

# ICANN 50 PUBLIC BOARD MEETING

## Board Papers

---



## TABLE OF CONTENTS – BOARD PAPERS

### TABLE OF CONTENTS – BOARD PAPERS

Agenda Table.....	p. 2-3
<b>Consent Agenda</b>	
Redelegation of the .GW domain, representing Guinea-Bissau.....	p. 4-13
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) New Appointees.....	p. 14-15
Investment Policy Update.....	p. 16-18
ICANN 52 Public Meeting Venue.....	p. 19-21
Report of Multi-Stakeholder Meeting Strategy Working Group (MSWG).....	p. 22-24
NGPC Membership.....	p. 25-27
Thank You to Departing Community Member Sarmad Hussain, SSAC.....	p. 28-29
<b>Main Agenda</b>	
Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATR2) Recommendations.....	p. 30-35
2 <sup>nd</sup> At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Declaration (Info Paper).....	p. 36-41

**AGENDA – 26 June 2014 BOARD Meeting – 1.0 hour – last updated 12 June**

<b>Time, etc.</b>	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Shepherd</b>	<b>Expected Action</b>	<b>Director to Read and Move Res Aloud, Director to Second Motion</b>
<b>• Assembly, Roll Call &amp; Consent Agenda Vote</b>  30 min	<b>1. Consent Agenda</b>			
	1.a. Minutes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 30 April 2014 Meeting of the ICANN Board</li> </ul>	John Jeffrey	Approval	
	1.b. Redelelegation of the .GW domain, representing Guinea Bissau	Kuo-Wei Wu	Approval	
	1.c. Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) New Appointees	Suzanne Woolf	Approval	
	1.d. Investment Policy Update	Cherine Chalaby	Approval	
	1.e. ICANN 52 Public Meeting Venue	Cherine Chalaby	Approval	
	1.f. Report of Multi-Stakeholder Meeting Strategy Working Group (MSWG)	Sebasti�n Bachollet	Approval	

**AGENDA – 26 June 2014 BOARD Meeting – 1.0 hour – last updated 12 June**

<b>Time, etc.</b>	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Shepherd</b>	<b>Expected Action</b>	<b>Director to Read and Move Res Aloud, Director to Second Motion</b>
	1.g. NGPC Membership	Cherine Chalaby	Approval	
	1.h. Thank you to Departing Community Members <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sarmad Hussain, SSAC</li> </ul>	Ram Mohan		
	1.i. Thank You to Sponsors of ICANN 50 Meeting	Steve Crocker		
	1.j. Thank You to Interpreters, Staff, Event & Hotel Teams of ICANN 50 Meeting	Steve Crocker	Approval	
<b>• Discussion &amp; Decision</b>	<b>2. Main Agenda</b>			
20 min	2.a. Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATR2) Recommendations	Steve Crocker	Approval	
	2.b. AOB			

**ICANN BOARD PAPER NO. 2014.06.26.1b**

**TITLE:** **Redelegation of the .GW domain representing Guinea-Bissau to the Autoridade Reguladora Nacional das Tecnologias de Informação e Comunicação da Guiné Bissau**

**PROPOSED ACTION:** **For Board Consideration and Action – Consent Agenda**

**IANA REFERENCE:** **740560**

**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 .GW, comprised of the ISO 3166-1 code representing Guinea-Bissau, to the Autoridade Reguladora Nacional das Tecnologias de Informação e Comunicação da Guiné Bissau.

Sensitive Delegation Information

**PROPOSED RESOLUTION:**

Resolved (2014.06.26.xx), as part of the exercise of its responsibilities under the IANA Functions Contract, ICANN has reviewed and evaluated the request to redelegate the .GW country-code top-level domain to the Autoridade Reguladora Nacional das Tecnologias de Informação e Comunicação da Guiné Bissau. The documentation demonstrates that the proper procedures were followed in evaluating the request.

Resolved (2014.06.26.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 redelegation 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 change the sponsoring organisation (also known as the manager or trustee) of the .GW country-code top-level domain to the Autoridade Reguladora Nacional das Tecnologias de Informação e Comunicação da Guiné Bissau.

### **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 continued delegation, as it is an assigned alpha-2 code that is listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard for the country of Guinea-Bissau;
- The currently listed sponsoring organization, Fundação IT & MEDIA Universidade de Bissao, no longer exists;
- 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 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 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: 3 June 2014  
Email: kim.davies@icann.org





## EXHIBIT A TO ICANN BOARD SUBMISSION NO. 2014.06.26.1b

# Report on the Redelegation of the .GW domain representing Guinea-Bissau to the Autoridade Reguladora Nacional das Tecnologias de Informação e Comunicação da Guiné Bissau

3 June 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 “GW” ISO 3166-1 code is designated for use to represent Guinea-Bissau.

### Chronology of events

The currently designated manager for the .GW top-level domain is Fundação IT & MEDIA Universidade de Bissao, as described in the IANA Root Zone Database. Over the past two years, ICANN’s IANA department has received several reports from the community that the administrative contact and sponsoring organization for .GW are unreachable.

On 24 May 2010 the Supreme Court of Justice of Guinea-Bissau declared the nonexistence of Fundação IT & MEDIA Universidade de Bissao. Since that time, a variety of applicants have submitted unsuccessful redelegation requests.

In October 2012, the Ministry Council of Guinea-Bissau approved the Decree No. 7/2012 that empowered the Autoridade Reguladora Nacional das Tecnologias de Informação e Comunicação da Guiné Bissau (ARN) to lead and manage the .GW top-level domain. One month later, an agreement was signed between Fundacao para a Computacao Cientifica Nacional (FCCN), the private nonprofit organisation responsible for managing the .PT (Portugal) top-level domain, and ARN. The agreement governs the terms of the cooperation between the parties and the support that will be provided by FCCN to ARN. FCCN has agreed to use its experience managing the country-code top-level domain for Portugal to provide technical support for ARN in managing the .GW domain. ARN’s goal is to eventually become fully autonomous.

On 3 January 2013, ARN commenced a request to ICANN for redelegation of the .GW top-level domain. The .GW registry data has been communicated to DNS.PT by the domain's current technical contact, DENIC.

In August 2013, the .PT top-level domain was redelegated from FCCN to Associação DNS.PT. Associação DNS.PT inherited all the responsibilities that were already previously assumed as part of FCCN, including the collaboration with ARN.

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

The proposed sponsoring organisation is Autoridade Reguladora Nacional das Tecnologias de Informação e Comunicação da Guiné Bissau, a national regulatory authority in Guinea-Bissau.

The proposed administrative contact is Frank Barbosa de Oliveira, Member of the Board of Autoridade Reguladora Nacional das Tecnologias de Informação e Comunicação da Guiné Bissau. The administrative contact is understood to be based in Guinea-Bissau.

The proposed technical contact is Assis Neves Guerreiro, Manager of Technical Infrastructure Service, Associação DNS.PT.

## **EVALUATION OF THE REQUEST**

### **String Eligibility**

The top-level domain is eligible for continued delegation under ICANN policy, as it is the assigned ISO 3166-1 two-letter code representing Guinea-Bissau.

### **Public Interest**

Support for the application to redelegate the domain was provided by Rui Duarte Barros, the Prime Minister of Guinea-Bissau. Additional statements in support of this redelegation were provided by two local telecommunications companies, Spacetel Guinea-Bissau and Orange Bissau.

The application is consistent with known applicable local laws in Guinea-Bissau.

The proposed sponsoring organisation undertakes responsibility to operate the domain in a fair and equitable manner.

### **Based in country**

The proposed sponsoring organisation is constituted in Guinea-Bissau. The proposed administrative contact is understood to be resident in Guinea-Bissau.

### **Stability**

The existing sponsoring organisation has been dissolved, and as such ICANN is unable to obtain formal explicit consent for the transfer.

The current administrative contact for the domain does not consent to the change request. He proposed an alternative redelegation request that was deemed insufficient. The application was not revised after an extended opportunity to remedy its deficiencies, and was therefore administratively closed. A transfer plan was provided by ARN for the redelegation of .GW to mitigate any risks relating to Internet stability.

### **Competency**

The application has provided satisfactory details on the technical and operational infrastructure and expertise that will be used to operate the .GW domain. 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 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 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 PAPER NO. 2014.06.26.1c**

**TITLE:** **Appointment of D- and E-Root Server Operator  
Representatives to the RSSAC**

**PROPOSED ACTION:** **For Board Approval – Consent Agenda**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

Per ICANN Bylaws (Article XI, Section 2.3), the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) is submitting the following members for appointment to the RSSAC:

RSO-D: University of Maryland, Tripti Sinha (to replace Tim Shortall)

RSO-E: NASA, Kevin Jones (to replace David Swager)

The individuals are replacing the initial appointed members who are no longer associated with their respective root server operator organizations. The new individuals will assume the extant terms of the initial appointees.

**RSSAC RECOMMENDATION:**

The RSSAC Chairs recommend the Board appoint Tripti Sinha as the appointee for D-root server operator and Kevin Jones as the appointee for E-root server operator

**PROPOSED RESOLUTION:**

Whereas, the ICANN Bylaws call for the establishment of a Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) with the role to advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the operation, administration, security, and integrity of the Internet's Root Server System.

Whereas, the ICANN Bylaws call for Board appointment of RSSAC members based on recommendations from the RSSAC Chairs.

Whereas, the RSSAC Chairs recommended for Board consideration appointments to the RSSAC to represent the D-root and E-root server operators.

Resolved (2014.06.26.XX), the Board appoints the representative for D-root server operator, Tripti Sinha, through 31 December 2016, and the representative for E-root server operator, Kevin Jones, through 31 December 2016 to the Root Server System Advisory Committee.

**PROPOSED RATIONALE:**

In May 2013, the Root Server Operators (RSOs) agreed to an initial membership of RSO operator representatives for RSSAC, and each RSO nominated an individual. The Board approved the initial membership of RSSAC in July 2013. Since then, new representatives have replaced the initial appointees from RSO-D and RSO-E.

The appointment of these new representatives will allow the RSSAC to be properly comprised to serve its function within ICANN's policy development work as an advisory committee while continuing with its reorganization process.

The appointment of these RSSAC members is not anticipated to have any fiscal impact on ICANN, though there are budgeted resources necessary for ongoing support of the RSSAC.

This resolution is an organizational administrative function for which no public comment is required. The appointment of RSSAC members contributes to ICANN's commitment to strengthening the security, stability and resiliency of the DNS.

**Signature Block:**

Submitted by: Steve Sheng

Position: Director of RSSAC and SSAC Advisories Development Support

Date Noted: 5 June 2014

Email: [steve.sheng@icann.org](mailto:steve.sheng@icann.org)

**ICANN BOARD PAPER NO. 2014.06.26.1d**

**TITLE:** Investment Policy Update  
**PROPOSED ACTION:** For Board Consideration and Action – Consent Agenda

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

In furtherance of its due diligence in regards to ICANN's Investment Policy ("Policy"), the Board Finance Committee (BFC) requested staff to engage an investment consulting firm to review the Policy. For this purpose, ICANN used the services of Bridgebay Investment Consultant Services ("Bridgebay"), which had also performed the previous review of the Policy in 2011. As a result of its review process, Bridgebay recommended a few modifications to the Policy, intended to: (i) enhance consistency with ICANN's investment strategy; (ii) add to the philosophy of the Policy's reference to inflation when evaluating returns; and (iii) allow flexibility, within the existing limits, for rebalancing the assets in accordance with the strategic allocation. Bridgebay also reviewed and made additional suggested revisions to language, including items such as: segregation of duties and responsibilities, risk controls, monitoring and reporting and procedures Policy exceptions. Bridgebay presented comments, analysis and the suggested changes to the Policy to the BFC during its meeting of 28 April 2014. These limited Policy modifications will enable the investment manager to optimize its asset allocation strategy for ICANN's Reserve Fund in a conservative, risk-controlled manner.

**STAFF BOARD FINANCE COMMITTEE (BFC) RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff and BFC recommend that the Board approve the proposed revisions to ICANN's Investment Policy.

**PROPOSED RESOLUTION:**

Whereas, the Board Finance Committee requested that an outside expert review the Investment Policy to ensure it is appropriate for ICANN.



Whereas, the outside expert completed a review of the ICANN Investment Policy and concluded that overall the Investment Policy continues to support well the conservative philosophy of ICANN's investment strategy.

Whereas, the outside expert recommends that a few modifications be made to the Investment Policy to enhance and clarify some provisions, but do not change the overall investment strategy.

Resolved (2014.06.26.xx), the Board endorses and adopts the <ICANN Investment Policy> as revised.

**PROPOSED RATIONALE:**

In furtherance of its due diligence in regards to ICANN's Investment Policy ("Policy"), the Board Finance Committee (BFC) requested staff to engage an investment consulting firm to review the Policy. For this purpose, ICANN used the services of Bridgebay Investment Consultant Services ("Bridgebay"), which had also performed the previous review of the Policy in 2011. As a result of its review process, Bridgebay recommended a few modifications to the Policy, intended to: (i) enhance consistency with ICANN's investment strategy; (ii) add to the philosophy of the Policy's reference to inflation when evaluating returns; and (iii) allow flexibility, within the existing limits, for rebalancing the assets in accordance with the strategic allocation. Bridgebay also reviewed made additional suggested revisions to language, including items such as: segregation of duties and responsibilities, risk controls, monitoring and reporting and procedures Policy exceptions. Bridgebay presented comments, analysis and the suggested changes to the Policy to the BFC during its meeting of 28 April 2014. These limited Policy modifications will enable the investment manager to optimize its asset allocation strategy for ICANN's Reserve Fund in a conservative, risk-controlled manner.

Adopting the suggested modifications is expected to be in the best interest of ICANN and the ICANN community in that it is meant to enhance and clarify certain aspects of ICANN's investment strategy. This action is not expected to have any fiscal impact, or any impact on the security, stability and resiliency of the domain name system.

This is an Organizational Administrative Function that does not require public comment

**ICANN BOARD SUBMISSION No. 2014.06.26.1e**

**TITLE:** Meeting Venue Location and Hotel Contract for February 2015 ICANN Meeting

**PROPOSED ACTION:** For Board Consideration and Action – Consent Agenda

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

The location of the ICANN Public Meeting (“Meeting”) to be held from 8-12 February 2015 needs to be confirmed. In addition, since the Meeting venue contract will exceed US\$500,000, the expenditure must be approved by the Board (see <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/signing-authority-2012-02-25-en>). In the normal geographic rotation plan for 2015, this Meeting is to be held in Africa. The Reference Materials for this paper summarize the steps taken to locate a site for the 2015 Africa Meeting, and outlines the venue hotel costs.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends that the Board delegate to the President and CEO, or his designee(s), the authority to take all actions necessary to hold the February 2015 ICANN Meeting in Marrakech, Morocco, including approving the Meeting venue contracting and expenditure disbursement.

**BOARD FINANCE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:**

The Board Finance Committee recommends that the Board delegate to the President and CEO, or his designee(s), the authority to take all necessary actions to hold the February 2015 ICANN Public Meeting in Marrakech, Morocco, as reflected in the Annex to this Paper.

**PROPOSED RESOLUTION:**

Whereas, ICANN intends to hold its first Public Meeting of 2015 in the Africa region.

Whereas, staff has completed a thorough review of all proposed venues in Africa and finds the one in Marrakech, Morocco to be the most suitable.

Whereas, the Board Finance Committee has reviewed during its meeting on 10 June 2014 the financial implications of contracting with the venue identified to hold the ICANN meeting in Marrakech, Morocco, and agrees with the recommendation from staff.

Whereas, the Board Finance Committee has recommended that the Board delegate to the President and CEO, or his designee(s), the authority to take all actions to hold the February 2015 ICANN Meeting in Marrakech, Morocco, including all necessary contracting and disbursements.

Resolved (2014.06.26.xx), the Board approves Marrakech, Morocco as the location of the ICANN 2015 Africa Meeting from 8-12 February 2015, and authorizes the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to take all actions necessary to hold the February 2015 ICANN Meeting in Marrakech, Morocco.

Resolved (2014.06.26.xx), that Board authorizes the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to engage in and facilitate all necessary contracting and disbursements for the Meeting venue of the February 2015 ICANN Public Meeting, in an amount not to exceed Confidential Negotiation Information

Resolved (2014.06.26.xx), specific items within this resolution shall remain confidential for negotiation purposes pursuant to Article III, section 5.2 of the ICANN Bylaws until the President and CEO determines that the confidential information may be released.

#### **PROPOSED RATIONALE:**

As part of ICANN's public meeting schedule, three times a year ICANN hosts a meeting in a different geographic region (as defined in the ICANN Bylaws). ICANN Meeting 52, scheduled for 8-12 February 2015, is to occur in the Africa geographic region. A call for recommendations for the location of the meeting in Africa was posted on 03 May 2013. Various parties sent a proposal to ICANN.

The staff performed a thorough analysis of the proposals and prepared a paper to identify those that met the Meeting Selection Criteria (see

<http://meetings.icann.org/location-selection-criteria>). Based on the proposals and analysis, staff has recommended that ICANN 52 be held in Marrakech, Morocco.

The Board reviewed staff's recommendation for hosting the meeting in Marrakech, Morocco and the determination that the proposal met the significant factors of the Meeting Selection Criteria used to guide site selection work. The process for selection of this site does not call for public consultation, as the assessment of the feasibility of a site is the primary consideration.

There will be a financial impact on ICANN in hosting the meeting and providing travel support as necessary, as well as on the community in incurring costs to travel to the meeting. But such impact would be faced regardless of the location of the meeting.

There is no impact on the security or the stability of the DNS due to the hosting of the meeting.

The Board thanks all who recommended sites for ICANN Meeting 52.

This is an Organizational Administrative function that does not require public comment.

Submitted by:	Nick Tomasso
Position:	VP, Meetings & Int'l Real Estate Operations
Date Noted:	5 June 2014
Email and Phone Number	<a href="mailto:nick.tomasso@icann.org">nick.tomasso@icann.org</a> <small>Confidential Information Redacted</small>

## ICANN BOARD PAPER NO. 2014.06.26.1f

**TITLE:** **Multi-Stakeholder Meeting Strategy Working Group ICANN Future Meetings Strategy**

**PROPOSED ACTION:** **For Board Consideration and Action**

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

The [Multi-Stakeholder Meeting Strategy Working Group](#) (MSGW) developed a strategy for future ICANN public meetings containing recommendations in the areas of: meeting timing, duration and format; rotation of the meeting location; meeting support and engagement activities; and meeting planning.

The Board has emphasized the importance of facilitating the evolution and scalability of ICANN public meetings and in 2013 created a working group composed of Board members, community and staff to develop a strategy for future meetings.

The working group delivered its final report, which was adapted to take into account public comments received and input from discussions held at a public session in Singapore on 24 March 2014. An implementation plan by staff is now required.

### **MSWG AND STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The Board is recommended to receive the report of the MSWG and direct the preparation of implementation plans for Board review that will allow for the implementation of the recommendations in calendar year 2016.

### **PROPOSED RESOLUTION:**

Whereas, ICANN public meetings are a central pillar of ICANN's multi-stakeholder model because they provide a venue for progressing policy work, conducting outreach, exchanging best practices, networking, interacting among members of the ICANN Community, including Board and staff, and learning about ICANN.

Whereas, in [February 2013 the ICANN Board resolved to create a multi-stakeholder working group](#) to look into all aspects of ICANN meetings to meet growing, global and multi-stakeholder needs and the [group's composition was announced in March 2013](#).

Whereas, the Meeting Strategy Working Group (MSWG) was a true cross-community working group of which the mandate was to gather information, exchange ideas and propose strategic and operational changes to future ICANN meetings, in particular on: (i) scheduling and general conference agenda; (ii) length of the conference overall, and; (iii) number of international public meetings per year.

Whereas, the final report of the MSWG recommends changes to the meetings model of ICANN public meetings and proposes a new strategy for their structure, purpose and locations to support broad, informed participation and reflect the functional, geographic, and cultural diversity of the Internet at all levels of policy development and decision-making. These recommendations have been the subject of community comment and input.

Resolved (2014.06.26.xx), the Board acknowledges the MSWG's work and dedication, thanks the MSWG for producing a comprehensive set of recommendations anticipated to improve the long-term scalability of ICANN's public meetings, and thanks the ICANN community for commenting on the MSWG Recommendations.

Resolved (2014.06.26.xx), the Board directs the President and CEO, through his designee(s), to propose a plan for implementation of the recommendations contained in the report, to be provided to the Board for approval in sufficient time for implementation for meetings to be held in calendar year 2016.

#### **PROPOSED RATIONALE:**

The [Multi-Stakeholder Meeting Strategy Working Group](#) (MSGW) was a cross-community Working Group. Its mandate was to gather information, exchange ideas and propose changes to future ICANN meetings at both a strategic and operational level.

The MSWG developed a constructive report that made proposals for changes to ICANN public meetings in the following areas: meeting timing, duration and format; rotation of the meeting location; meeting support and engagement activities; and meeting planning.

The overall recommendations made by the MSWG for public comment are:

(i) Continue the three-meeting schedule annually, but evolve the structure of the three meetings (defined as Meeting A, B, and C) to better address meeting objectives, scheduling conflicts and to use the time in a most effective way; (ii) Continue regional rotation for all meetings and coordinate rotation to balance global coverage on a multi-year cycle, but evolve the rotation strategy to take advantage of the smaller mid-year meeting (Meeting B) to rotate through new geographic locations previously unavailable to the meetings due to the attendance and logistical requirements of the current meeting structure; (iii) Continue to allocate adequate time for SO/AC work, but evolve the format of the meetings to afford greater opportunity for cross-community engagement and outreach; and, (iv) Continue with the public forum at the first and third meetings in the cycle, but evolve the format by splitting the time into two portions with differing focus.

The Working Group posted its [Report and Recommendations](#) for [public comment on 25 February 2014](#), in addition to which there were also consultations and discussions held at a public session in Singapore on 24 March 2014. [Input from the community](#), including inputs from ICANN's Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, was considered.

In order for ICANN to move forward with implementation of the MSWG's recommendations, an implementation plan including estimated resource costs is required.

This action will require the use of resources in the development of implementation plans, and the implementation of these recommendations is likely to result in a financial impact on the organization. This action is not expected to have a direct impact on the security, stability or resiliency of the domain name system.

**Signature Block:**

Submitted by: Nick Tomasso

Positions: VP, Meetings & Int'l Real Estate Operations

Date Noted: 9 June 2014

Email: [nick.tomasso@icann.org](mailto:nick.tomasso@icann.org)



**ICANN BOARD SUBMISSION NO. 2014.06.26.1g**

**TITLE:** New gTLD Program Committee Membership  
**PROPOSED ACTION:** For Board Consideration and Action – Consent Agenda

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

Suzanne Woolf has recently submitted a new Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form that does not identify anything that would lead to an actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest related to the new gTLD Program. Accordingly, the Board is being asked to add Suzanne Woolf as a liaison to the New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC).

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends that the Board add Suzanne Woolf as a liaison to the New gTLD Program Committee.

**PROPOSED RESOLUTION:**

Whereas, on 10 April 2012 the Board created the New gTLD Program Committee, to which it delegated all legal and decision making authority of the Board relating to the New gTLD Program as set forth in its Charter, which excludes those things that the Board is prohibited from delegating by law, or pursuant to Article XII, Section 2 of the ICANN Bylaws.

Whereas, the Board had previously determined that Suzanne Woolf should not participate in the New gTLD Program Committee due to actual, potential or perceived conflicts stemming from her then employment situation.

Whereas, Suzanne has reported that with a change in her employment situation, there is no longer anything related to the New gTLD Program that would lead to an actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest with respect to the New gTLD Program.

Resolved (2014.06.26.xx), Suzanne Woolf is hereby appointed as a liaison to the New gTLD Program Committee.

## **PROPOSED RATIONALE:**

The Board reaffirms its Rationale for Resolutions 2012.04.10.01-2012.04.10.04, stating in full: In order to have efficient meetings and take appropriate actions with respect to the New gTLD Program for the current round of the Program and as related to the Applicant Guidebook, the Board decided to create the "New gTLD Program Committee" in accordance with Article XII of the Bylaws and has delegated decision making authority to the Committee as it relates to the New gTLD Program for the current round of the Program which commenced in January 2012 and for the related Applicant Guidebook that applies to this current round.

Establishing the New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) without conflicted members, and delegating to it decision making authority, has provided some distinct advantages, including helping eliminate any uncertainty for conflicted Board members with respect to attendance at Board meetings and workshops since the New gTLD Program topics can be dealt with at the NGPC level. Further, it has provided the community with a transparent view into the Board's commitment to dealing with actual, potential or perceived conflicts.

The Board Governance Committee (BGC) Subcommittee for Conflicts & Ethics on new gTLDs initially evaluated all Board members' statements of interest related to new gTLDs when the membership of the NGPC was first established. At that time, the Subcommittee determined, and the Board agreed, that Suzanne should not be a member of the New gTLD Program Committee in light of actual, potential or perceived conflicts of interest resulting from her employment status at that time.

Suzanne's employment status has changed and she has recently submitted a new Disclosure Form wherein she reports nothing that could generally lead to an actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest as it relates to the New gTLD Program. Accordingly, Suzanne should be made part of the NGPC, given that the goal is to have all non-conflicted Board members be part of the NGPC.

This resolution should have a positive impact on the community and ICANN as a whole, particularly the fact of increasing the number of Board members who participate in decisions surrounding the New gTLD Program.

No fiscal impact is anticipated as a result of this action and there will be no impact on the security, stability and resiliency of the domain name system.

This decision is an Organizational Administrative Function that does not require public comment.

Submitted By: Amy A. Stathos, Deputy General Counsel  
Date Noted: 10 June 2014  
Email: amy.stathos@icann.org

**ICANN BOARD SUBMISSION NO. 2014.06.26.1h**

**TITLE:** **Thank You from Security and Stability Advisory Committee to Sarmad Hussain**

**PROPOSED ACTION:** **For Board Consideration and Action – Consent Agenda**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

The Board appointed Sarmad Hussain to the SSAC for a two-year term beginning on 01 January 2011 and ending on 31 December 2013. The Board reappointed Mr. Hussain to a three-year term beginning 01 January 2014 and ending 31 December 2016. Mr. Hussain resigned from the SSAC on 30 May 2014. Mr. Hussain has been a valued SSAC member who has made many excellent contributions to the Committee's work. The SSAC requests that the Board join the Committee in extending its thanks to Mr. Hussain for his service to the SSAC and the Community.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:**

The Committee wishes to formally thank Sarmad Hussain for his work while a member of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee.

**PROPOSED RESOLUTION:**

Whereas, the Board appointed Sarmad Hussain to the SSAC for a two-year term beginning on 01 January 2011 and ending on 31 December 2013.

Whereas, The Board reappointed Mr. Hussain to a three-year term beginning 01 January 2014 and ending 31 December 2016.

Whereas, Mr. Hussain resigned from the SSAC on 30 May 2014.

Whereas, ICANN wishes to acknowledge and thank Mr. Hussain for his service to the community by his membership on the SSAC.

Resolved (2014.06.26.xx), that Sarmad Hussain has earned the deep appreciation of the Board for his service to ICANN by his membership on the SSAC, and that the Board wishes Mr. Hussain well in all future endeavours.

**PROPOSED RATIONALE:**

It is the practice of the SSAC to seek Board recognition of the service of Committee members upon their departure.

Submitted by:	Ram Mohan
Position:	Liaison to the ICANN Board from the Security and Stability Advisory Committee
Date Noted:	30 May 2014
Email:	rmohan@afilias.info

Pages 30/41 through 35/41 have been intentionally omitted.

The version of the ATRT2 Recommendations board paper that was considered by the Board is available with the 26 June 2014 Board Briefing Materials as “ATRT2 Board Paper.”

**ICANN BOARD INFORMATION PAPER NO. 2014.06.26.1**

**TITLE:** **2<sup>ND</sup>. AT-LARGE SUMMIT (ATLAS II)  
DECLARATION**

**PROPOSED ACTION:** **FOR BOARD INFORMATION**

**Note: This item will be mentioned briefly at the beginning of the public board meeting by Steve Crocker, who will recognize Olivier Crépin-Leblond for the ALAC's efforts.**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

The primary output of the 2<sup>nd</sup> At-Large Summit (ATLAS II), which will be bringing over 150 At-Large Structure Representatives to the 50<sup>th</sup> ICANN Meeting in London to participate in plenary meetings and Thematic Group breakout sessions as well as other sessions, will be the ATLAS II Declaration.

The Declaration is expected to be similar in format to the ATLAS 1 Declaration (see: <http://atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-05mar09-en.htm>), but updated to reflect current key issues of importance to the At-Large community.

The ATLAS II Declaration is expected to form the basis for post-ATLAS II activity of the At-Large community.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Chair of the ALAC, will be presenting the ATLAS II Declaration to the Board at the beginning of the public Board Meeting on Thursday, 26 June 2014.

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON THE THEMATIC GROUPS:**

The focus of the ATLAS II Declaration will be the results of work within five Thematic Groups consisting of the following:

1. [The Future of Multistakeholderism](#)

**Abstract**

As a form of participatory democracy that builds on the other forms of democracy practiced in the world today, the variety of multistakeholder models have a promising future.

However, multistakeholderism is not monolithic, it must recognize the different roles played by different stakeholders in different issues. And that any person, alone or as part of a group should be able to contribute fully to that process according to their expertise and interests.

Furthermore, multistakeholderism is threatened by those who reject this form of democracy, oftentimes by the same states who reject democracy. This rejection of multistakeholderism finds support in all other sectors, but at this point in time those who support the model form a rough consensus in its favor.

Multistakeholderism is a form of democratic action that is still evolving and still needs a fair amount of care and attention to thrive. NETmundial has given the world one of its first examples of multistakeholder decision making modalities. This points the way forward for multistakeholderism.

## 2. [The Globalization of ICANN](#)

### **Abstract**

ICANN has been created to provide a global infrastructure to manage worldwide Internet resources like domain names, IP addresses and Internet parameters. To be really “global”, ICANN needs to provide a framework where all stakeholders worldwide can interact on equal footing, without cultural, geopolitical, gender, or other barriers to participation. Moreover, ICANN needs to be accountable to the global Internet community: the globalization of ICANN is strictly linked to the ability of the multi-stakeholders to set checks and balances to verify that ICANN is really independent from local constraining factors limiting the global equal access to the process.

## 3. [Global Internet: The User Perspective](#)

### **Abstract**



The Internet grew and developed based on trust. This important element added to a series of Internet design principles such as interoperability, openness, decentralization, end to end, permissionless innovation, best effort, packet switching, parsimony, among others. Together, these principles have allowed us, the Internet Users, to enjoy the global Internet that we have today. This trust is the foundation of our community. So much so that even today we talk about the concept of "Web of Trust" than as representatives of the organizations of Internet users are enabling us to participate in our At-Large community.

In this growth that the Internet have experimented to become a global network of networks, has collaborated very much the contribution that Internet Users have made. Without the trust of users on purchases made over the Internet would not have expanded the e-commerce in the way it did in different world regions.

Without the trust of users, they had not been able to exercise their political rights and democracy through Internet voting to elect their representatives in some countries that have regulated the electronic voting. Without the trust of users, the world would not be able to implement new standards and this could be impeding innovation and development.

Without the trust of users and their representative organizations, we would not be discussing policies that affect us in this At-Large space. We need to continue to developing this trust of users to achieve their perspectives can impregnate the decisions that we make in this battle to defend a unique and global Internet.

#### 4. [ICANN Transparency and Accountability](#)

##### **Abstract**

ATRT Final Recommendation #9 generally reflects the community feedback on existing appeals mechanisms and includes a set of necessary improvements. Rec.9.2 is particularly important for accountability of decision-making process and reform of appeal mechanism. It's suggested to form a Stakeholder Group Committee to examine the options to restructure the current Board reconsideration process and the Independent Review Process (IRP).

However, it is unclear whether Board reconsideration process and the IRP will remain the only or the "final" appeal channel available for reviewing other appeals decisions, either from internal bodies or outside service providers, especially in the various gTLDs and ccTLDs processes. For example, will improved appeals mechanisms take into account the processing of reconsideration requests and objections on decisions made in the new gTLD program by ICANN or its dispute resolution providers, or will it apply to a review procedure for decisions made in IDN ccTLD program, for issues such as string similarity.

In the long run, enhancement of accountability depends on the improvement and development of mechanisms in three correlated areas, namely (1) institutional transparency, particularly in the decision-making process; (2) check and balance through duly separation of powers, especially after the transition of stewardship of IANA function; and (3) effective and efficient appeal system, within or outside ICANN, including the external final appeal system to "judicially" supervise the decision of ICANN Board and its members, like the constitutional court.

As we have not seen what the Board intends to do about recommendation 9.2 it is good to be cautious. But if the Board and ICANN staff do honor the suggestion for a community wide discussion of ICANN accountability and appeals, then At-large needs a strategy for contributing to that and needs to begin substantive work on identifying the features required in a well formed ICANN appeals process. In developing accountability and transparency mechanisms, from an At-Large perspective, discussion needs to extend to all of the At-Large Structures (ALS) so that they can contribute from the diversity of global user experience on accountability and transparency and access to appeals mechanisms, that only At-Large can bring to ICANN.

## 5. [At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN](#)

### **Abstract**

"At-Large" is the name for the community of individual Internet users who participate in the policy development work of ICANN. Currently, more than 160

groups representing the views of individual Internet users are active throughout the world.

The At-Large Community is made up of representatives from civil society, the private sector and the technical community. Each individual brings a voice, ideas, concerns, passion and context to the discussion.

Our challenge is how we engage with such a large multi-stakeholder community and break down the silos represented by those groups. Further our challenge is to develop the At-Large Community's capacity for engagement in ICANN by increasing its knowledge and understanding of the key issues confronting ICANN. Understanding ICANN's roles and responsibilities and aligning these with our own perspective is a task where we welcome participation and dialogue.

Policy Development is at the heart of what ICANN does. Policy development happens at many levels in the organization. The system used to develop policies is in many ways unique. It is designed to promote bottom-up development and decision-making and is a perfect fit into the general theory of ICANN as an innovative governance model that allows participation from everyone that has either a stake or an interest in the subject matter. This policy development model is precious because it gives everyone a voice, but no-one a louder voice than anyone else. It brings together the technical, user, legal, commercial, governmental, civil and non-profit perspectives so that the resulting policy can truly be suited to all types of uses and users.

A Policy Development workshop will help you understand how one of ICANN's key policy development mechanisms, the GNSO or Generic Names Service Organization, is used to develop policy for generic Top Level Domains.

## **BACKGROUND ON THE ATLAS II**

The ICANN At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) along with the At-Large community will hold a second At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) at the June 2014 ICANN Meeting in London on the theme of “Global Internet: The User Perspective”.

ATLAS II will build upon the successful activities of the At-Large community since the first At-Large Summit (ATLAS) was held alongside the ICANN Meeting in Mexico in March 2009 – an event of fundamental importance since it became the foundation stone to the involvement of many of our At-Large Structures (ALSes) in ICANN.

**The purpose of holding the ATLAS II is fourfold:**

- 1) Debate on the key issues of interest for ICANN, both policy and process, and provide the opinion of the At-Large community physically present in the meeting about those issues;
- 2) Strengthen the bottom up structure of the volunteer At-Large community by building capacity and awareness of At-Large policies and processes of the 160+ At-Large Structures;
- 3) Further develop the At-Large Community's capacity for engagement with all members of the ICANN community by increasing its knowledge and understanding of the key issues confronting ICANN and ICANN's roles and responsibilities and plan for the next stage of the ALAC/At-Large community's development;
- 4) Allow ICANN to fair a key component of its bottom-up multi-stakeholder environment to the rest of the world at a time pivotal to ICANN as an Internet multi-stakeholder organization.

**Signature Block:**

Submitted by: Heidi Ullrich

Position: Senior Director for At-Large

Date Noted: 5 June 2014

Email: Heidi.ullrich@icann.org