencies in the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO).

In September 2013, the Board established a [Process For Amending GNSO Stakeholder Group and Constituency Charters](#) (*Process*) to provide a streamlined methodology for compliance with the Bylaws requirement.

The GNSO Registrars Stakeholder Group (RrSG), ICANN Staff, and the Structural Improvements Committee (SIC) completed all steps identified in the *Process* including a determination that the proposed charter amendments will not raise any fiscal or liability concerns for the ICANN organization and publication of the amendments for community review and comment (no objections received).

There is no anticipated impact from this decision on the security, stability and resiliency of the domain name system as a result of this decision.

**SIGNATURE BLOCK:**

Submitted by:	David Olive; Robert Hoggarth
Position:	Vice-President; Senior Director – Policy and Community Engagement
Date Noted:	26 September 2014
Email:	<a href="mailto:policy-staff@icann.org"><u>policy-staff@icann.org</u></a>



## ICANN BOARD PAPER NO. 2014.10.16.2b

**TITLE:** Introduction of Two-character Domain Names in the New gTLD Namespace

**PROPOSED ACTION:** For Board Approval

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

The Board is being asked to permit the release of certain two-character domain names that are currently required to be reserved by the New gTLD Registry Agreement.

Over the past six months, registry operators representing 207 new gTLDs have submitted requests pursuant to the Registry Services Evaluation Policy (RSEP) requesting the release of various combinations of two-character domain names, including: (a) number/number combinations; (b) letter/letter combinations not currently in use by a ccTLD, (c) all letter/letter combinations (regardless of whether the combination is in use by a ccTLD), and (d) letter/number combinations.

Amendments to the applicable Registry Agreements to implement the requests have been the subject of public comment.

At this time, the Board is being asked to take action to permit the release of number/number combinations, and letter/number combinations of two-character domain names. The Board is *not* being asked to approve letter/letter combinations at this time because the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) has indicated that some of its members raised concerns about the release of letter/letter combinations, in particular, as they may related to codes already assigned as ccTLDs, as well as codes that are not yet assigned. As a result, the GAC intends to consider the matter during ICANN 51 in Los Angeles and asked the Board to consider this timing as it handles the RSEP requests.

To note, several legacy gTLDs were previously permitted to release certain two-character domain names. In 2006, .name requested a limited release of reserved two-character names, which matter was referred to the Registry Services Technical Evaluation Panel (RSTEP). The RSTEP considered the security and stability impacts





of the proposal, which focused on unexpected responses being received from the DNS for both existing and non-existing domains, as well as simply user confusion where the idea of two letter second-level domains is unfamiliar. Based on the report of the RSTEP, internal experts and other public comments, no significant security and stability issues related to introduction of the proposal were identified, and the Board adopted a resolution on 16 January 2007 to authorize ICANN to amend the .name Registry Agreement to implement the proposed registry service. From 2007 to 2012, ICANN approved various proposals regarding the release of two-character domain names for 11 gTLDs (.jobs, .coop, .mobi, .biz, .pro, .cat, .info, .travel, .tel, .asia, and .org).

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends that the Board permit the release of two-character names composed of one or two numeric characters (letter/number and number/number combinations) which are currently required to be reserved in the New gTLD Registry Agreement. As determined by the 4 December 2006 RSTEP report, no significant risk has been identified for the stability and security of the DNS related to the release of two-character domain names. In addition, no issue was raised during public comments periods with respect to this specific subset of two-character names. To note, while the GAC has indicated that some GAC members have concerns with letter-letter combinations, there may be some letter-number combinations that may be seen as similar to country codes. As previously noted, there are limited concerns for user confusion as witnessed by current usage of two-character names in legacy TLDs as well as the history of ICANN approvals of releases of such names for legacy and sponsored gTLDs.

Staff also recommends that the Board postpone consideration of the release of two-character names composed of two letters until after the ICANN 51 meeting where the GAC intends to consider the matter of letter/letter two-character combinations. The GAC has specifically requested from the Board “*a pause in granting any exemptions from Specification 5*” while stating that it is only concerned with the “*subset of two-character labels consisting of letter-letter combinations*”.

#### **PROPOSED RESOLUTION:**



Resolution Text Superseded

**PROPOSED RATIONALE:**

**Why is the Board addressing the issue?**



Section 2 of Specification 5 (Schedule of Reserved Names) of the New gTLD Registry Agreement addresses reservations of two-character labels as follows:

*All two-character ASCII labels shall be withheld from registration or allocated to Registry Operator at the second level within the TLD. Such labels may not be activated in the DNS, and may not be released for registration to any person or entity other than Registry Operator, provided that such two-character label strings may be released to the extent that Registry Operator reaches agreement with the related government and country-code manager of the string as specified in the ISO 3166-1 alpha-2 standard. The Registry Operator may also propose the release of these reservations based on its implementation of measures to avoid confusion with the corresponding country codes, subject to approval by ICANN.*

In January 2014, New gTLD Registry Operators began submitting requests to ICANN through the Registry Services Evaluation Policy (RSEP) process proposing to implement a new registry service to release certain two-character domain names required to be reserved by the New gTLD Registry Agreement. The implementation of the proposals would require an amendment to the Exhibit A of the respective Registry Agreement. The proposed amendments to implement the new registry service were the subject of public comment periods over the past several months. In total, ICANN has posted 28 RSEP proposals and amendments which concern a total of 203 New gTLDs. ICANN continues to receive additional RSEP requests on a weekly basis for the same Registry Service.

Pursuant to Section 2.4.D of the RSEP and the RSEP Implementation Notes, if the implementation of a proposed service requires a material change to the Registry Agreement, the preliminary determination will be referred to the ICANN Board for consideration.

### **What is the proposal being considered?**

Rationale Text Superseded

### **Which stakeholders or others were consulted?**



As of 24 September 2014, ICANN staff initiated five (5) public comment forums to obtain feedback from the community on the amendments to implement the proposed new registry service: 12 June 2014 < <https://www.icann.org/public-comments/two-char-new-gtld-2014-06-12-en>>; 8 July 2014 <<https://www.icann.org/public-comments/two-char-new-gtld-2014-07-08-en>>; 23 July 2014 < <https://www.icann.org/public-comments/two-char-new-gtld-2014-07-23-en>>; 19 August 2014 < <https://www.icann.org/public-comments/two-char-new-gtld-2014-08-19-en>>; and 12 September 2014 < <https://www.icann.org/public-comments/two-char-new-gtld-2014-09-12-en>>. Various members of the community submitted comments, including the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) and registry operators.

In addition, ICANN notified the GAC when each request from a registry operator was posted for public comment.

### **What concerns or issues were raised by the community?**

There were several comments received during the public comment period indicating a series of arguments in favor of, or in opposition to, the general release of all or certain two-character names in the new gTLD namespace. The majority of the comments received were in favor for the release of the two character domain names.

The arguments made in opposition to the release of the two character domain names expressed two general concerns. The first concern is related to the general recognition and associated use of the two character domain names leading to user confusion or abuse. The second concern is how to specifically protect ccTLDs when country and territory names are newly formed.

Public comments received so far are overwhelmingly in favor of the introduction of two-character domain names in the new gTLD namespace. The arguments made in favor to the release of the two-character domain names were as follows:

- The introduction of two character domain names would increase competition since the current restrictions hinder competition, in particular for the New gTLDs which are competing with legacy TLDs (delegated prior to the 2012 New gTLD application round) who are allowed to offer such registrations. The current restrictions to the New gTLD Registry Operators create a



discriminatory situation which is contrary to the ICANN Bylaws Article II, Section 3 which provide for Non-Discriminatory Treatment of ICANN stakeholders.

- The introduction of two-character domain names poses a limited risk of confusion, or no risk at all, as demonstrated by prior use of two character domain names in existing TLDs.
- The release of certain types of two character domain names to include at least one digit or number, would not cause concern and may be considered for release.
- The release of two-character domain names would provide opportunities for companies and brands to have tailored segmented domain names to connect with the public as well as provide localized content, thus expanding consumer choice and driving economic growth, in particular in developing countries.
- The proposed registry service does not conflict with the Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPM) requirements document.
- There is uniform precedent regarding the release of two-character domain name in the history of relevant RSEP requests.
- The release of country codes and names is allowed by the Applicant Guidebook

The GAC has also raised some concerns about the release of certain two-character domain names. In its 27 March 2014 Singapore Communiqué, the GAC discussed the Brand Registry Group proposal for a streamlined process under an addendum to the Registry Agreement for the approval of country names and two letter and character codes at the second level. The GAC stated: “While the GAC has no major concerns about brand owners seeking approval for such names, but that this approval should be done directly with the countries concerned rather than through a GAC level operational process.” The GAC reported that individual GAC members could assist with proposals relevant to their particular country if requested. The GAC suggested that consideration be given to establishing a register of countries that do not require



individual requests to be made.

Rationale Text Superseded

**What significant materials did the Board review? What factors did the Board find to be significant?**

The Board reviewed several materials and also considered several significant factors during its deliberations about whether or not to approve the request. The significant materials and factors that the Board considered as part of its deliberations, included, but not limited to the following:

- [Introduction of Two-Character Domain names in the New gTLD Namespace Public Comment Period](#)
- [Introduction of Two-Character Domain Names for .DEALS, XN--FJQ720A, .CITY, .XYZ, .COLLEGE, .GOP, .TRADE, .WEBCAM, .BID, .HEALTHCARE, .WORLD, .BAND](#) (8 July 2014)
- [Introduction of Two-Character Domain Names for .LUXURY, .WANG, XN--3BST00M, XN--6QQ986B3XL, XN--CZR2D, XN--45Q11C, .BUILD, .REN, .PIZZA, .RESTAURANT, .GIFTS, .SARL, XN--55QX5D, XN--IO0A7I, and 20 TLDs associated with Top Level Domain Holdings Limited](#) (23 July 2014)
- [Introduction of Two-Character Domain Names for .JETZT, .GLOBAL, .NEUSTAR, .KIWI, .BERLIN](#) (12 September 2014)
- [Introduction of Two-Character Domain Names for .SOHU, .IMMO, .SAARLAND, .CLUB](#) (19 August 2014)
- [RSETP Report on Internet Security and Stability Implications of the .name proposal for the Limited Release of Initially Reserved Two-Character Names](#) (4 December 2006)
- [GAC Singapore Communiqué](#) (17 March 2014)
- [Letter from GAC Chair to ICANN Board](#) (8 August 2014)



- [Letter from Stephen Crocker to Heather Dryden](#) (02 September 2014)
- [Letter from Heather Dryden to Dr. Stephen Crocker](#) (10 September 2014)

**Are there positive or negative community impacts? Are there fiscal impacts or ramifications on ICANN (strategic plan, operating plan, budget); the community, and/or public? Are there any security, stability or resiliency issues relating to the DNS?**

The overall impact on the community is anticipated to be positive as new opportunities for diversification and competition in the gTLD namespace are created, while no specific risk of user confusion has been identified.

The eventual implementation of this Registry Service may have a fiscal impact on ICANN, the community or the public, as there may be additional costs associated with the broader implications of this Registry Service.

As determined by the ICANN Registry Services Technical Evaluation Panel (RSETP) in a 4 December 2006 report on proposed release of two-character domains in the .name gTLD, such a service does not create a reasonable risk of a meaningful adverse effect on security and stability.

**Is this either a defined policy process within ICANN's Supporting Organization or ICANN's Organizational Administrative Function decision requiring public comment or not requiring public comment?**

The Registry Services Evaluation Policy (RSEP) is an ICANN consensus policy, effective as of 15 August 2006. Consistent with the policy, ICANN posted the Registry Agreement amendments for public comment as the implementation of the proposed service required what was then considered a material change to the Registry Agreement. Following today's resolution, future RSEP proposals requesting the release of two-character names composed letter/number or number/number combinations will not be considered as requiring a material change to the Registry Agreement.



**Signature Block:**

Submitted by: Akram Atallah

Position: President, Global  
Domains Division

Date Noted: 3 October 2014

Email: [akram.atallah@icann.org](mailto:akram.atallah@icann.org)



**ICANN BOARD PAPER NO. 2014.10.16.2c**

**TITLE:** **ICANN Strategic Plan for fiscal years 2016 – 2020**

**PROPOSED ACTIONS:** **For Board Approval**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

As previously indicated, Board members’ final edits were incorporated in the Final Draft of the ICANN Five-Year Strategic Plan (FY16 – FY20) and it awaits formal Board approval. This is the final step in ICANN’s fourteen-month collaborative, multistakeholder and multilingual planning process. When the last comment period ended on 27 June, the CEO and Staff carefully considered public comments and Board guidance on the Draft Strategic Plan, conducted an in-depth review of ICANN’s activities, plans and finances, and produced an updated Final Draft Strategic Plan, which the Board discussed at the Istanbul workshop and subsequently edited.

ICANN’s Strategic Plan is intended to coalesce our global community around a new overarching vision and long-term objectives. The Strategic Plan: articulates ICANN’s Vision; restates ICANN’s original Mission (included in the Bylaws); and sets forth five carefully crafted Strategic Objectives, each with Strategic Goals, Key Success Factors (Outcomes), and Strategic Risks.

The complimentary Five-Year Operating Plan has been provided to the Board separately and will be addressed in the Board’s discussion about ICANN’s Planning Process. The Five-Year Operating Plan details—for each Strategic Objective and Goal—portfolios of ICANN activities, key operational success factors (outcomes), risks, key performance indicators (measurements), key dependencies, and phasing over five years (through FY2020) (at the Goal level).

ICANN’s proposed “rolling” Planning Process, which will be discussed at the Board’s Saturday workshop, includes:

- A Strategic Plan that is approved by the Board and renewed every five years, with a public strategic planning review process that is launched two years before the end of each five-year cycle;
- A Five-Year Operating Plan, which includes a Five-Year Financial Model and Planning Calendar, and is reviewed and updated via the annual plans; and
- Annual operating plans and budgets, which are discussed with the community and commented upon by the public, and are reviewed and approved by the Board.

The Strategic Plan is provided in Exhibit A in the form of an interactive document to simulate the web-based, user-friendly format by which the community ultimately will access the Plan. Exhibit B contains a plain text, red-line version of the Strategic Plan, showing the updates made to the previous version provided to the Board. Exhibit C provides a summary of public comments on the Draft Strategic Plan and responses to those comments, which will be publicly posted.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends that the Board approve the Strategic Plan covering fiscal years 2016 – FY2020. It is a product of unprecedented community, Board and Staff brainstorming, input, and extensive planning, and it will serve as an aspirational guide for ICANN over the next five years.

Beginning with fiscal year 2016, the Strategic Plan – along with the Five-Year Operating Plan and the Five-Year Financial Model – will inform the annual planning process.

**PROPOSED RESOLUTION:**

Whereas, ICANN’s Strategic Plan for fiscal years 2016 – 2020 is the result of an extensive, collaborative, bottom-up, multistakeholder and multilingual process that began in April 2013 online and at the ICANN meeting in Beijing (and is detailed [online](#)).

Whereas, the Strategic Plan provides a new ICANN Vision, reiterates ICANN's existing Mission, and describes five Strategic Objectives, each with Strategic Goals, Key Success Factors, and Strategic Risks.

Whereas, to compliment the Strategic Plan, a Five-Year Operating Plan provides—for each Strategic Objective and Goal—portfolios of ICANN activities, key operational success factors, operational risks, key performance indicators, key dependencies, and phasing over five years (at the Goal level), and together these plans will serve as a foundation for the annual operating plans and budgets.

Resolved, (2014.10.16.xx) that the ICANN Strategic Plan for fiscal years 2016 – 2020 is adopted, and ICANN’s President and CEO is requested to take actions necessary to publish and execute the Plan.

**PROPOSED RATIONALE:**

The Strategic Plan provides ICANN's Vision, restates ICANN’s Mission, and sets forth five Strategic Objectives, each with Strategic Goals, Key Success Factors (Outcomes), and Strategic Risks. It will guide ICANN’s activities in fiscal years 2016 through 2020 and inform ICANN's operating plans and budgets.

To provide the public with more insight and advance ICANN’s accountability and transparency, Measurements (Key Performance Indicators) and high-level, five-year Phasing have been expanded upon in a Five-Year Operating Plan that compliments the Strategic Plan. A new element of ICANN’s planning process, the Five-Year Operating Plan details—for each Strategic Objective and Goal—portfolios of ICANN activities, key operational success factors (outcomes), risks, key performance indicators (measurements), key dependencies, and phasing over five years (at the Goal level).

Beginning with fiscal year 2016, the Strategic Plan—along with the Five-Year Operating Plan—will inform the annual operating plans and budgets. The annual operating plans and budgets will address the resource requirements of the strategies, as well as impact on the security, stability and resiliency of the DNS, and any necessary risk mitigation actions.

The progress of work, accomplishments toward goals and effectiveness of strategies will be managed and reported through ICANN's Managements Systems, including through a set of key success factors and key performance indicators. These will inform an annual planning check to validate that the organization is on-track, or that adjustments are needed.

ICANN's Strategic Plan is the result of an extensive, collaborative, bottom-up, multistakeholder, and multilingual process that began in April 2013 online and at the ICANN meeting in Beijing. ICANN has sought extensive public input on its key challenges and opportunities and on strategic areas highlighted by ICANN's Board. Public comments, and community discussions (detailed [here](#)) involving ICANN's Supporting Organizations, Constituencies, and Advisory Committees, have informed all elements of the Strategic Plan. Responses to all public comments received on the draft strategic plans and can be found [here](#) and [here](#). The Strategic Plan also reflects work and input on related initiatives, such as the Security, Stability and Resiliency Framework, the Regional Engagement Strategies, and Strategy Panel strategic themes.

Submitted by: Denise Michel

Position: VP Strategic Initiatives

Date Noted: 1 October 2014

Email: [denise.michel@icann.org](mailto:denise.michel@icann.org)



<b>1. Consent Agenda:</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>a. Approval of Board Meeting Minutes</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>b. Redelegating of the .MK domain and delegation of the .мкд domain representing the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the Macedonian Academic Research Network Skopje</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<i>Rationale for Resolutions 2014.10.16.xx – 2014.10.16.xx</i> .....	<i>2</i>
<b>c. Delegation of the გე (“ge”) domain representing Georgia in Georgian (Mkhedruli) script to the Information Technologies Development Center</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<i>Rationale for Resolutions 2014.10.16.xx – 2014.10.16.xx</i> .....	<i>6</i>
<b>d. Appointment of 2015 Nominating Committee Chair-Elect</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<i>Rationale for Resolution 2014.10.16.xx</i> .....	<i>10</i>
<b>e. Registrars Stakeholder Group Charter Amendments</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<i>Rationale for Resolution 2014.10.16.xx</i> .....	<i>12</i>
<b>f. Item Removed From Agenda</b>	
<b>g. Thank You to Community Members</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>h. Thank You to Sponsors of ICANN 51 Meeting</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>i. Thank You to Interpreters, Staff, Event and Hotel Teams of ICANN 51 Meeting</b> .....	<b>16</b>
<b>2. Main Agenda:</b> .....	<b>16</b>
<b>a. Thank You to the 2014 Nominating Committee</b> .....	<b>16</b>
<b>b. Introduction of Two-character Domain Names in the New gTLD Namespace</b> <b>17</b>	
<i>Rationale for Resolutions 2014.10.16.xx – 2014.10.16.xx</i> .....	<i>18</i>
<b>c. ICANN Strategic Plan for fiscal years 2016-2020</b> .....	<b>25</b>
<i>Rationale for Resolution 2014.10.16.xx</i> .....	<i>25</i>
<b>d. Item Removed From Agenda</b>	
<b>e. Thank You to Sébastien Bachollet for his service to the ICANN Board</b> .....	<b>27</b>
<b>f. Thank You to Bill Graham for his service to the ICANN Board</b> .....	<b>28</b>
<b>g. AOB</b> .....	<b>29</b>

## **1. Consent Agenda:**

### **a. Approval of Board Meeting Minutes**

Resolved (2014.10.16.xx), the Board approves the minutes of the 9 September 2014 Regular Meeting of the ICANN Board.

### **b. Redelegation of the .MK domain and delegation of the .мкд domain representing the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the Macedonian Academic Research Network Skopje**

Resolved (2014.10.16.xx), as part of the exercise of its responsibilities under the IANA Functions Contract, ICANN has reviewed and evaluated the request to redelegate the .MK country-code top-level domain and delegate the .мкд IDN country-code top-level domain to Macedonian Academic Research Network Skopje. The documentation demonstrates that the proper procedures were followed in evaluating the request.

Resolved (2014.10.16.xx), the Board directs that pursuant to Article III, Section 5.2 of the ICANN Bylaws, that certain portions of the rationale not appropriate for public distribution within the resolutions, preliminary report or minutes at this time due to contractual obligations, shall be withheld until public release is allowed pursuant to those contractual obligations.

#### ***Rationale for Resolutions 2014.10.16.xx – 2014.10.16.xx***

#### **Why the Board is addressing the issue now?**

In accordance with the IANA Functions Contract, the ICANN staff has evaluated two requests for ccTLD redelegation and delegation, and is presenting its report to the Board for review. This review by the Board

is intended to ensure that ICANN staff has followed the proper procedures.

### **What is the proposal being considered?**

The proposal is to approve two requests to IANA to assign and change the sponsoring organization (also known as the manager or trustee) of the .мкд and .MK country-code top-level domains to the Macedonian Academic Research Network Skopje.

### **Which stakeholders or others were consulted?**

In the course of evaluating a delegation and redelegation applications, ICANN staff consults with the applicant and other interested parties. As part of the application process, the applicant needs to describe consultations that were performed within the country concerning the ccTLD, and their applicability to their local Internet community.

### **What concerns or issues were raised by the community?**

Staff are not aware of any significant issues or concerns raised by the community in relation to this request.

### **What significant materials did the Board review?**

The Board reviewed the following IANA staff evaluations:

- The domains are eligible for continued delegation, as MK is an assigned alpha-2 code that is listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard for the country of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and мкд is the approved internationalized domain name string for the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia;

- The requests are consented by the existing sponsoring organization, Ministry of Foreign Affairs;
- The relevant government has been consulted and does not object;
- The proposed sponsoring organization and its contacts agree to their responsibilities for managing these domains;
- The proposals have demonstrated appropriate local Internet community consultation and support;
- The proposals do not contravene any known laws or regulations;
- The proposals ensure the domains are managed locally in the country, and are bound under local law;
- The proposed sponsoring organization has confirmed they will manage the domains in a fair and equitable manner;
- The proposed sponsoring organization has demonstrated appropriate operational and technical skills and plans to operate the domains;
- The proposed technical configuration meets IANA's various technical conformance requirements;
- No specific risks or concerns relating to Internet stability have been identified; and
- Staff have provided a recommendation that these requests be implemented based on the factors considered.



These evaluations are responsive to the appropriate criteria and policy frameworks, such as "Domain Name System Structure and Delegation" (RFC 1591) and "GAC Principles and Guidelines for the Delegation and Administration of Country Code Top Level Domains".

As part of the process established by the IANA Functions Contract, the "Delegation and Redelelegation Report" will be published at <http://www.iana.org/reports>.

**What factors the Board found to be significant?**

The Board did not identify any specific factors of concern with these requests.

**Are there positive or negative community impacts?**

The timely approval of country-code domain name managers that meet the various public interest criteria is positive toward ICANN's overall mission, the local communities to which country-code top-level domains are designated to serve, and responsive to ICANN's obligations under the IANA Functions Contract.

**Are there financial impacts or ramifications on ICANN (strategic plan, operating plan, budget); the community; and/or the public?**

The administration of country-code delegations in the DNS root zone is part of the IANA functions, and the delegation action should not cause any significant variance on pre-planned expenditure. It is not the role of ICANN to assess the financial impact of the internal operations of country-code top-level domains within a country.

**Are there any security, stability or resiliency issues relating to the DNS?**

ICANN does not believe these requests pose any notable risks to security, stability or resiliency.

This is an Organizational Administrative Function not requiring public comment.

**c. Delegation of the ზ ე (“ge”) domain representing Georgia in Georgian (Mkhedruli) script to the Information Technologies Development Center**

Resolved (2014.10.16.xx), as part of the exercise of its responsibilities under the IANA Functions Contract, ICANN has reviewed and evaluated the request to delegate the ზ ე country-code top-level domain to the Information Technologies Development Center (ITDC). The documentation demonstrates that the proper procedures were followed in evaluating the request.

Resolved (2014.10.16.xx), the Board directs that pursuant to Article III, Section 5.2 of the ICANN Bylaws, that certain portions of the rationale not appropriate for public distribution within the resolutions, preliminary report or minutes at this time due to contractual obligations, shall be withheld until public release is allowed pursuant to those contractual obligations.

***Rationale for Resolutions 2014.10.16.xx – 2014.10.16.xx***

**Why the Board is addressing the issue now?**

In accordance with the IANA Functions Contract, the ICANN staff has evaluated a request for ccTLD delegation and is presenting its report to the Board for review. This review by the Board is intended to ensure that ICANN staff has followed the proper procedures.

### **What is the proposal being considered?**

The proposal is to approve a request to IANA to create the country-code top-level domain and assign the role of sponsoring organization (also known as the manager or trustee) to Information Technologies Development Center (ITDC).

### **Which stakeholders or others were consulted?**

In the course of evaluating a delegation application, ICANN staff consults with the applicant and other interested parties. As part of the application process, the applicant needs to describe consultations that were performed within the country concerning the ccTLD, and their applicability to their local Internet community.

### **What concerns or issues were raised by the community?**

Staff are not aware of any significant issues or concerns raised by the community in relation to this request.

### **What significant materials did the Board review?**

The Board reviewed the following IANA staff evaluations:

- The domain is eligible for delegation, as it is a string that has been approved by the IDN ccTLD Fast Track process, and represents a country that is listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard;
- The relevant government has been consulted and does not object;
- The proposed sponsoring organization and its contacts agree to their responsibilities for managing this domain;

- The proposal has demonstrated appropriate local Internet community consultation and support;
- The proposal does not contravene any known laws or regulations;
- The proposal ensures the domain is managed locally in the country, and is bound under local law;
- The proposed sponsoring organisation has confirmed they will manage the domain in a fair and equitable manner;
- The proposed sponsoring organisation has demonstrated appropriate operational and technical skills and plans to operate the domain;
  - The proposed technical configuration meets IANA's various technical conformance requirements;
  - No specific risks or concerns relating to Internet stability have been identified; and
  - Staff have provided a recommendation that this request be implemented based on the factors considered.

These evaluations are responsive to the appropriate criteria and policy frameworks, such as "Domain Name System Structure and Delegation" (RFC 1591) and "GAC Principles and Guidelines for the Delegation and Administration of Country Code Top Level Domains".

As part of the process established by the IANA Functions Contract, the "Delegation and Redelelegation Report" will be published at <http://www.iana.org/reports>.

**What factors the Board found to be significant?**

The Board did not identify any specific factors of concern with this request.

**Are there positive or negative community impacts?**

The timely approval of country-code domain name managers that meet the various public interest criteria is positive toward ICANN's overall mission, the local communities to which country-code top-level domains are designated to serve, and responsive to ICANN's obligations under the IANA Functions Contract.

**Are there financial impacts or ramifications on ICANN (strategic plan, operating plan, budget); the community; and/or the public?**

The administration of country-code delegations in the DNS root zone is part of the IANA functions, and the delegation action should not cause any significant variance on pre-planned expenditure. It is not the role of ICANN to assess the financial impact of the internal operations of country-code top-level domains within a country.

**Are there any security, stability or resiliency issues relating to the DNS?**

ICANN does not believe this request poses any notable risks to security, stability or resiliency.

This is an Organizational Administrative Function not requiring public comment.

#### **d. Appointment of 2015 Nominating Committee Chair-Elect**

Whereas, the Board Governance Committee (BGC) reviewed the Expressions of Interest from candidates for the 2015 Nominating Committee (“NomCom”) Chair and Chair-Elect, considered the results of a 360-degree evaluation of the 2014 NomCom leadership, and evaluated responses to questions posed by the BGC to each candidate.

Whereas, on 9 September 2014 the Board appointed Stéphane Van Gelder as the 2015 NomCom Chair, and deferred appointing a Chair-Elect pending interviews of some of the candidates.

Whereas, the since 9 September 2014, the BGC has interviewed the top candidates for the 2015 NomCom Chair-Elect position and has recommended that the Board appoint [INSERT NAME HERE] as the Chair-Elect.

Resolved (2014.10.16.xx), the Board hereby appoints [INSERT NAME HERE] as the 2015 Nominating Committee Chair-Elect.

#### ***Rationale for Resolution 2014.10.16.xx***

ICANN’s Bylaws require the Board to appoint the Nominating Committee (NomCom) Chair and NomCom Chair-Elect. See Article VII, sections 2.1 and 2.2 at

<http://www.icann.org/en/general/bylaws.htm#VII>. The Board has delegated the responsibility for recommending the NomCom Chair and Chair-Elect for Board approval to the Board Governance Committee (BGC). See BGC Charter at <http://www.icann.org/en/committees/board-governance/charter.htm>. The BGC twice posted a call for expressions of interest (EOI) (see (<https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2->

[2014-07-01-en](#)), received and reviewed EOIs, oversaw a 360-degree evaluation of the 2014 NomCom leadership and conducted interviews with some of the candidates for the 2015 NomCom Chair-Elect.

On 9 September 2014, the Board appointed Stéphane Van Gelder as the 2015 Nominating Committee (NomCom) Chair. (See <https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#1.a>). The Board acknowledged at that time that the BGC was still in the process of interviewing some candidates for the 2015 Nominating Committee (NomCom) Chair-Elect, so the Board deferred its appointment of this position pending completion of the process, which has now concluded.

The BGC made its recommendation after careful consideration and discussion. The Board has considered and agrees with the BGC's recommendation for the 2015 NomCom Chair –Elect. The Board would like to thank all who expressed interest in becoming part of the NomCom leadership.

Appointing a NomCom Chair-Elect identified through a public EOI process positively affects the transparency and accountability of ICANN, as well as supports ICANN's overall mission. Adopting the BGC's recommendation has no financial impact on ICANN that was not otherwise anticipated, and will not negatively impact the security, stability and resiliency of the domain name system.

#### **e. Registrars Stakeholder Group Charter Amendments**

Whereas, the Registrars Stakeholder Group (RrSG) of the GNSO has proposed a series of amendments to its governing Charter document;

Whereas, the RrSG, ICANN Staff, and the Structural Improvements Committee (SIC) have completed all requirements associated with the

Board [Process For Amending GNSO Stakeholder Group and Constituency Charters](#);

Resolved (2014.10.16.xx), that the ICANN Board approves the Registrars Stakeholder Group Charter Amendments as documented in this paper and directs the Registrars Stakeholder Group and ICANN Staff to provide access to the new governing document on the appropriate web pages for the group.

***Rationale for Resolution 2014.10.16.xx***

The ICANN Bylaws (Article X, Section 5.3) state, "Each Stakeholder Group shall maintain recognition with the ICANN Board." The Board has interpreted this language to require that the ICANN Board formally approve any amendments to the governing documents of Stakeholder Groups (SG) and/or Constituencies in the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO).

In September 2013, the Board established a [Process For Amending GNSO Stakeholder Group and Constituency Charters](#) (Process) to provide a streamlined methodology for compliance with the Bylaws requirement.

The GNSO Registrars Stakeholder Group (RrSG), ICANN Staff, and the Structural Improvements Committee (SIC) completed all steps identified in the Process including a determination that the proposed charter amendments will not raise any fiscal or liability concerns for the ICANN organization and publication of the amendments for community review and comment (no objections received).

There is no anticipated impact from this decision on the security, stability and resiliency of the domain name system as a result of this decision.



Item Removed From Agenda

### **g. Thank You to Community Members**

Whereas, ICANN wishes to acknowledge the considerable energy and skills that members of the stakeholder community bring to the ICANN process.

Whereas, in recognition of these contributions, ICANN wishes to acknowledge and thank members of the community when their terms of service on Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees end.

Whereas, the following members of the At-Large community are concluding their terms of service:

- Olivier Crépin LeBlond – ALAC Chair
- Fouad Bajwa – APRALO Vice-Chair
- Alan Greenberg – ALAC Liaison to the GNSO
- Philip Johnson – AFRALO Secretary
- Jean-Jacques Subrenat – ALAC Member (EURALO, Nominating Committee Appointee)
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh – ALAC Member (LACRALO)
- Evan Leibovitch – ALAC Vice Chair (NARALO)
- Glenn McKnight – NARALO Secretary

Resolved (2014.10.16.xx), Olivier Crépin LeBlond, Fouad Bajwa, Alan Greenberg, Philip Johnson, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Evan Leibovitch, and Glenn McKnight have earned the deep appreciation of the Board for their terms of service, and the Board wishes them well in their future endeavors within the ICANN community and beyond.

Whereas, the following Address Supporting Organization (ASO) Address Council member (AC) is concluding his term of service:

- Naresh Ajawani – ASO AC Member

Resolved (2014.10.16.xx), Naresh Ajawani has earned the deep appreciation of the Board for his terms of service, and the Board wishes him well in his future endeavors within the ICANN community and beyond.

Whereas, the following members of the Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO) Council are concluding their terms of service:

- Keith Davidson – Framework of Interpretation Working Group Chair
- Hong Xue – ccNSO Councilor

Resolved (2014.10.16.xx), Keith Davidson and Hong Xue have earned the deep appreciation of the Board for their terms of service, and the Board wishes them well in their future endeavors within the ICANN community and beyond.

Whereas, the following members of the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) are concluding their terms of service:

- John Berard – GNSO Councilor (Commercial Business Users Constituency)
- Ching Chiao – GNSO Councilor (Registries Stakeholder Group)
- Jeffrey Eckhaus – Registrars Stakeholder Group Vice Chair
- Maria Farrell – GNSO Councilor (Non-Commercial Users Constituency)
- Magaly Pazello – GNSO Councilor (Non-Commercial Users)

Constituency)

- Klaus Stoll – GNSO Councilor (Not-for-Profit Operational Concerns Constituency)
- Jennifer Wolfe – GNSO Councillor (Nominating Committee Appointee)

Resolved (2014.10.16.xx), John Berard, Ching Chiao, Jeffrey Eckhaus, Maria Farrell, Magaly Pazello, Klaus Stoll, and Jennifer Wolfe, have earned the deep appreciation of the Board for their terms of service, and the Board wishes them well in their future endeavors within the ICANN community and beyond.

Whereas, the following members of the Nominating Committee (NomCom) are concluding their terms of service:

- Ron Andruff – Commercial and Business Users Constituency Representative
- Veronica Cretu – At-Large Representative
- William Manning – RSSAC Representative
- John McElwaine – Intellectual Property Constituency Representative
- Russ Mundy – IAB for IETF Representative
- Vanda Scartezini – At-Large Representative

Resolved (2014.10.16.xx), Ron Andruff, Veronica Cretu, William Manning, John McElwaine, Russ Mundy, and Vanda Scartezini have earned the deep appreciation of the Board for their terms of service, and the Board wishes them well in their future endeavors within the ICANN community and beyond.

## **h. Thank You to Sponsors of ICANN 51 Meeting**

The Board wishes to thank the following sponsors: Verisign, Inc., Public Interest Registry, Afilias Limited, PDR Solutions FZC,

Community.Asia, Neustar, Freenom, China Internet Network Information Center, .GLOBAL, .CLUB Domains, CentralNic, Brandma.Co, NCC Group, Trademark Clearinghouse, Hu Yi Global Information Resources (Holding) Company . HongKong Limited, Uniregistry Corp., ZA Central Registry, Minds + Machines Group, Iron Mountain, Inc., INOC, Radix FZC, and ICANNWIKI.

**i. Thank You to Interpreters, Staff, Event and Hotel Teams of ICANN 51 Meeting**

The Board expresses its deepest appreciation to the scribes, interpreters, audiovisual team, technical teams, and the entire ICANN staff for their efforts in facilitating the smooth operation of the meeting.

The Board would also like to thank the management and staff of the Grand Hyatt Century Plaza Hotel, for providing a wonderful facility to hold this event. Special thanks are extended to Kim Aragon, Kim Aragon, Associate Director of Event Planning and Susie Schultz, International Sales Manager.

**2. Main Agenda:**

**a. Thank You to the 2014 Nominating Committee**

Whereas, ICANN appointed Cheryl Langdon-Orr as Chair of the 2014 Nominating Committee and Stéphane Van Gelder as Chair-Elect of the 2014 Nominating Committee, and Yrjö Länsipuro as Associate Chair.

Whereas, the 2014 Nominating Committee consisted of delegates from each of ICANN's constituencies and advisory bodies.

Resolved (2014.10.16.xx), the ICANN Board expresses its deep appreciation to Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Stéphane Van Gelder, Yrjö

Lansipuro and all of the members of the 2014 Nominating Committee (including Ron Andruff, Satish Babu, John Berryhill, Alain Bidron, Don Blumenthal, Veronica Cretu, Sarah B. Deutsch, Robert Guerra, Hans Petter Holen, Louis Houle, Juhani Juselius, Brenden Kuerbis, Bill Manning, John McElwaine, Russ Mundy, Vanda Scartezini and Fatimata Seye Sylla) for their dedication, hard work and successful efforts.

**b. Introduction of Two-character Domain Names in the New gTLD Namespace**

Resolution Text Superseded

Resolution Text Superseded

***Rationale for Resolutions 2014.10.16.xx – 2014.10.16.xx***

**Why is the Board addressing the issue?**

Section 2 of Specification 5 (Schedule of Reserved Names) of the New gTLD Registry Agreement addresses reservations of two-character labels as follows:

*All two-character ASCII labels shall be withheld from registration or allocated to Registry Operator at the second level within the TLD. Such labels may not be activated in the DNS, and may not be released for registration to any person or entity other than Registry Operator, provided that such two-character label strings may be released to the extent that Registry Operator reaches agreement with the related government and country-code manager of the string as specified in the ISO*

*3166-1 alpha-2 standard. The Registry Operator may also propose the release of these reservations based on its implementation of measures to avoid confusion with the corresponding country codes, subject to approval by ICANN.*

In January 2014, New gTLD Registry Operators began submitting requests to ICANN through the Registry Services Evaluation Policy (RSEP) process proposing to implement a new registry service to release certain two-character domain names required to be reserved by the New gTLD Registry Agreement. The implementation of the proposals would require an amendment to the Exhibit A of the respective Registry Agreement. The proposed amendments to implement the new registry service were the subject of public comment periods over the past several months., In total, ICANN has posted 28 RSEP proposals and amendments which concern a total of 203 New gTLDs. ICANN continues to receive additional RSEP requests on a weekly basis for the same Registry Service.

Pursuant to Section 2.4.D of the RSEP and the RSEP Implementation Notes, if the implementation of a proposed service requires a material change to the Registry Agreement, the preliminary determination will be referred to the ICANN Board for consideration.

### **What is the proposal being considered?**

Rationale Text Superseded

### **Which stakeholders or others were consulted?**

As of 24 September 2014, ICANN staff initiated five (5) public comment forums to obtain feedback from the community on the

amendments to implement the proposed new registry service: 12 June 2014 < <https://www.icann.org/public-comments/two-char-new-gtld-2014-06-12-en>>; 8 July 2014 <<https://www.icann.org/public-comments/two-char-new-gtld-2014-07-08-en>>; 23 July 2014 < <https://www.icann.org/public-comments/two-char-new-gtld-2014-07-23-en>>; 19 August 2014 < <https://www.icann.org/public-comments/two-char-new-gtld-2014-08-19-en>>; and 12 September 2014 < <https://www.icann.org/public-comments/two-char-new-gtld-2014-09-12-en>>. Various members of the community submitted comments, including the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) and registry operators.

In addition, ICANN notified the GAC when each request from a registry operator was posted for public comment.

### **What concerns or issues were raised by the community?**

There were several comments received during the public comment period indicating a series of arguments in favor of, or in opposition to, the general release of all or certain two-character names in the new gTLD namespace. The majority of the comments received were in favor for the release of the two character domain names.

The arguments made in opposition to the release of the two character domain names expressed two general concerns. The first concern is related to the general recognition and associated use of the two character domain names leading to user confusion or abuse. The second concern is how to specifically protect ccTLDs when country and territory names are newly formed.

Public comments received so far are overwhelmingly in favor of the introduction of two-character domain names in the new gTLD namespace. The arguments made in favor to the release of the two-character domain names were as follows:



- The introduction of two character domain names would increase competition since the current restrictions hinder competition, in particular for the New gTLDs which are competing with legacy TLDs (delegated prior to the 2012 New gTLD application round) who are allowed to offer such registrations. The current restrictions to the New gTLD Registry Operators create a discriminatory situation which is contrary to the ICANN Bylaws Article II, Section 3 which provide for Non-Discriminatory Treatment of ICANN stakeholders.
- The introduction of two-character domain names poses a limited risk of confusion, or no risk at all, as demonstrated by prior use of two character domain names in existing TLDs.
- The release of certain types of two character domain names to include at least one digit or number, would not cause concern and may be considered for release.
- The release of two-character domain names would provide opportunities for companies and brands to have tailored segmented domain names to connect with the public as well as provide localized content, thus expanding consumer choice and driving economic growth, in particular in developing countries.
- The proposed registry service does not conflict with the Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPM) requirements document.

- There is uniform precedent regarding the release of two-character domain name in the history of relevant RSEP requests.
- The release of country codes and names is allowed by the Applicant Guidebook.

The GAC has also raised some concerns about the release of certain two-character domain names. In its 27 March 2014 Singapore Communiqué, the GAC discussed the Brand Registry Group proposal for a streamlined process under an addendum to the Registry Agreement for the approval of country names and two letter and character codes at the second level. The GAC stated: “While the GAC has no major concerns about brand owners seeking approval for such names, but that this approval should be done directly with the countries concerned rather than through a GAC level operational process.” The GAC reported that individual GAC members could assist with proposals relevant to their particular country if requested. The GAC suggested that consideration be given to establishing a register of countries that do not require individual requests to be made.

Rationale Text Superseded

**What significant materials did the Board review? What factors did the Board find to be significant?**

The Board reviewed several materials and also considered several significant factors during its deliberations about whether or not to approve the request. The significant materials and factors that the Board considered as part of its deliberations, included, but not limited to the following:

- [Introduction of Two-Character Domain names in the New gTLD Namespace Public Comment Period](#)

- [Introduction of Two-Character Domain Names for .DEALS, XN--FJQ720A, .CITY, .XYZ, .COLLEGE, .GOP, .TRADE, .WEBCAM, .BID, .HEALTHCARE, .WORLD, .BAND](#) (8 July 2014)
- [Introduction of Two-Character Domain Names for .LUXURY, .WANG, XN--3BST00M, XN--6QQ986B3XL, XN--CZRU2D, XN--45Q11C, .BUILD, .REN, .PIZZA, .RESTAURANT, .GIFTS, .SARL, XN--55QX5D, XN--IO0A7I, and 20 TLDs associated with Top Level Domain Holdings Limited](#) (23 July 2014)
- [Introduction of Two-Character Domain Names for .JETZT, .GLOBAL, .NEUSTAR, .KIWI, .BERLIN](#) (12 September 2014)
- [Introduction of Two-Character Domain Names for .SOHU, .IMMO, .SAARLAND, .CLUB](#) (19 August 2014)
- [RSETP Report on Internet Security and Stability Implications of the .name proposal for the Limited Release of Initially Reserved Two-Character Names](#) (4 December 2006)
- [GAC Singapore Communiqué](#) (17 March 2014)
- [Letter from GAC Chair to ICANN Board](#) (8 August 2014)
- [Letter from Stephen Crocker to Heather Dryden](#) (02 September 2014)
- [Letter from Heather Dryden to Dr. Stephen Crocker](#) (10 September 2014)

**Are there positive or negative community impacts? Are there fiscal impacts or ramifications on ICANN (strategic plan, operating plan,**

**budget); the community, and/or public? Are there any security, stability or resiliency issues relating to the DNS?**

The overall impact on the community is anticipated to be positive as new opportunities for diversification and competition in the gTLD namespace are created, while no specific risk of user confusion has been identified.

The eventual implementation of this Registry Service may have a fiscal impact on ICANN, the community or the public, as there may be additional costs associated with the broader implications of this Registry Service.

As determined by the ICANN Registry Services Technical Evaluation Panel (RSETP) in a 4 December 2006 report on proposed release of two-character domains in the .name gTLD, such a service does not create a reasonable risk of a meaningful adverse effect on security and stability.

**Is this either a defined policy process within ICANN's Supporting Organization or ICANN's Organizational Administrative Function decision requiring public comment or not requiring public comment?**

The Registry Services Evaluation Policy (RSEP) is an ICANN consensus policy, effective as of 15 August 2006. Consistent with the policy, ICANN posted the Registry Agreement amendments for public comment as the implementation of the proposed service required what was then considered a material change to the Registry Agreement. Following today's resolution, future RSEP proposals requesting the release of two-character names composed letter/number or number/number combinations will not be considered as requiring a material change to the Registry Agreement.

### **c. ICANN Strategic Plan for fiscal years 2016-2020**

Whereas, ICANN's Strategic Plan for fiscal years 2016 – 2020 is the result of an extensive, collaborative, bottom-up, multistakeholder and multilingual process that began in April 2013 online and at the ICANN meeting in Beijing (and is detailed online).

Whereas, the Strategic Plan provides a new ICANN Vision, reiterates ICANN's existing Mission, and describes five Strategic Objectives, each with Strategic Goals, Key Success Factors, and Strategic Risks.

Whereas, to compliment the Strategic Plan, a Five-Year Operating Plan provides—for each Strategic Objective and Goal—portfolios of ICANN activities, key operational success factors, operational risks, key performance indicators, key dependencies, and phasing over five years (at the Goal level), and together these plans will serve as a foundation for the annual operating plans and budgets.

Resolved, (2014.10.16.xx) that the ICANN Strategic Plan for fiscal years 2016 – 2020 is adopted, and ICANN's President and CEO is requested to take actions necessary to publish and execute the Plan.

#### ***Rationale for Resolution 2014.10.16.xx***

The Strategic Plan provides ICANN's Vision, restates ICANN's Mission, and sets forth five Strategic Objectives, each with Strategic Goals, Key Success Factors (Outcomes), and Strategic Risks. It will guide ICANN's activities in fiscal years 2016 through 2020 and inform ICANN's operating plans and budgets.

To provide the public with more insight and advance ICANN's accountability and transparency, Measurements (Key Performance Indicators) and high-level, five-year Phasing have been expanded upon in a Five-Year Operating Plan that compliments the Strategic

Plan. A new element of ICANN’s planning process, the Five-Year Operating Plan details—for each Strategic Objective and Goal—portfolios of ICANN activities, key operational success factors (outcomes), risks, key performance indicators (measurements), key dependencies, and phasing over five years (at the Goal level). Beginning with fiscal year 2016, the Strategic Plan—along with the Five-Year Operating Plan—will inform the annual operating plans and budgets. The annual operating plans and budgets will address the resource requirements of the strategies, as well as impact on the security, stability and resiliency of the DNS, and any necessary risk mitigation actions.

The progress of work, accomplishments toward goals and effectiveness of strategies will be managed and reported through ICANN's Managements Systems, including through a set of key success factors and key performance indicators. These will inform an annual planning check to validate that the organization is on-track, or that adjustments are needed.

ICANN’s Strategic Plan is the result of an extensive, collaborative, bottom-up, multistakeholder, and multilingual process that began in April 2013 online and at the ICANN meeting in Beijing. ICANN has sought extensive public input on its key challenges and opportunities and on strategic areas highlighted by ICANN's Board. Public comments, and community discussions (detailed [here](#)) involving ICANN’s Supporting Organizations, Constituencies, and Advisory Committees, have informed all elements of the Strategic Plan. Responses to all public comments received on the draft strategic plans and can be found [here](#) and [here](#). The Strategic Plan also reflects work and input on related initiatives, such as the Security, Stability and Resiliency Framework, the Regional Engagement Strategies, and Strategy Panel strategic themes.

Item Removed From Agenda

**e. Thank You to Sébastien Bachollet for his service to the ICANN Board**

Whereas, Sébastien Bachollet was appointed to serve as an At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) Member to the ICANN Board on 9 December 2010.

Whereas, Sébastien concluded his term on the ICANN Board on 16 October 2014.

Whereas, Sébastien served as a member of the following Committees and Working Groups:

- Finance Committee

- Structural Improvements Committee
- Public and Stakeholder Engagement Committee
- Meeting Strategy Working Group

Resolved (2014.10.16.xx), Sébastien Bachollet has earned the deep appreciation of the Board for his term of service, and the Board wishes her well in his future endeavors within the ICANN community and beyond.

**f. Thank You to Bill Graham for his service to the ICANN Board**

Whereas, Bill Graham was appointed to serve as a Generic Names Supporting Organization Member to the ICANN Board on 23 June 2011.

Whereas, Bill concludes his term on the ICANN Board on 16 October 2014.

Whereas, Bill has served as a member of the following Committees and Working Groups:

- Audit Committee
- Global Relations Committee
- Governance Committee
- IANA Committee
- New gTLD Program Committee
- Risk Committee
- Structural Improvements Committee
- Board-GAC Recommendation Implementation Working Group

Resolved (2014.10.16.xx), Bill Graham has earned the deep appreciation of the Board for his term of service, and the Board



wishes him well in his future endeavors within the ICANN community and beyond.

**g. AOB**

**Directors and Liaisons,**

**Attached below please find Notice of date and time for our Annual General Meeting, consisting of a Regular Meeting of the ICANN Board of Directors, followed by an Organizational Meeting of the ICANN Board of Directors:**

**16 October 2014 – Annual General Meeting of the ICANN Board of Directors - at 00:00 UTC (5:00pm – 6:30pm in Los Angeles). This Board meeting is estimated to last approximately 90 minutes (if needed) following the conclusion of the ICANN Public Forum.**

<http://www.timeanddate.com/worldclock/fixetime.html?msg=Annual+General+Meeting+of+the+ICANN+Board&iso=20141016T17&p1=137&ah=1&am=30>

**Some other time zones:**

**16 October 2014 – 8:00pm EST Washington, D.C.**

**17 October 2014 – 1:00am London BST**

**17 October 2014 – 2:00am Brussels CEST**

## **REGULAR MEETING OF THE ICANN BOARD**

**Consent Agenda:**

- Approval of Minutes
- Redelegation of .MK ccTLD and delegation of IDN ccTLD (мкд) for the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
- Delegation of IDN ccTLD (.გე) for Georgia
- Appointment of 2015 Nominating Committee Chair-Elect
- Registrars Stakeholder Group Charter Amendments
- ICANN Meeting dates 2016-2020
- Thank You to Departing Community Members
- Thank You to Sponsors of ICANN 51 Meeting
- Thank You to Interpreters, Staff, Event and Hotel Teams of ICANN 51 Meeting

## Main Agenda

- Thank You to the 2014 Nominating Committee
- Introduction of Two-character Domain Names in the New gTLD Namespace
- ICANN Strategic Plan for fiscal years 2016 – 2020
- Thank You to Wolfgang Kleinwächter for his service to the ICANN Board
- Thank You to Sébastien Bachollet for his service to the ICANN Board
- Thank You to Bill Graham for his service to the ICANN Board

## **ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING OF THE ICANN BOARD**

### Main Agenda

- Election of Board Chair and Vice Chair
- Committee Slates
- Confirmation of Officers of ICANN
- AOB

## **MATERIALS – [Link to BoardVantage Materials](#)**

**If you have trouble with access, please let us know and we will work with you to assure that you can use the BoardVantage Portal for this meeting.**

**If call information is required, it will be distributed separately**

**If you have any questions, or we can be of assistance to you, please let us know.**

**John Jeffrey**

**General Counsel & Secretary, ICANN**

**[John.Jeffrey@icann.org](mailto:John.Jeffrey@icann.org) <[John.Jeffrey@icann.org](mailto:John.Jeffrey@icann.org)>**

**<mailto:John.Jeffrey@icann.org> <<mailto:John.Jeffrey@icann.org>> >**

Contact Information Redacted