

2011-07-28- NoticeBDMtg

Directors and Liaisons,

Attached below please find the Notice of date and time for the Special Meeting of the ICANN Board of Directors:

28 July 2011 - Special Meeting of the ICANN Board of Directors --
at 11:00 UTC – This Board meeting is estimated to last 2 hours.

Some other time zones:

28 July 2011 – 4:00 AM PDT Los Angeles

28 July 2011 – 1:00 PM CEST Brussels

28 July 2011 – 7:00 AM EDT Washington, D.C.

28 July 2011 – 9:00 PM Sydney

<http://www.timeanddate.com/worldclock/fixetime.html?iso=20110728T11&ah=2>

MATERIALS - SPECIAL NOTE – Following on the changes that were recently made to the Materials, they have been broken into two separate books – included in the Board Book (along with the notice and call information) are the following: 1) an expanded agenda and 2) a more concisely formatted set of board papers. The last part – titled “Additional Materials” is a separate board book, available on Board Vantage which includes additional materials and exhibits that are related to some of the papers where board members would like to explore additional information on many of the topics.

MATERIALS -- All Materials are available on Contact Information
Redacted , 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.

The materials are all available in two board books from BoardVantage, if you are unable to access, it can be mailed to you directly.

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

The call information is also attached. If you require a call out to be brought into the meeting, because you are not in a location with a toll free dial-in, please let us know and we will have the call operators call you 5-10 minutes before the start of the meeting.

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 <John.Jeffrey@icann.org>

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

Contact Information Redacted

Contact Information Redacted

2011-07-28-Agenda-Resolutions-Rationales



Draft Board Resolutions
28 July 2011
Special Meeting of the ICANN Board

*Note: Where available, draft Rationale of the Board's actions is presented under the associated Resolution. The draft Rationale is not final until approved with the minutes of the Board meeting.

1. Consent Agenda	2
1.1. Approval of Minutes of 20 June 2011 ICANN Board Meeting	2
1.2. Approval of Minutes of 24 June 2011 ICANN Board Meeting	2
1.3. Approval of Minutes of 24 June 2011 ICANN Organizational Board Meeting.....	2
1.4. Approval of Minutes of 25 June 2011 ICANN Board Meeting	2
1.5. Approval of Redelelegation of .om Domain Representing Oman	2
Rationale for Resolution 2011.07.28.xx.....	3
2. Receipt of Security, Stability & Resiliency Framework for FY12	5
Rationale for Resolutions 2011.07.28.xx	5
3. Ombudsman Contract.....	6

1. Consent Agenda

Resolved, the following resolutions in this Consent Agenda are approved:

1.1. Approval of Minutes of 20 June 2011 ICANN Board Meeting

Resolved (2011.07.28.xx), the Board approves the minutes of the 20 June 2011 ICANN Board Meeting.

1.2. Approval of Minutes of 24 June 2011 ICANN Board Meeting

Resolved (2011.07.28.xx), the Board approves the minutes of the 24 June 2011 ICANN Board Meeting.

1.3. Approval of Minutes of 24 June 2011 ICANN Organizational Board Meeting

Resolved (2011.07.28.xx), the Board approves the minutes of the 24 June 2011 ICANN Organizational Board Meeting.

1.4. Approval of Minutes of 25 June 2011 ICANN Board Meeting

Resolved (2011.07.28.xx), the Board approves the minutes of the 25 June 2011 ICANN Board Meeting.

1.5. Approval of Redelelegation of .om Domain Representing Oman

Whereas, OM is the ISO 3166-1 two-letter country-code designated for Oman;

Whereas, ICANN has received a request for redelegation of .OM to the Telecommunications Regulatory Authority.

Whereas, ICANN has reviewed the request, and has determined that the proposed redelegation would be in the interests of the local and global Internet communities;

It is hereby Resolved (2011.07.28.xx), that the proposed redelegation of the .OM top-level domain to the Telecommunications Regulatory Authority is approved.

Rationale for Resolution 2011.07.28.xx

Why the Board is addressing the issue now?

Staff present delegation and redelegation requests for country-code domains to the Board for decision, once staff are satisfied the applicant has provided a sufficiently complete application that has a reasonable prospect of a positive Board decision. In line with ICANN's commitments to perform timely processing of requests relating to the IANA function, and the DNS root zone in particular, the ICANN Board seeks to evaluate such requests at its next scheduled Special Meeting.

What is the proposal being considered?

The proposal is to approve a request to IANA to change or designate the sponsoring organisation (also known as the manager or trustee) of a country-code top-level domain. In line with established practice, the ICANN Board is involved in making the decision to proceed with such requests as one step of this multi-step process.

Which stakeholders or others were consulted?

In the course of evaluating a delegation application, ICANN staff consults with the applicant, the current operator (if applicable), and other directly connected parties. In line with ICANN's practice of keeping incomplete root zone change requests in confidence, ICANN has not performed open consultation on this matter.

What concerns or issues were raised by the community?

Any concerns or issues are raised within the public report that will be published in conjunction with this action. This report will be published on the IANA website at <http://www.iana.org/> should the root zone change request has successfully completed final processing, usually 1-2 months after the Board's decision.

What significant materials did the Board review?

The Board is involved in assessing requests against a variety of public interest criteria. This criteria includes establishing the

country-code is eligible (e.g. listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard); establishing the proposed manager is supported by the local Internet community; establishing the proposed operator is operationally and technically competent; establishing the proposed manager is based locally and bound under local law; establishing the proposed manager operates fairly and equitably; establishing that in cases there is a transfer of operations that an appropriate plan is in place to preserve ongoing stability of the domain; and establishing that the action is compatible with any applicable local laws and regulations. During the staff compilation process, the applicant is asked to provide a variety of materials in support of these various aspects. Pertinent information from these supplied materials and other staff research is provided to the Board, and published in a public report at the end of implementing an approved request.

What factors the Board found to be significant?

The Board considers factors described in the public report, in relation to the basic principles of country-code domain delegation described earlier.

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, and the local communities to which country-code top-level domains are designated to serve.

Are there fiscal 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 fiscal impact of the internal operations of country-code top-level domains within a country, other than ensuring the operator is based in country and has the appropriate mechanisms to allow the local

Internet community to properly oversee the domain's ongoing operation.

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

For country-code top-level domain delegations, ICANN seeks to approve only such requests where reasonable concerns have been satisfactorily addressed, and the proposed new manager has demonstrated a sufficient level of operational and technical competency where such concerns should be minimal.

2. Receipt of Security, Stability & Resiliency Framework for FY12

Whereas, the FY 12 Security, Stability & Resiliency (SSR) Framework was posted for public comment from 2 May to 7 June 2011.

Whereas, a public comment summary and analysis was completed and published on 8 June 2011.

Whereas, staff conducted a community briefing during the Singapore meeting and is incorporating feedback into the operational priorities described in the SSR Framework, including benchmarks, objectives, milestones and a mechanism for assessing success in SSR activities.

Resolved (2011.07.28.xx), the Board acknowledges receipt of the FY 12 SSR Framework.

Rationale for Resolutions 2011.07.28.xx

Under the Affirmation of Commitments signed by ICANN and the US Department of Commerce on 30 September 2009, preserving the security, stability and resiliency of the DNS is recognized as a key commitment. The Affirmation acknowledges in Section 9.2 that ICANN has adopted a Security, Stability and Resiliency (SSR) Plan, which will be regularly updated to reflect emerging threats to the DNS, including unique identifiers. Previous SSR Plans were published in 2009 and 2010, and acknowledged by the ICANN Board at the international public meetings in Sydney, Australia (June 2009) and Cartagena, Colombia (December 2010).

This latest version of the SSR Framework has been updated in a more streamlined and accessible format, and was published in May 2011 to bring ICANN's baseline documentation on SSR on schedule with the publication of the FY 12 ICANN Operating Plan and Budget cycle. The document provides guidance to the community on ICANN's role in SSR, describes areas in which ICANN has operational responsibility, areas in which ICANN is a collaborator, facilitator and contributor, and areas in which ICANN is an observer of activities led by others in the ecosystem. Community inputs received in the public comment period were generally supportive of the revised format, and asked for greater specificity and precision on definitions.

A Board paper detailing the SSR Framework and annex containing information on the comments received between 2 May and 7 June 2011 has been provided to the Board.

The document is separate from the overall ICANN Operating Plan and Budget and there are no anticipated fiscal impacts from this decision. The Framework serves as guidance on ICANN activities in SSR for the coming fiscal year.

3. Ombudsman Contract

For approval – agreement in final stages – draft terms to be presented to board.

2011-06-20-Board-Minutes



Minutes
Board of Directors Meeting
20 June 2011
Singapore

A transcript of the meeting is posted at <http://singapore41.icann.org/meetings/singapore2011/transcript-board-new-gtlds-20jun11-en.txt>.

A Regular Meeting of the ICANN Board of Directors was held on 20 June 2011 in Singapore at 11:00 am local time.

Chairman Peter Dengate Thrush promptly called the meeting to order.

In addition to Chairman Peter Dengate Thrush the following Directors participated in the meeting: Rod Beckstrom (President and CEO), Steve Crocker (Vice Chairman), Sébastien Bachollet, Cherine Chalaby, Bertrand de la Chapelle, Rita Rodin Johnston, Erika Mann, Gonzalo Navarro, Raymond A. Plzak, R. Ramaraj, George Sadowsky, Mike Silber, Bruce Tonkin, Katim Touray, and Kuo-Wei Wu.

The following Board Liaisons participated in all or part of the meeting: Heather Dryden, GAC Liaison; Ram Mohan, SSAC Liaison; Thomas Narten, IETF Liaison; Reinhard Scholl, TLG Liaison; and Suzanne Woolf, RSSAC Liaison.

1. Approval of the New gTLD Program

The Chair of the Board introduced the meeting and confirmed that the timing of the meeting was set by resolution at the Board's meeting during the Silicon Valley/San Francisco meeting.

The Chair then thanked the staff for its extraordinary effort in making sure the Board was prepared for this meeting, the GAC for participating diligently and thoroughly in the meetings regarding the new gTLD program, and the Board for the effort in preparing, receiving and digesting information on the program.

The Chair noted that in addition to the public meetings in Brussels and San Francisco, the Board had weekly calls, with the GAC Chair participating in most of the meetings. There have been conversations with the GAC topic leads, and the entire effort has been exemplary.

Adhering to the Board's conflict of interest policy, the Chair then polled the Board, requesting a declaration of whether a conflict exists and whether the Board member intends to vote.

The Chair, the CEO, Cherine Chalaby, Bertrand de La Chapelle, Katim Touray, George

Board Minutes

20 June 2011

Page 2 of 12

Sadowsky, Sébastien Bachollet, Gonzalo Navarro, Rita Rodin Johnston, R. Ramaraj, Steve Crocker, Mike Silber, Erika Mann, Ray Plzak and Kuo Wei Wu each declared that they have no conflict and intend to vote.

Bruce Tonkin declared that he would abstain from voting. Bruce clarified that though he's been working hard to find solutions within the new gTLD program, he has not participated in Board discussions on topics such as vertical integration. Bruce noted that the actual decision to launch the program and the date of launch would have an impact on his employer, Melbourne I.T., an ICANN accredited registrar as well as a ccTLD accredited registrar, that also provides a range of services to corporations considering applying for new gTLDs.

The Chair noted that the Liaisons to the Board have also followed the conflicts of interest process during Board discussion and deliberation. As the Liaisons are non-voting, they were not polled during the meeting.

Rita Rodin Johnston then moved the following resolution and read it into the record:

Whereas, on 28 November 2005, the GNSO Council voted unanimously to initiate a policy development process on the introduction of new gTLDs.

Whereas, the GNSO Committee on the Introduction of New gTLDs addressed a range of difficult technical, operational, legal, economic, and policy questions, and facilitated widespread participation and public comment throughout the policy development process.

Whereas, on 6 September 2007, the GNSO Council approved by a supermajority vote a motion supporting the 19 recommendations, as a whole, as set out in the Final Report of the ICANN Generic Names Supporting Organisation on the Introduction of New Generic Top-Level Domains going forward to the ICANN Board <<http://gns0.icann.org/issues/new-gtlds/pdp-dec05-fr-parta-08aug07.htm>>.

Whereas, the Board instructed staff to review the GNSO recommendations and determine whether they were capable of implementation, and staff engaged international technical, operational and legal expertise to support the implementation of the policy recommendations and developed implementation plans for the GNSO's policy recommendations.

Whereas, on 26 June 2008, the Board adopted the GNSO policy recommendations for the introduction of new gTLDs and directed staff to further develop and complete its detailed implementation plan, continue communication with the community on such work, and provide the Board with a final version of the implementation proposals for the board and community to approve before the launching the new gTLD application process <http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-26jun08.htm#_Toc76113171>.

Board Minutes

20 June 2011

Page 3 of 12

Whereas, staff has made implementation details publicly available in the form of drafts of the gTLD Applicant Guidebook and supporting materials for public discussion and comment.

Whereas, the first draft of the Applicant Guidebook was published on 23 October 2008 <<http://www.icann.org/en/topics/new-gtlds/comments-en.htm>>, and the Guidebook has undergone continued substantial revisions based on stakeholder input on multiple drafts.

Whereas, the Board has conducted intensive consultations with the Governmental Advisory Committee (including in Brussels in February 2011, in San Francisco in March 2011, by telephone in May 2011, and in Singapore on 19 June 2011), resulting in substantial agreement on a wide range of issues noted by the GAC, and the Board has directed revisions to the Applicant Guidebook to reflect such agreement.

Whereas, ICANN received letters from the United States Department of Commerce and the European Commission addressing the issue of registry-registrar cross-ownership, and the Board considered the concerns expressed therein. The Board agrees that the potential abuse of significant market power is a serious concern, and discussions with competition authorities will continue.

Whereas, ICANN has consulted with the GAC to find mutually acceptable solutions on areas where the implementation of policy is not consistent with GAC advice, and where necessary has identified its reasons for not incorporating the advice in particular areas, as required by the Bylaws; see <<http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/rationale-gac-response-new-gtld-20jun11-en.pdf>> [PDF, 103 KB].

Whereas, the ICANN community has dedicated countless hours to the review and consideration of numerous implementation issues, by the submission of public comments, participation in working groups, and other consultations.

Whereas, the Board has listened to the input that has been provided by the community, including the supporting organizations and advisory committees, throughout the implementation process.

Whereas, careful analysis of the obligations under the Affirmation of Commitments and the steps taken throughout the implementation process indicates that ICANN has fulfilled the commitments detailed in the Affirmation <<http://www.icann.org/en/documents/affirmation-of-commitments-30sep09-en.htm>>.

Whereas, the Applicant Guidebook posted on 30 May 2011 <<http://www.icann.org/en/topics/new-gtlds/comments-7-en.htm>> includes updates resulting from public comment and from recent GAC advice.

Whereas, the draft New gTLDs Communications Plan <<http://www.icann.org/en/topics/new-gtlds/new-gtlds-communications-plan-30may11-en.pdf>> [PDF, 486 KB] forms the basis of the global outreach and education activities that will be conducted leading up to and during the execution of the program in each of the ICANN geographic regions.

Whereas, the Draft FY12 Operating Plan and Budget <<http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-17may11-en.htm>> includes a New gTLD Program Launch Scenario, and the Board is prepared to approve the expenditures included in Section 7 of the Draft FY12 Operating Plan and Budget.

Whereas, the Board considers an applicant support program important to ensuring an inclusive and diverse program, and will direct work to implement a model for providing support to potential applicants from developing countries.

Whereas, the Board's Risk Committee has reviewed a comprehensive risk assessment associated with implementing the New gTLD Program, has reviewed the defined strategies for mitigating the identified risks, and will review contingencies as the program moves toward launch. Whereas, the Board has reviewed the current status and plans for operational readiness and program management within ICANN.

Resolved (2011.06.20.01), the Board authorizes the President and CEO to implement the new gTLD program which includes the following elements:

1. the 30 May 2011 version of the Applicant Guidebook <<http://www.icann.org/en/topics/new-gtlds/comments-7-en.htm>>, subject to the revisions agreed to with the GAC on 19 June 2011, including: (a) deletion of text in Module 3 concerning GAC advice to remove references indicating that future Early Warnings or Advice must contain particular information or take specified forms; (b) incorporation of text concerning protection for specific requested Red Cross and IOC names for the top level only during the initial application round, until the GNSO and GAC develop policy advice based on the global public interest, and (c) modification of the "loser pays" provision in the URS to apply to complaints involving 15 (instead of 26) or more domain names with the same registrant; the Board authorizes staff to make further updates and changes to the Applicant Guidebook as necessary and appropriate, including as the possible result of new technical standards, reference documents, or policies that might be adopted during the course of the application process, and to prominently publish notice of such changes;

2. the Draft New gTLDs Communications Plan as posted at <<http://www.icann.org/en/topics/new-gtlds/new-gtlds-communications-plan-30may11-en.pdf>> [PDF, 486 KB], as may be revised and elaborated as

necessary and appropriate;

3. operational readiness activities to enable the opening of the application process;

4. a program to ensure support for applicants from developing countries, with a form, structure and processes to be determined by the Board in consultation with stakeholders including: (a) consideration of the GAC recommendation for a fee waiver corresponding to 76 percent of the \$185,000 USD evaluation fee, (b) consideration of recommendations of the ALAC and GNSO as chartering organizations of the Joint Applicant Support (JAS) Working Group, (c) designation of a budget of up to \$2 million USD for seed funding, and creating opportunities for other parties to provide matching funds, and (d) the review of additional community feedback, advice from ALAC, and recommendations from the GNSO following their receipt of a Final Report from the JAS Working Group (requested in time to allow staff to develop an implementation plan for the Board's consideration at its October 2011 meeting in Dakar, Senegal), with the goal of having a sustainable applicant support system in place before the opening of the application window;

5. a process for handling requests for removal of cross-ownership restrictions on operators of existing gTLDs who want to participate in the new gTLD program, based on the "Process for Handling Requests for Removal of Cross-Ownership Restrictions for Existing gTLDs"

<<http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-02may11-en.htm>>, as modified in response to comments <<http://www.icann.org/en/tlds/process-cross-ownership-gtlds-en.htm>> (a redline of the Process to the earlier proposal is provided at <<http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/process-cross-ownership-restrictions-gtlds-20jun11-en.pdf>> [PDF, 97 KB]); consideration of modification of existing agreements to allow cross-ownership with respect to the operation of existing gTLDs is deferred pending further discussions including with competition authorities;

6. the expenditures related to the New gTLD Program as detailed in section 7 of the Draft FY12 Operating Plan and Budget

<<http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-17may11-en.htm>>; and

7. the timetable as set forth in the attached graphic

<<http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/timeline-new-gtld-program-20jun11.pdf>> [PDF, 167 KB], elements of which include the New gTLD application window opening on 12 January 2012 and closing on 12 April 2012, with the New gTLD Communications Plan beginning immediately.

Ray Plzak seconded the resolution.

The Chair called for comment from Board members. The voting statements of the

Directors are available at [insert link to statement].

The Chair then called for a vote on the Resolution, and polled the Directors:

Bruce Tonkin: Abstain

Kuo-Wei-Wu: In favor

Ray Plzak: In favor

Erika Mann: In favor

Mike Silber: Abstain

Steve Crocker: In favor

R. Ramaraj: In favor

Rita Rodin Johnston: In favor

Gonzalo Navarro: In favor

Sébastien Bachollet: In favor

George Sadowsky: Opposed

Katim Touray: In favor

Bertrand de La Chapelle: In favor

Cherine Chalaby: In favor

Rod Beckstrom: In favor

Peter Dengate Thrush: In favor

The Chair declared Resolution 2011.06.20.01 carried. Thirteen members of the Board approved Resolution 2011.06.20.01. One member opposed the Resolution and two Board members abstained from voting.

The Chair then noted the Board's appreciation for the work of the Governmental Advisory Committee, and the focus in asking for, receiving and discussing advice from the GAC. ICANN cannot survive without full support from the governments of the world, and the Board is grateful for all the members of the GAC for participating in and showing their support for the ICANN and its multistakeholder model. There are aspects of GAC advice that the Board has elected not to follow, and that position is predicted in the Bylaws through the creation of the process for the consideration of GAC advice.

The Chair then moved the following resolution and read it into the record:

Resolved (2011.06.20.02), the Board and the GAC have completed good faith

consultations in a timely and efficient manner under the ICANN Bylaws, Article XI, Section 2.j. As the Board and the GAC were not able to reach a mutually acceptable solution on a few remaining issues, pursuant to ICANN Bylaws, Article XI, Section 2.k, the Board incorporates and adopts as set forth in the document describing the remaining areas of difference between ICANN's Board and the GAC <<http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/rationale-gac-response-new-gtld-20jun11-en.pdf>> [PDF, 103 KB] the reasons why the GAC advice was not followed. The Board's statement is without prejudice to the rights or obligations of GAC members with regard to public policy issues falling within their responsibilities.

Bertrand de La Chappelle seconded the resolution.

The Chair then called for a vote.

Fifteen members of the Board approved Resolution 2011.06.20.02. Bruce Tonkin abstained from voting. The Resolution carried.

Bruce Tonkin then noted the extent of work performed within the policy development process and within the community, including the GAC, in the implementation work. Bruce commented that he had the honor of chairing the GNSO policy development process that began in 2005, and that representatives from Internet Service Providers, business users, noncommercial users, intellectual property experts, registries, registrars, noncommercial users, and members of the At-Large Advisory Committee all participated. At the beginning of the processes, there was a great diversity of views, and by 2007, there was consensus on nearly all of the GNSO policy recommendations. Those recommendations have stood the test of time, and the Board has not changed those core policy recommendations. Bruce commended the group on their work in compromising and reaching a consensus position.

Bruce recognized the work of the GAC over the last six months, including meeting in Cartagena, Brussels, and San Francisco, as well as a teleconference while the Board was in Istanbul, and another meeting in Singapore. Those GAC members had to consult not only within the GAC, but also with colleagues in their home countries, to reach the positions. The work of the GAC has been immense.

Bruce noted that though there were a handful of Board members that appeared to be engaged during the public sessions, the truth is that the Board as a whole engaged in long consultation on every piece of advice from GAC – with at least 75 minutes of discussion among the Board on each line item. The Board did not take the GAC's advice lightly.

Finally, Bruce recognized the effort of ICANN staff, particularly for the support of the meetings and calls over the past six months, and the work that still remains ahead. Bruce requested that the community express their thanks to the staff, who are often caught between what appear to be warring parties. Bruce stated that the staff deserve

tremendous respect and thanks for their work.

Bruce then moved and read the following resolution into the record:

Resolved (2011.06.20.03), the Board wishes to express its deep appreciation to the ICANN community, including the members of the GAC, for the extraordinary work it has invested in crafting the New gTLD Program in furtherance of ICANN's mission and core values, and counts on the community's ongoing support in executing and reviewing the program.

George Sadowsky seconded the resolution.

Sébastien Bachollet (speaking in Spanish) thanked the entire community for their work, and noted that it's important to remain working on the implementation of the program.

Heather Dryden thanked those in the community and the Board that have played a leadership role in working with the GAC and understanding and recognizing the significance of government concerns, as it really is necessary to find a way to have the GAC working as part of the community in developing community consensus and to generate results that reinforce the multistakeholder model.

Heather noted that it is true that this is the end of the beginning, and the GAC will certainly have a continued role to play regarding the operational or implementation aspects that remain. Heather confirmed that she looks forward to raising the decisions that have been made today within the GAC, and to continue the discussion with the Board and the community regarding the new gTLD program. Heather thanked all who played a role in this process.

Bertrand de La Chappelle joined in the thanks being expressed, and provided an explanation reproduced in full here:

I want to take the opportunity at this end of this phase not only to associate myself to the thanks that are being expressed but also to explain what you and we collectively have done, which is basically a global public interest function, because you are ICANN as well. And this global public function is to find the better rules or the better modalities for allocating a common resource.

This common resource can be named in many different ways. I name it the semantic spectrum, whatever. It's about defining a policy for a common resource.

It's a very important function.

And the originality of this is this quasi regulatory role is exercised by a community that is open, as Rod said in the beginning. If you think about it, it's an amazing exercise. And the very fact that it was able, of course, in three years, but even if you think about it, the level of detail that has been achieved, the level of debate

that has been achieved in three years, the fact that it can be produced by a community where anybody can come and participate, is a testimonial not only to the value of ICANN as it is, but to the fact that the fundamental assumption that allowing the participation of everyone in governance processes is a fundamental positive and working assumption.

However, when you define the global public interest, there's nothing more difficult than going not only beyond the individual private interests but also articulating the global public interest with the national public interest that are represented in the GAC. And as you know, nobody is better placed than I am to understand the tension between the two.

I think in this case what this program and this phase in the program has done is test the mettle of our procedures, to basically make the equivalent of a stress test to see whether the resilience was there and whether we could overcome the bumps. And as a result, I think our procedures are better. The interaction between the GAC, in particular, and the board, but also between the GAC and the other parts of the community has been strengthened. As I said before, this is not a zero-sum game. Whenever one part of the structure is seeing its role strengthened, its engagement broadened, it makes for a stronger structure.

And so at that stage, I would like to make an analogy. There have been many analogies about this program. Mine is about the construction of an airport.

In 2008 we agreed on the master plan. Today we are basically finishing the facilities. I mean, we are cutting the ribbon and saying, okay, the facilities are there. We are going to invite companies, small planes, to apply for the right to take off to whatever destination.

And in this phase, there will be small planes, large planes, but we want to have rules that are both unified and simple to understand enough so that we don't have to -- and they are fair, but also that are flexible enough to allow for diversity.

In this new phase, the challenge for the board and the staff will change. It will not be more policy-making. This is a phase that is closed. It will be implementation. And as many have said, it's almost a bigger challenge to be up to par in that respect.

But what I would like to do in closing is to make a call to most of you and all of you. Most of you are going to, after this day, get into operational mode like we do, preparing your own applications, supporting other applications, preparing and ramping up your capacity.

I would love to ask you all to continue your engagement in this process. Not only to go on your own activities, but to keep engaged, because of two things. The first one is that we will need you to spread the word and to make this program

known so that it reaches who it can benefit.

But the second thing is more subtle. And by the way, we need you also to continue to participate in whatever process will be needed to address the unavoidable, unplanned things that will emerge. There is no way this program can be implemented without things emerging that will need to be solved.

And so we will need you also to participate in whatever adaption may be needed so that they remain fully multistakeholder endorsed.

But in more subtle way, you have participated here not only to defend your own interests, which are legitimate, but also to participate collectively in a global public interest exercise.

Please keep it with you in everything you do, because it is a global responsibility and a common responsibility to make sure that this program is implemented, and that whatever flaws it may still contain, whatever loopholes it may still contain, are not exploited that will make it fail.

So you are with us in charge of making all those planes fly correctly and safely. Build nice planes so that there is no need for additional regulation. And my final word is a quote from somebody the people in the European Union know is called Jean Monnet, who is actually the originator of the idea of the European Union. And the quote is when an idea corresponds to the necessity of the time, it no longer belongs to those who invented it, and it becomes stronger than those who are in charge of implementing it.

Thank you.

Rita Rodin Johnston, agreeing with Bruce's expression of the time and scale of the Board discussion, thanked Heather for her remarks. Rita noted that it is important to integrate the GAC and governments around the world into these dialogues. Rita reflected that she was uncomfortable with some of the exchanges and dialogue between the Board and the GAC, and that she is hopeful that the Board, GAC and the community can continue to improve participation in a way that respects the ideas and processes of the other groups.

The Chair then called for a vote.

All members of the Board voted in favor of Resolution 2011.06.20.03. The Resolution carried unanimously.

The CEO provided closing remarks:

On behalf of the organization and the staff, we thank the community and the board for your exceptional efforts over the past six years.

There have been many long days and nights of working. There was even a pajama party along the way, as some of you might recall, when some of us were in Nairobi and others were in D.C. dialing in remotely.

There have been many meetings in every region of the world, thousands of pages of e-mails, documents, drafts, revisions, submissions, and many, many opportunities for public input.

The process has been truly open, and a good model for accountability and transparency.

Thank you, and congratulations.

And as CEO, I accept the great responsibility of this authorization you have granted me and, under my direction, our excellent staff. A very large ball with years of work has just rolled this way. And I want to assure you that we will execute, and we will do so professionally. And I want to assure you that the ICANN staff is prepared to support the launch, and we will execute with competence, transparency, and accountability while respecting confidentiality when appropriate.

Following this vote, the first step will be the communications program which will start later this afternoon with the press conference following this meeting. We are committing substantial resources to this, but we will also rely upon the community and need your work -- your help to get the message out around the world.

The CEO then recognized some of the exceptional contributions from within ICANN, recognizing Kurt Pritz and his team, John Jeffrey and the legal team, and all other staff that have supported the new gTLD effort.

The Chair then provided his closing remarks:

I have the pleasure now of closing the meeting. Just a few final comments. First of all, supporting what's been said about the principle of innovation. Unless there's a good reason to restrain it, it should be allowed to reign free. And remembering also what President Clinton said in the speech in San Francisco. We know that the program isn't perfect. We know that not everyone's view has been incorporated. We know we have to watch it very carefully, and we will stumble sometimes. But as President Clinton said, as long as we are stumbling forwards, then that's the way of progress.

So there's a lot to be done. As people have said, this is the start of a whole new phase.

The perfect, though, is the enemy of the good, and we have got to the stage where, as Steve Crocker and others have said, this is a good program. And I

think we have got community support for it, and I look forward to handing that big ball over to Rod and the staff, and to the rest of the community.

It's an enormous challenge, but I think we're up to it.

Congratulations.

The Chair then called the meeting to a close.

Rationale for Resolutions 2011.06.20.01-2011.06.20.03

[Rationale for Approval of the Launch of the New gTLD Program](#) [PDF, 624 KB]

2011-06-24-Board-Minutes



**Minutes – Regular Meeting of the Board of
Directors
24 June 2011
Singapore**

**A transcript of the meeting is posted at
<http://singapore41.icann.org/meetings/singapore2011/transcripts-board-meeting-1-24jun11-en.txt>.**

A Regular Meeting of the ICANN Board of Directors was held on 24 June 2011 in Singapore at 11:00 am local time.

Chairman Peter Dengate Thrush promptly called the meeting to order.

In addition to Chairman Peter Dengate Thrush the following Directors participated in all or part of the meeting: Rod Beckstrom (President and CEO), Steve Crocker (Vice Chairman), Sébastien Bachollet, Cherine Chalaby, Bertrand de la Chapelle, Rita Rodin Johnston, Erika Mann, Gonzalo Navarro, Raymond A. Plzak, R. Ramaraj, George Sadowsky, Mike Silber, Bruce Tonkin, Katim Touray, and Kuo-Wei Wu.

The following Board Liaisons participated in all or part of the meeting: Heather Dryden, GAC Liaison; Ram Mohan, SSAC Liaison; Thomas Narten, IETF Liaison; Reinhard Scholl, TLG Liaison; and Suzanne Woolf, RSSAC Liaison.

1. Consent Agenda.....	4
1.1. Approval of Minutes of 21 April 2011 ICANN Special Board Meeting....	4
1.2. Approval of ALAC-Related Bylaw Amendments.....	4
Rationale for Resolution 2011.06.24.02	5
1.3. Approval of ccNSO Review Implementation Plan	5
Rationale for Resolution 2011.06.24.03:	6
1.4. Approval of Permanent Charter for GNSO’s Commercial Stakeholders Group	6
Rationale for Resolution 2011.06.24.04:	7
1.5. Proposal for a Not-for-Profit Operational Concerns Constituency in the GNSO.....	7
Rationale for Resolutions 2011.06.24.05 – 2011.06.24.06	8
1.6. Approval of Permanent Charter for GNSO’s Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group.....	8

ICANN Board Minutes – Regular Meeting

24 June 2011

Page 2 of 41

Rationale for Resolutions 2011.06.24.07 – 2011.06.24.08:	9
1.7. Approval of New GNSO Constituency Recognition Process	10
Rationale for Resolution 2011.06.24.09:	11
1.8. Changes to SSAC Membership – Appointment of Jason Livingood	12
Rationale for Resolution 2011.06.24.10:	12
1.9. Changes to SSAC Membership – Thanks to Duncan Hart.....	12
1.10. Academia Representation on NomCom.....	13
Rationale for Resolutions 2011.06.24.12 – 2011.06.24.13:	14
1.11. March 2012 ICANN Meeting in Latin America	15
Rationale for Resolution 2011.06.24.14:	16
1.12. June 2012 ICANN Meeting in Europe.....	16
Rationale for Resolution 2011.06.24.15:	17
1.13. Thanks to Departing At-Large Volunteers.....	17
1.14. Thanks to Sponsors	18
1.15. Thanks to Scribes, Interpreters, Staff, Event and Hotel Teams	18
1.16. Thanks to Local Hosts	19
1.17. Thanks to Meeting Participants.....	19
2. ATRT Recommendations	19
Rationale for Resolutions 2011.06.24.17 – 2011.06.24.19:	23
3. Whois Review Team Budget for Consumer Research Study.....	24
Rationale for Resolution 2011.06.24.20:	26
4. Renewal of .NET Agreement	26
Rationale for Resolution 2011.06.24.21:	28
5. Internet Number Certification (RPKI) Program	30
Rationale for Resolution 2011.06.24.22:	31
6. FY12 Operating Plan & Budget	31

Rationale for Resolution 2011.06.24.23:	33
7. Report from Board-GAC Joint Working Group	33
Rationale for Resolutions 2011.06.24.24 – 2011.06.24.25:	35
8. Issues arising from the Singapore Meeting.....	35
9. Thanks to Rita Rodin-Johnston.....	35
10. Thanks to Peter Dengate-Thrush	36

1. Consent Agenda

The Chair of the Board introduced the design of the agenda, including the use of the consent agenda, to the community and noted that any Board member could request the removal of items from the Consent Agenda. The Chair confirmed that the Board has discussed each of the items prior to the meeting, all members understand the contents and have had the opportunity to remove any item from the consent agenda for placement on the full agenda if further discussion is required. The matters on the consent agenda include approval of minutes, Bylaws amendments, approvals of processes and charters, thanks to meeting hosts and scribes, and others.

The Chair then moved and the George Sadowsky seconded the following resolutions:

Resolved, the following resolutions in this Consent Agenda are approved:

1.1. Approval of Minutes of 21 April 2011 ICANN Special Board Meeting

Resolved (2011.06.24.01), the Board approves the minutes of the 21 April 2011 ICANN Special Board Meeting.

1.2. Approval of ALAC-Related Bylaw Amendments

Whereas, on 9 June 2009, the Final Report of the ALAC Review Working Group on ALAC Improvements <<http://www.icann.org/en/reviews/alach/final-report-alach-review-09jun09-en.pdf>> was published, including a recommendation to amend the ICANN Bylaws to reflect the continuing purpose of the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) within ICANN.

Whereas, on 26 June 2009, the Board resolved (2009.06.26.30) that all recommendations (except for the allocation of two voting Directors to At-Large) presented in the Final Report could be implemented, as recommended by the Structural Improvements Committee (SIC).

Whereas, the ICANN Office of the General Counsel, in consultation with the ALAC and At-Large staff, drafted the proposed revisions to the

ICANN Bylaws regarding the ALAC necessary to reflect the continuing purpose of the ALAC as described in the Final Report.

Whereas, on 18 March 2011, the Board directed (2011.06.24.37) the ICANN CEO to post the proposed Bylaw revisions for public comment.

Whereas, the proposed revisions were posted for public comment <<http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-08apr11-en.htm>> for a period of 30 days, from 8 April through 9 May 2011, and no relevant comments were received.

Resolved (2011.06.24.02), the Board approves the revisions to the ICANN Bylaws, Article XI, Section 4.

Rationale for Resolution 2011.06.24.02

The revision of the ICANN Bylaws regarding the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) is in fulfillment of the recommendations arising out of the organizational review of the ALAC and is the culmination of community work and consultation on this issue.

There is no anticipated fiscal impact from this decision. There will be no impact on the security, stability, and resilience of the Domain Name System (DNS) as a result of this action.

1.3. Approval of ccNSO Review Implementation Plan

Whereas, on 21 April 2011, the Board resolved to direct ICANN Staff, in coordination with the Structural Improvements Committee, to develop a proposed implementation plan and timeline for the recommendations in the Final Report of the ccNSO Review Board Working Group and to submit these to the Structural Improvements Committee for review and Board approval. (Resolution 2011.04.21.06).

Whereas, at its 18 June 2011 meeting, the SIC acknowledged receipt from staff of an implementation plan, titled "ccNSO Improvements Implementation Project Plan", dated 9 June 2011, and resolved to recommend it to the ICANN Board for approval.

Resolved (2011.06.24.03), the Board requests ICANN's CEO to direct Staff to proceed with implementation in accordance with the

implementation plan document "ccNSO Improvements Implementation Project Plan" dated 9 June 2011 [*link to be provided when available*].

Rationale for Resolution 2011.06.24.03:

This action is in direct response to a request from the Board and serves to enable the implementation of the ccNSO review outcomes in a timely manner, thereby realizing the foreseen and agreed process improvements. There is no reason to delay this action as it, per se, does not involve any complex structural changes and would have no budgetary consequences. There will be no impact on the security, stability and resiliency of the domain name system as a result of this action.

1.4. Approval of Permanent Charter for GNSO's Commercial Stakeholders Group

Whereas, on July 30, 2009 the Board approved a transitional Charter for the GNSO's Commercial Stakeholder Group.

Whereas, the Board directed the CSG to subsequently develop a permanent Charter document.

Whereas, the CSG leadership has collaborated closely with ICANN Staff and has now produced a permanent Charter document developed and approved by the CSG community and that document has been presented to the ICANN community for review and comment.

Whereas, the Board Structural Improvements Committee recommends approval of the permanent CSG Charter.

Resolved (2011.06.24.04), the Board approves the permanent Charter of the GNSO's Commercial Stakeholders Group. The CSG is directed to publicly post its charter and to maintain a process for publicly posting subsequent amended versions of the document. To assure continued adherence to the ICANN Bylaws principles, the Board will re-examine the CSG charter, structure and operations consistent with the timetable for the next independent review of the GNSO.

Rationale for Resolution 2011.06.24.04:

The approval of this permanent charter documents satisfies the original Board direction in Resolution 2009.30.07.09 by establishing a permanent Charter for the GNSO's Commercial Stakeholder Group. This action provides a degree of certainty and finality regarding the community debate over the relationship between Constituencies and Stakeholder Groups in the GNSO in that it affirms the ability of individual communities to establish and manage processes and procedures – consistent with existing ICANN Bylaws principles - that allows them to govern and expand their participation in GNSO policy development efforts in a manner best suited to their individual communities. There are no particular additional budget implications for approving the CSG Charter. This action does not have any technical impact on the security, stability or resiliency of the DNS.

1.5. Proposal for a Not-for-Profit Operational Concerns Constituency in the GNSO

Whereas, the Board has specifically directed that efforts be made to provide leadership and guidance within the GNSO's Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group to encourage the creation of broad, diverse and representative new GNSO Constituencies advancing global non-commercial interests.

Whereas, the Board has received a formal petition for the creation of a Not-for-Profit Operational Concerns Constituency (NPOC) within the GNSO.

Whereas, the NPOC proposal has been subjected to a two-phase, public process that was instituted as part of the GNSO Improvements Review.

Whereas, staff conducted a Public Comment Forum giving community members the opportunity to review and comment upon the proposed NPOC Charter and the comments submitted in that proceeding were consistently favorable regarding the NPOC proposal.

Whereas, this new GNSO Constituency will expand participation in GNSO

policy development efforts by formally recognizing a vibrant new community that will represent the non-commercial perspective of not-for-profit and non-governmental organizations who are registrants and users of domain names.

Resolved (2011.06.24.05), the Board approves the proposed charter of the new Not-for-Profit Operational Concerns Constituency and formally recognizes the organization as an official Constituency within the GNSO's Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG) eligible for formal GNSO administrative support and subject to the NCSG Charter approved by the Board.

Resolved (2011.06.24.06), the Board thanks Debra Y. Hughes, appointed by the Board to the GNSO Council, for her leadership in helping to establish this new Constituency.

Rationale for Resolutions 2011.06.24.05 – 2011.06.24.06

The promotion of new GNSO Constituencies was one of the fundamental recommendations of the GNSO Review effort and an important intentional strategy to expand participation in GNSO policy development efforts. The approval of a new GNSO Constituency will impact the ICANN budget by increasing administrative support of community activities during ICANN Public meetings and throughout the year. This is within the parameters of the proposed FY12 budget and no substantial additional budget resources will be impacted by the approval of this new Constituency. This new additional organizational structure will not have any technical impact on the security, stability or resiliency of the DNS.

1.6. Approval of Permanent Charter for GNSO's Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group

Whereas, on July 30, 2009 the Board approved a transitional Charter for the GNSO's Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG).

Whereas, the Board directed the NCSG to subsequently develop a permanent Charter document by the 2011 ICANN Annual General Meeting.

Whereas, NCSG leaders and members of the Board’s Structural Improvements Committee (SIC) have collaborated on developing a Charter document that meets the strategic goals of the Board and provide a foundation for future governance and growth of the non commercial community in the GNSO; and that document has been presented to the ICANN community for review and comment.

Resolved (2011.06.24.07), the Board approves the permanent Charter of the GNSO’s Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group. NCSG leadership is directed to publicly post the Charters and to work with ICANN Staff to maintain a process for publicly posting any subsequent amended versions of the document. To assure continued adherence to the ICANN Bylaws principles, the Board will re-examine the NCSG Charter, structure and operations consistent with the timetable for the next independent review of the GNSO.

Resolved (2011.06.24.08), all existing Constituencies within the NCSG (the Noncommercial Users Constituency and the NPOC) shall immediately demonstrate to the NCSG that they meet all membership requirements as imposed at Section 2.0 of the newly-adopted NCSG Charter, including the requirement at Section 2.3 that all members of the constituency should already either be members of the NCSG or be qualified for membership under the Charter. If a Constituency cannot demonstrate membership requirements, the NCSG is directed to (i) immediately implement the Constituency Review process set forth at Section 2.3.3 of the NCSG Charter, and (ii) such constituency will not be entitled to constituency participation in NCSG activities, effective immediately, until the earlier of such compliance can be demonstrated or the review process is concluded and a decision is reached.

Rationale for Resolutions 2011.06.24.07 – 2011.06.24.08:

The approval of this permanent charter documents satisfies the original Board direction in Resolution 2009.30.07.09 by establishing a permanent Charter for the GNSO’s Non-Commercial

Stakeholder Group. This action provides a degree of certainty and finality regarding the community debate over the relationship between Constituencies and Stakeholder Groups in the GNSO in that it affirms the ability of individual communities to establish and manage processes and procedures – consistent with existing ICANN Bylaws principles - that allows them to govern and expand their participation in GNSO policy development efforts in a manner best suited to their individual communities. This action will also allow the NCSG to assure adherence to its revised membership rules from the outset. There are no particular additional budget implications for approving the NCSG Charter. This action does not have any technical impact on the security, stability or resiliency of the DNS.

1.7. Approval of New GNSO Constituency Recognition Process

Whereas, the SIC identified a number of structural and process impediments in the existing procedures for evaluating proposals for new GNSO Constituencies.

Whereas, the SIC has developed a replacement "Process for Recognition of New GNSO Constituencies" and Staff has completed an extended Public Comment Forum (closed 3 April 2011) regarding the proposed new process.

Whereas, the SIC has thoroughly and carefully considered community feedback in the Public Comment Forum and incorporated a number of procedural changes and associated recommendations into the final process package.

Whereas, the new process will:

1. Optimize the considerable time and effort required to form, organize, and propose a new GNSO Constituency;
2. Delegate more authority to each GNSO Stakeholder Group in evaluating new Constituency proposals while maintaining the Board's oversight role;

3. Manage the entire process to a flexible, but specific and limited timeframe; and
4. Provide a partial set of criteria for use during future periodic reviews of the GNSO.
5. Whereas, the SIC recommends that the new process be approved and take effective immediately upon Board approval;

Resolved (2011.06.24.09), the ICANN Board approves the new "Process for Recognition of New GNSO Constituencies" developed by the SIC and directs Staff to begin implementation effective immediately.

Rationale for Resolution 2011.06.24.09:

The promotion of new GNSO Constituencies was one of the fundamental recommendations of the GNSO Review effort and an important strategy to expand participation in GNSO policy development efforts. The SIC found that the original process for evaluating new GNSO Constituency proposals was not effective because lack of objective and measurable criteria by which prospective new GNSO Constituencies were formally evaluated and recognized; and that general process weaknesses presented potential new Constituency prospects with considerable preparation work, indefinite time frames for Board review and general lack of guidance on their prospects for Board approval.

This new process will accomplish four goals:

- 1. Optimize the considerable time and effort required to form, organize, and propose a new GNSO Constituency by prescribing a streamlined sequence of steps and associated evaluation criteria that are objective, fair, and transparent - with ample opportunity for community input;*
- 2. Delegate more authority to each GNSO Stakeholder Group in evaluating new Constituency proposals while maintaining the Board's oversight role;*
- 3. Manage the entire process to a flexible, but specific and limited timeframe; and*

4. *Provide a partial set of criteria for use during the periodic review of the GNSO.*

The approval of new GNSO Constituencies will impact the ICANN budget by increasing the overall resources and administrative support necessary to conduct the additional Constituency activities during ICANN Public meetings and throughout the year. No substantial additional budget resources, however, will be triggered by the approval of this new recognition process. If anything, this new process will make the evaluation of new GNSO Constituency proposals more efficient from a budget perspective. The new criteria articulated in the process may also make future independent review efforts of the GNSO more efficient. The new process does not have any impact on the security, stability or resiliency of the DNS.

1.8. Changes to SSAC Membership – Appointment of Jason Livingood

Whereas, the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) does review its membership and make adjustments from time-to-time.

Whereas, the SSAC Membership Committee, on behalf of the SSAC, requests that the Board should appoint Jason Livingood to the SSAC.

Resolved (2011.06.24.10), the Board appoints Jason Livingood to the SSAC.

Rationale for Resolution 2011.06.24.10:

The SSAC is a diverse group of individuals whose expertise in specific subject matters enables the SSAC to fulfill its charter and execute its mission. Since its inception, the SSAC has invited individuals with deep knowledge and experience in technical and security areas that are critical to the security and stability of the Internet's domain name system.

1.9. Changes to SSAC Membership – Thanks to Duncan Hart

Whereas, Duncan Hart was appointed to the ICANN Security and

Stability Advisory Committee on 26 June 2009.

Whereas, ICANN wishes to acknowledge and thank Duncan Hart for his service to the community by his membership on the Security and Stability Advisory Committee.

Resolved (2011.06.24.11), Duncan Hart has earned the deep appreciation of the Board for his service to ICANN by his membership on the Security and Stability Advisory Committee, and that the Board wishes Duncan Hart well in all future endeavours.

1.10. Academia Representation on NomCom

Whereas, Article VII, Section 2.8.c of the ICANN Bylaws requires the Nominating Committee (NomCom) to include a voting member selected by "an entity designated by the Board to represent academic and similar organizations" (a "Selecting Entity").

Whereas, despite attempts to identify a Selecting Entity, the Board has not defined the proper criteria to do so, and instead has made direct recommendations of delegates to represent academia on the NomCom. In addition to the Board-selected delegate, there have consistently been multiple delegates on each NomCom from academia.

Whereas, the Board Governance Committee (BGC) recommended and the Board approved seeking community input on an appropriate process for identifying a Selecting Entity and input was sought from the community. A public comment forum was opened from 30 April 2011 through 30 May 2011
<<http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-30apr11-en.htm>>.

Whereas, the BGC has reviewed the public comment received, and determined that no viable process for identifying, selecting or evaluating a Selecting Entity was recommended by the community.

Whereas, because no viable process has been identified, the BGC has recommended that the Board approve the deletion of the relevant Bylaws provision, subject to continued monitoring of academia representation on the NomCom.

Whereas, if the academic sector becomes under-represented on the NomCom in the future, consideration should be given to the creation of a mechanism to ensure that academia has a continuing voice on the NomCom.

Resolved (2011.06.24.12), the Board approves the deletion of Article VII, Section 2.8.c of the Bylaws.

Resolved (2011.06.24.13), the Board directs the CEO to ensure that staff monitors the composition of future NomComs and periodically report to the BGC the staff findings as to academia representation among the NomCom delegates.

Rationale for Resolutions 2011.06.24.12 – 2011.06.24.13:

Since the 2002 introduction of the current form of the ICANN Bylaws, there has been a provision for the NomCom to include a voting delegate appointed by "an entity designated by the Board to represent academic and similar organizations" (Selecting Entity). See Article VII, section 2.8.c. The Board has not been successful in identifying such a Selecting Entity; despite a 2003 identification of a Selecting Entity, by 2005, no designees had been identified and the BGC has been making a direct recommendation of a voting NomCom delegate after soliciting nominees. In 2007, the Chair noted that the BGC had not been successful in identifying a Selecting Entity, and in 2010, the Board directed that a process for choosing the Selecting Entity be created through the BGC and proposed to the Board.

After attempting to develop criteria, the BGC determined that community input should be sought. The BGC further recommended that if the community failed to suggest a method for identifying, selecting and evaluating a Selecting Entity then the relevant Bylaws provision should be deleted. A public comment forum was opened, but no viable process for identifying, selecting or evaluating a Selecting Entity was recommended by the community. While one party did make a suggestion of a few entities that could serve as the Selecting Entity, there was no process identified to inform how that selection could be made. Another party suggested staying a decision on the Bylaws

provision pending the potential development of an academia constituency, which might be the right group to identify a Selecting Entity. However, there are no pending constituency petitions proposing to form such a group.

The Board has determined that as no process for identifying, selecting or evaluating a Selecting Entity has been identified, the relevant Bylaws provision should be deleted, subject to continued monitoring to ensure there is academia representation on the NomCom. If the academic sector is under-represented in the future, a review of how best to assure academic representation on the NomCom will be initiated.

Deleting this NomCom Bylaws provision will have an extremely minor financial impact on ICANN and will have no impact on the security, stability and resiliency of the domain name system.

1.11. March 2012 ICANN Meeting in Latin America

Whereas, ICANN intends to hold its first Meeting for 2012 in the Latin America region as per its policy.

Whereas, the Academia Nacional de Ciencias, Costa Rica submitted a viable proposal to serve as host for the ICANN 2012 Latin America Meeting.

Whereas, staff has completed a thorough review of the Academia Nacional de Ciencias, Costa Rica proposal and finds it acceptable.

Whereas, the Board Finance Committee will review and is expected to approve the budget for the ICANN 2012 Latin America Meeting as proposed in this paper on 14 June 2011.

Resolved (2011.06.24.14), the Board accepts the proposal of the Academia Nacional de Ciencias, Costa Rica and approves that the ICANN 2012 Latin America Meeting shall be held in San Jose, Costa Rica from 11-16 March 2012, with a budget not to exceed US\$2.29M.

Rationale for Resolution 2011.06.24.14:

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) of the world. Meeting Number 43, scheduled for 11-16 March 2012, is to occur in the Latin America geographic region. A call for recommendations for the location of the meeting in Latin America was posted on 25 April 2011. A number of proposals were received including from Academia Nacional de Ciencias, the .cr TLD administrator, Costa Rica – San Jose.

The Board reviewed Staff's recommendation for hosting the meeting in San Jose, Costa Rica and the determination that the proposal met the significant factors of the Meeting Selection Criteria used to guide site selection work. Outside of the call for recommendations, the process for selection of sites does not call for public consultation, as the staff assessment of the feasibility of any 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. There is no impact on the security or the stability of the DNS due to the hosting of the meeting.

1.12. June 2012 ICANN Meeting in Europe

Whereas, ICANN intends to hold its second Meeting for 2012 in the Europe region as per its policy.

Whereas, CZ.NIC, Czech Republic submitted a viable proposal to serve as host for the ICANN 2012 Europe Meeting.

Whereas, staff has completed a thorough review of the CZ.NIC, Czech Republic proposal and finds it acceptable.

Whereas, the Board Finance Committee will review and is expected to approve the budget for the ICANN 2012 Europe Meeting as proposed in this paper on 14 June 2011.

Resolved (2011.06.24.15), the Board accepts the proposal of CZ.NIC, Czech Republic and approves that the ICANN 2012 Europe Meeting shall be held in Prague, Czech Republic from 24-29 June 2012, with a budget not to exceed US\$2.268M.

Rationale for Resolution 2011.06.24.15:

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) of the world. Meeting Number 44, scheduled for 24-29 June 2012, is to occur in the Europe geographic region. A call for recommendations for the location of the meeting in Europe was posted on 25 April 2011. A number of proposals were received, including from CZ.NIC, Czech Republic – Prague.

The Board reviewed Staff’s recommendation for hosting the meeting in Prague, Czech Republic and the determination that the proposal met the significant factors of the Meeting Selection Criteria used to guide site selection work. Outside of the call for recommendations, the process for selection of sites does not call for public consultation, as the staff assessment of the feasibility of any 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. 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 Number 44.

1.13. Thanks to Departing At-Large Volunteers

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 Sponsoring Organizations and Advisory Committees end.

Whereas, three members of the At-Large leadership have left their positions since the Silicon Valley meeting:

- Dr. Olivier M.J. Crépin-Leblond, EURALO Secretary - June 2010 to June 2011
- Andrés Piazza, LACRALO Chair - March 2009 through July 2011.
- Prof. Hong Xue - APRALO Chair - 22 June 2010 through 30 March 2011

Resolved (2011.06.24.16), Dr. Olivier M.J. Crépin-Leblond , Andrés Piazza and Prof. 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.

1.14. Thanks to Sponsors

Verisign, Neustar, .ORG, The Public Interest Registry, Afilias Limited, InterNetX, China Internet Network Information Center (CNNIC), GMO Registry, Inc., CORE Internet Council of Registrars, AusRegistry International, Siter.com, IP Mirror Group, Registry Services Corporation, Community.asia, united-domains AG, Internet Systems Consortium (ISC), SIDN, Iron Mountain, ironDNS, and JSU RU-CENTER.

1.15. Thanks to Scribes, Interpreters, Staff, Event and Hotel Teams

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

The Board would also like to thank Canaan Lam, Conference Services Manager, and the entire management and staff of The Fairmont Singapore and Swissôtel the Stamford, Raffles City Convention Centre.

1.16. Thanks to Local Hosts

The Board wishes to extend its thanks to the local host organizers, Info-communications Development Authority of Singapore (iDA) and The Singapore Network Information Centre Pte Ltd (SGNIC).

1.17. Thanks to Meeting Participants

Whereas, the success of ICANN depends on the contributions of participants at the meetings.

Whereas, the participants engaged in fruitful and productive dialog at this meeting.

Resolved, the Board thanks the participants for their contributions.

Resolutions 2011.06.24.01, 201103.18.02, 2011.06.24.03, 2011.06.24.04, 2011.06.24.05, 2011.06.24.06, 2011.06.24.07, 2011.06.24.08, 2011.06.24.09, 2011.06.24.10, 2011.06.24.11, 2011.06.24.12, 2011.06.24.13, 2011.06.24.14, 2011.06.24.15, and 2011.06.24.16 were approved in a single vote approving the consent agenda items. All Board members present unanimously approved these resolutions.

2. ATRT Recommendations

The Chair introduced this agenda item noting that it's Board's response to the recommendations from the Accountability and Transparency Review team. The Chair noted that considerable discussion occurred in Singapore on this issue.

Steve Crocker then moved the following resolution and read it into the record:

Whereas, the Affirmation of Commitments reinforced ICANN's commitment to ensuring accountability, transparency, and the interests of global Internet users, and called for a community review of ICANN's execution of these commitments, to be acted upon by 30 June 2011.

Whereas, ICANN has committed to maintain and improve robust mechanisms for public input, accountability, and transparency so as to assure that the outcomes of its decision making will reflect the public interest and be accountable to all stakeholders.

Whereas, ICANN has committed to review the execution of its commitments.

Whereas, implementing the recommendations of that review will strengthen ICANN's self-regulating, global, multi-stakeholder model that is transparent, accountable, and operates in the public interest.

Whereas, the Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT) received the Board's gratitude for conducting this review and providing a Final Report with 27 recommendations to improve ICANN.

Whereas, designated Board committees and the Board/GAC Joint Working Group considered the ATRT Recommendations and provided the Board with recommendations on Board action. The designated committees are incorporating implementation oversight into their work plans.

Whereas, transparent and regular reporting to the community on the status of the implementation work is an essential component of enhancing ICANN's accountability and transparency, and reporting on the current work is available at <http://www.icann.org/en/accountability/atrt-report-recommendations-project-list-22jun11-en.pdf>, and will continue to be available at <http://www.icann.org/en/accountability/overview-en.htm>.

Whereas, implementation of Recommendation No. 5 with respect to Board compensation requires an independent study and review. The Board Governance Committee has requested the CEO and the General Counsel to facilitate the next step in consideration of ATRT Recommendation No. 5, including identification of a committee of independent, non-directors to review whether Board member compensation is appropriate and, if so, with assistance from independent compensation experts to determine the levels of such compensation.

Resolved (2011.06.24.17), the Board accepts all remaining ATRT Recommendations and directs the CEO to proceed with their implementation. For recommendations focusing on enhancing the relationship between the GAC and the Board, the Board will recommend

coordinated activities between the Board and the GAC to oversee implementation.

Resolved (2011.06.24.18), the CEO is directed to regularly report to the community and the Board on the status of implementation.

Resolved (2011.06.24.19), the CEO is directed to provide the Board with a proposal for metrics and benchmarks to evaluate ICANN's achievement of enhanced accountability and transparency.

The CEO seconded the Resolution.

Bruce Tonkin provided some further information on the recommendations that are being examined by the Board Governance Committee, to provide the community some insight into the approach for managing and monitoring implementation. Bruce noted that the different committees may take different approaches, however the BGC decided to divide the recommendations into three categories: (1) already implemented; (2) items to incorporate into standard operating procedures; and (3) items that need further investigation and planning. For each of the recommendations, the BGC assigned a Board lead to work closely with staff.

Bruce then shared the leads: Recommendations 1 and 2, 6 and 7 will be lead by Ray Plzak. Ram Mohan will lead Recommendation 3. Cherine Chalaby will lead on Recommendation 4, 5, and 20. Bill Graham will take the lead on the recommendations regarding ICANN's accountability mechanisms.

Recommendation 8, regarding the redaction of Board materials, has been completed and the explanatory document is available on the website. Recommendation 19, on the translation of Board materials, has already started to be incorporated into ICANN procedures.

For Recommendation 5, on Board member compensation, Bruce noted the need for the Board to obtain appropriate independent advice, and that the General Counsel's office will be active in that work.

Bruce confirmed that the Board takes the recommendations very seriously, and invited the community to provide input to the relevant Board members on topics that are of interest.

Bertrand de La Chapelle noted the import of the timing of the receipt of the ATRT report, as community interaction was ongoing regarding the new gTLD program. Particularly between the Board and the GAC, many of the recommendations have already been put into some sort of practice, and there will be the ability to review what has already occurred to consider how to best move forward. The experiences of the past few months should be integrated into the work to implement the ATRT recommendations.

Mike Silber provided an update on the work of the Public Participation Committee to oversee implementation on recommendations 15, 16, 17, 18 and 21 regarding public comment processes and provision of information to make the community aware of policy-making activities. Significant changes will be made to web pages, templates and document formats to address the recommendations and enhance transparency. Mike reported that a focus group is being consulted on changes to public comment cycles. Mike noted the challenges still to come in addressing the complicated issues, including the years of research that have been undertaken for other input processes, such as the Administrative Procedures Act in the United States, and that improvements will come through a series of refinements already underway.

The Chair commented on the strategic importance of the ATRT work. At the end of the Joint Project Agreement, ICANN moved from a system of reporting to the United States Government to reporting to the community as a whole and being accountable to the community as a whole. The review processes, and checking ICANN's performance against its commitments, is an integral part of this accountability. The Board's adoption of the community's recommendations is a sign of strength in the accountability model.

The Chair noted that this is an historic motion. He congratulated the review team for bringing the recommendations and the community for their work in the process, and the Board and all who will work on the implementation. The Board's acceptance of the recommendations is an extraordinary position and the Board is delighted to do so.

The Board then took the following action:

**All Board members present unanimously approved of Resolutions
2011.06.24.17 – 2011.06.24.19.**

Rationale for Resolutions 2011.06.24.17 – 2011.06.24.19:

As required by the Affirmation of Commitments, the recommendations resulting from the ATRT were provided to the Board on 31 December 2010 and posted for public comment. The ATRT provided a constructive report that validates and builds upon ICANN's commitments and improvements. The Board encouraged and considered input from the community, including the Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees, and the Nominating Committee, and is awaiting input from the Joint Working Group and the Governmental Advisory Committee. The public comments were supportive of the ATRT report and Staff's due diligence resulted in advice that ICANN move forward with implementation of all 27 of the ATRT's recommendations with the exception of Recommendation No. 5 relating to Board Compensation. For Recommendation No. 5 staff recommends that the Board approve the completion of an appropriate review of Board compensation, following relevant laws and restrictions on non-profit organizations. Staff provided proposed plans that demonstrated ICANN's ability to implement the recommendations and estimated resource costs. The Board has concluded that ICANN should move forward on implementation plans for the 27 recommendations, noting that each plan has an estimated budget and implementation timeline and will be carried out under Board, GAC, NomCom, and community leadership. The Board also has concluded that appropriate review of Board compensation is needed as discussed for Recommendation No. 5, following relevant laws and restrictions on non-profit organizations.

The Board finds that these recommendations: have the potential to advance ICANN's transparency and accountability objectives, which are articulated in the Affirmation and ICANN's bylaws; can be implemented by ICANN (with resource allocation); and do not appear to negatively impact the systemic security, stability and resiliency of the DNS. The Board has asked Staff to work with affected organizations to execute the implementation plans, and notes that ICANN has already made progress on implementation of several operational changes called for by the ATRT.

The Board agrees with Staff's assessment that the ATRT recommendation for a compensation scheme for voting Board Directors should be supported to allow for appropriate consideration following relevant laws and restrictions on non-profit organizations. Due to the complexity of this issue and the multiple planning and consideration stages it involves, additional effort is required to confirm whether full implementation is feasible and appropriate.

Finally, in order to evaluate ICANN's execution of commitments to "maintain and improve robust mechanisms for public input, accountability, and transparency," and effectively measure ICANN's ability to improve elements that support these objectives, specific assessment mechanisms are needed. The Board has asked Staff to develop metrics and benchmarks for consideration. Without agreement on clear, measurable actions, future transparency and accountability improvement efforts and assessments could be hampered.

Upon receipt of the Final Report, ICANN initiated significant planning work towards implementation, and to the extent possible, operational-related items (such as assuring regular provision of translations of Board Resolutions) were immediately implemented and incorporated into staff procedures. The Board committee involvement in review of the recommendations and proposed implementation plans has resulted in further direction and refinement of the implementation plans, and in better assessing the timeframes within which the recommendations can be implemented.

The acceptance of the ATRT recommendations has a large financial impact on ICANN, as significant resources will have to be allocated to sufficiently meet the recommendations. ICANN staff has carefully considered the resource impacts, and provided budgetary information to the Board.

3. Whois Review Team Budget for Consumer Research Study

Mike Silber moved the following resolution and read it into the record:

Whereas, the Whois Review Team has determined that it needs to "undertake a consumer research study . . . to evaluate the effectiveness of WHOIS policy and its implementation as it relates to promoting consumer trust."

Whereas, the Board wants to remind the community that the following Whois studies are currently under way: (i) a Whois "misuse" study with a budget of approximately US\$150,000, (ii) a Whois registrant identification study with a budget of approximately US\$150,000, (iii) a Whois Proxy and Privacy "Abuse" study with a budget of approximately US\$150,000; and (iv) a Whois Proxy and Privacy & Relay Study with a budget of approximately US\$80,000.

Whereas, the Whois Review Team has determined such a consumer study must be undertaken by a third party with expertise in the area.

Whereas, the Whois Review Team has determined that such a study shall cost no more than US\$125,000.

Whereas, the Board Finance Committee has recommended that the Board approve the budget allocation requested by the WHOIS Review Team, not to exceed US\$125,000.

Resolved (2011.06.24.20), the Board approves a budget allocation not to exceed US\$125,000 for purposes of engaging a third party to undertake a research study to evaluate the effectiveness of WHOIS policy and its implementation as it relates to promoting consumer trust.

R. Ramaraj seconded the resolution.

Rita Rodin Johnston commented on the costs to the community for the Whois studies that are already ongoing, and the community dialogue about budgets and travel support and volunteer fatigue, while the Board is now approving additional funds for another Whois study. Rita noted that one of her goals when she expressed interest in joining the Board was to finalize Whois issues, and as she's leaving, another study is commencing. To date, the issue has ended in deadlock. There could be some issues that are impassable, and there has to be a compromise. While it's fine to do this study, it's been six years, and it's time to look at the information from the studies and figure out a way forward.

Bruce Tonkin commented that the cost of Whois studies is approximately US\$655,000. Over the week, the community conversation was focused on the issue of whether resources are being used in the best possible way. One of the ways to meet that objective is to look at the needs of the overall community and optimize the total spend. ICANN has to avoid repeating the same work in different forums, which is why the Board drafted the whereas clauses as it did. Bruce noted that this allows the community to see in total the resources allocated to Whois and to encourage feedback to get the most effective results.

The Board then took the following action:

All Board members present unanimously approved of Resolution 2011.06.24.20.

Rationale for Resolution 2011.06.24.20:

The Affirmation of Commitments calls for a periodic, community review of WHOIS policy and "its implementation to assess the extent to which WHOIS policy is effective and its implementation meets the legitimate needs of law enforcement and promotes consumer trust." The Whois Review Team appointed under the Affirmation requested funds to commission professional research to enable the Team to evaluate the effectiveness of WHOIS policy and its implementation as it relates to promoting consumer trust. The Board has provided these funds, as requested, to support the Team's independent review effort.

4. Renewal of .NET Agreement

Katim Touray moved the following resolution and read it into the record:

Whereas, the current .NET Registry Agreement is due to expire on 30 June 2011.

Whereas, Section 4.2 of the current .NET Registry Agreement provides that the Agreement shall be renewed upon the expiration of the initial term so long as certain requirements are met, and that upon renewal, in

the event that certain terms of this Agreement are not similar to the terms generally in effect in the Registry Agreements of the five largest gTLDs (determined by the number of domain name registrations under management at the time of renewal), renewal shall be upon terms reasonably necessary to render the terms of this Agreement similar to such terms in the Registry Agreements for those other gTLDs.

Whereas, the Proposed .NET Renewal Registry Agreement includes modified provisions to bring the .NET Registry Agreement into line with other comparable agreements (e.g. BIZ, COM, INFO, ORG), including modifications to terms such as traffic data, limitation of liability, indemnification, assignment, and notice provisions.

Whereas, ICANN commenced a public comment period on the Proposed .NET Renewal Registry Agreement on 11 April 2011 (see, <<http://icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-11apr11-en.htm>>) that was open through 10 May 2011.

Whereas, ICANN received 186 comments addressing subjects such as the renewal of the agreement in general, the process for competition review of new registry services, rights protection mechanisms, use of traffic data, the new provisions with respect to special programs for registrars in underserved geographies, registry fees and registration pricing and a summary and analysis of the comments was prepared.

Whereas, the .NET agreement provides for a US\$0.75 registry-level transaction fee, and ICANN has used the funds to support developing country Internet communities to participate in ICANN, enhancing security and stability of the DNS, and for general operating funds. ICANN commits to provide annual reporting on the use of these funds from .NET transaction fees.

Whereas, additional changes were made in response to public comment.

Resolved (2011.06.24.21), the .NET Registry Agreement is approved, and the CEO and the General Counsel are authorized to take such actions as appropriate to implement the agreement as so revised.

Bruce Tonkin seconded the resolution.

The Board then took the following action:

Fifteen Board members voted in favor of Resolution 2011.06.24.21. Bertrand de La Chapelle abstained from voting. The resolution carried.

Rationale for Resolution 2011.06.24.21:

Why the Board is addressing the issue now?

The .NET Registry Agreement is due to expire on 30 June 2011.

What is the proposal being considered?

In accordance with the renewal provisions of the current .NET Registry Agreement, the Proposed .NET Renewal Registry Agreement includes modified provisions to bring .NET into line with other comparable agreements (e.g. BIZ, COM, INFO, and ORG), including modifications to terms such as traffic data, limitation of liability, indemnification, assignment, and notice provisions. In addition to the changes to bring .NET into conformance with other agreements, Verisign has requested a change to give more flexibility for the registry to take action to prevent the registration of particular domain names when necessary in order to protect the security and stability of the DNS and the Internet – such as the actions that were taken by Verisign and other registries in coordination with ICANN in order to mitigate the threat from the Conficker virus. One other change to the agreement would give the registry operator more flexibility to offer training, technical support, marketing or incentive programs for the purpose of supporting the development of the Internet in underserved geographic regions.

Which stakeholders or others were consulted?

ICANN conducted a public comment period on the Proposed .NET Renewal Registry Agreement from 11 April 2011 through 10 May 2011, following which time the comments were summarized and analysed for Board review.

What concerns or issues were raised by the community?

Various members of the community raised the concerns

summarized the accompanying analysis, including concerns with respect to the renewal of the agreement in general, the process for competition review of new registry services, rights protection mechanisms, use of traffic data, the new provisions with respect to special programs for registrars in underserved geographic regions, registry fees and registration pricing.

What significant materials did the Board review?

The Board reviewed the Proposed .NET Renewal Registry Agreement and its Appendices, as well as the summary of public comments and Staff's response to those comments in Annex A.

What factors the Board found to be significant?

The Board carefully considered the public comments and the Staff recommendation with respect to those comments. While the Board considers the concerns with respect to the renewal provisions of the agreement and the registry fee and pricing mechanisms to be important, the Board determined that, on balance, those provisions are acceptable. The Board considered ICANN's contractual obligations with respect to the current .NET Registry Agreement in reaching this decision, specifically that the agreement must be renewed absent certain uncured breaches by the registry operator and that certain terms of the renewal are required to conform to existing comparable gTLD registry agreements. The Board considered the public comments with respect to the new provision in the Proposed .NET Renewal Registry Agreement regarding the registry operator's ability to offer training, technical support, marketing or incentive programs for the purpose of supporting the development of the Internet in underserved geographic regions. The Board determined that the stated intention of the provision was laudable but that the initially proposed content of the provision should be revised to more accurately reflect the intent of the provision and to provide greater safeguards against discriminatory treatment of registrars. The Board determined that the revised text agreed to by Verisign to address this change was a minor change and a beneficial change to the agreement, and that the agreement as revised should be approved. The revised text can be found in Annex B to

this paper, and a redline of the final Proposed .NET Renewal Registry Agreement can be found in Annex C to this paper.

Are there positive or negative community impacts?

Verisign has operated .NET very well, with no downtime, etc., and the community can expect that to continue.

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

There are no fiscal impacts or ramifications on ICANN, the community, or the public if ICANN approves the Proposed .NET Renewal Registry Agreement. The provisions regarding registry-level fees and pricing constraints are consistent with the current .NET Registry Agreement.

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

There are no security, stability, or resiliency issues related to the DNS if ICANN approves the Proposed .NET Renewal Registry Agreement.

5. Internet Number Certification (RPKI) Program

Kuo-Wei Wu moved the following resolution and read it into the record:

Whereas, ICANN has made commitments to support Resource Public Key Infrastructure (RPKI) in the ICANN 2011-2014 Strategic Plan and the Plan for Enhancing Internet Security, Stability, and Resiliency (FY11).

Whereas, ICANN has received requests from stakeholders for ICANN to operate the Global Trust Anchor (GTA) of the Internet Number Resource Certification System and to issue RPKI objects.

Whereas, the IETF Secure Internet-Domain Routing (SIDR) working group has published several IETF standards documents that solidify the technology known as RPKI (as of this writing four documents are currently in the RFC Editor Queue, four have been approved for publication, and a further five await IESG action), and one of the documents approved for publication is a request for IANA to issue a number of RPKI objects.

Whereas, the regional Internet registries have already constructed Internet Number Resource Certification systems based on the RPKI technology and have both trial and operational deployments.

Whereas, technical, operational, and infrastructure elements must be deployed and implemented to support the GTA of the Internet Number Resource Certification system.

Resolved (2011.06.24.22), the Board directs the CEO to take steps to prepare to implement and deploy an ICANN Global Trust Anchor for supporting RPKI objects and necessary support structures for implementing an Internet Number Resource Certification system.

Ray Plzak seconded the resolution.

The Board then took the following action:

All Board members present unanimously approved of Resolution 2011.06.24.22.

Rationale for Resolution 2011.06.24.22:

ICANN is responding to the expressed needs of the technical and Internet number resource communities for the establishment of a single authoritative trust anchor for RPKI, and that the trust anchor should be aligned with the existing number resource hierarchy. Approval of this proposal allows ICANN to fulfill specific requests from the IETF for issuing RPKI certification for unallocated and reserved Internet number resources (IPv4, IPv6, and Autonomous System numbers).

6. FY12 Operating Plan & Budget

R. Ramaraj moved the following resolution and read it into the record:

Whereas, on 18 March 2011, ICANN's Board approved an update to the Strategic Plan <<http://www.icann.org/en/planning/>>.

Whereas, the Framework for the FY12 Operating Plan and Budget <<http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-18feb11->

en.htm> was posted in February 2011 for community consultation, and was presented at the Silicon Valley ICANN International public meeting.

Whereas, community consultations were held to discuss and obtain feedback on the initial Framework.

Whereas, the draft FY12 Operating Plan and Budget <<http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-17may11-en.htm>> was posted for public comment in accordance with the Bylaws on 17 May 2011, based upon the Framework for the FY12 Operating Plan and Budget, community consultation, and consultations with the Board Finance Committee <<http://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/-op-budget-fy12>>.

Whereas, ICANN has actively solicited further community feedback and consultation with the ICANN community through online fora, conference calls, meetings in Singapore, and in the open forum in Singapore.

Whereas, the ICANN Board Finance Committee has discussed, and guided staff on, the development of the FY12 Operating Plan and Budget at each of its regularly scheduled meetings.

Whereas, the ICANN Board Finance Committee met in Singapore on 18 June 2011 and discussed the FY12 Operating Plan and Budget, and recommended that the Board adopt the FY12 Operating Plan and Budget.

Whereas, the Board has heard comments from the community during the meetings in Singapore, the Board will make adjustments to the budget where appropriate in order to address the community's concerns.

Resolved (2011.06.24.23), the Board adopts the FY12 Operating Plan and Budget <<http://www.icann.org/en/financials/proposed-opplan-budget-v1-fy12-17may11-en.pdf>>.

Gonzalo Navarro seconded the Resolution.

Rita Rodin Johnston noted that the Board heard a lot of comments from the community about the budget and wanting more detail on how funds are spent. Rita provided some information about the new software application being

implemented in the Finance Department, called Great Plains. It's new financial accounting software that will improve the finance function in a number of ways. Notably, it will allow ICANN to improve its reporting for forecasting, budget line item variance analysis and allow more robust departmental work. It will also allow enhancements to external reporting. This is the hope of the system, and improvements have been a long-term project. Rita encouraged the SOs and ACs to provide more input on what types of reporting they'd like to see, as enabled by this new system.

The Board then took the following action:

All Board members present unanimously approved of Resolution 2011.06.24.23.

Rationale for Resolution 2011.06.24.23:

The Budget is being adopted pursuant to Article XVI, Section 4 of the ICANN Bylaws, which provides that "At least forty-five (45) days prior to the commencement of each fiscal year, the President shall prepare and submit to the Board, a proposed annual budget of ICANN for the next fiscal year, which shall be posted on the Website. The proposed budget shall identify anticipated revenue sources and levels and shall, to the extent practical, identify anticipated material expense items by line item. The Board shall adopt an annual budget and shall publish the adopted Budget on the Website." The FY12 Operating Plan and Budget was developed through extensive community consultation, including at the ICANN public meetings in Silicon Valley and Singapore. Further detail on the rationale for the components of the budget are included in both within the budget and ICANN's Strategic Plan.

7. Report from Board-GAC Joint Working Group

Ray Plzak introduced the resolution by thanking the members of the GAC who worked to develop the recommendations within the Joint Working Group report. Ray noted that the resolution will dissolve the working group, but the work is not over – there is a lot more to do. The Board and the GAC will continue to work together and with the community to bring the recommendations to fruition.

Ray then moved the following the resolution and read it into the record:

Whereas, the Board created the Board-GAC Joint Working Group (JWG) to review the GAC's role within ICANN, consider measures to enhance support of the GAC's work, and to propose better ways for governments to be informed about ICANN and for enhanced opportunities for the GAC to meet with the ICANN Board and community.

Whereas, the JWG submitted its final report for consideration.

Whereas, the JWG has now concluded the work called for in the working group's terms of reference.

Resolved (2011.06.24.24), the Board receives the final report from the JWG, acknowledges the work of JWG members and thanks them for producing this report.

Resolved (2011.06.24.25), the Board directs the CEO to post the JWG report for public comment.

Resolved (2011.06.24.26), the Board hereby dissolves the Board-GAC Joint Working Group.

Katim Touray seconded the resolution.

Heather Dryden thanked the Board members that participated in the working group. Heather noted that there was a lot of work completed, and the group is satisfied with the contents of the report. Heather noted her hopes that the recommendations will be seriously considered and that the efforts of the Board and the GAC will be supported, and that implementation will follow quickly after public comment closes on the report.

The Board then took the following action:

All Board members present unanimously approved of Resolutions 2011.06.24.24, 2011.06.24.25, and 2011.06.24.26.

The Chair thanked Heather and Ray, as the co-chairs of the Joint Working Group, for their efforts.

Rationale for Resolutions 2011.06.24.24 – 2011.06.24.25:

[Rationale to be approved with the Minutes]

8. Issues arising from the Singapore Meeting

The Chair invited comments from the Board on items observed during the meetings in Singapore .

Thomas Narten acknowledged the community comment that ICANN did not do a good job communicating what it is doing in response to the ATRT recommendations. There were suggestions made on ways of getting information out, and the Board will be taking up those suggestions and trying to follow up.

Bertrand de La Chapelle noted that the upcoming meetings may have a slightly different intensity due to the approval of the new gTLD program. Bertrand commented that suggestions may be helpful on how to make the next ICANN meeting useful in terms of exchanges or best practices. Bertrand also acknowledged the community comments on the lessons that need to be learned on the balance of different groups within policy development and the development of ICANN activities.

The Chair commented on the tone of the meeting since the approval of the new gTLD program on Monday, and the enormous relief of the community that a decision was reached and its time to move on. The Chair noted that he is particularly grateful to the GAC, and the comment in the Communiqué that “The GAC expresses its willingness to continue to work constructively with the whole ICANN community on the new gTLD program.” The whole community feels that nobody got everything they wanted out of the process, but there is a program that everybody is ready to move forward with in a constructive manner.

9. Thanks to Rita Rodin-Johnston

Gonzalo Navarro moved the following resolution and read it into the record:

Whereas, Rita Rodin-Johnston, was appointed by the GNSO to the ICANN Board in May 2006.

Whereas Rita was also appointed by the GNSO in April 2008 to serve an additional three-year term.

Whereas, Rita concludes her term as a member of the Board of Directors on 24 June 2011.

Whereas, Rita has served as:

- Chair and Member of the Board Audit Committee
- Member of the Board Review Working Group
- Member of the Board Governance, Compensation, Reconsideration and Structural Improvement Committees
- Member of the GNSO Improvements Working Group
- Member of the ICANN Board and ICANN Governmental Advisory Committee Working Group
- Member of the ICANN Board Equivalent Strings Working Group and ATRT Review Teams

Resolved (2011.06.24.27), Rita has earned the deep appreciation of the Board for her term of service as a Director, and the Board wishes Rita well in all future endeavours. Woohoo!

After presentation of the resolution, many Board members and liaisons provided individual thanks to Rita for her contributions to them and to ICANN. The Board member statements are available in full in the transcript of the meeting and are incorporated into the minutes by reference.

All Board members present unanimously approved of Resolution 2011.06.24.27, by acclamation.

10.Thanks to Peter Dengate-Thrush

Steve Crocker moved the following resolution and read it into the record:

Whereas, Peter Dengate-Thrush was appointed by the ccNSO to serve on the ICANN Board in January 2005.

Whereas, Peter was also appointed by the ccNSO in April 2008 to serve an additional three-year term.

Whereas, Peter concludes his term as a member of the Board of Directors on 24 June 2011.

Whereas, Peter has served as:

- Chairman of the ICANN Board
- Member of the ATRT
- Co-chair of the President’s Strategy Committee
- Chair of the Executive Committee
- Chair of the Compensation Committee
- Chair of the Board Global Relations Committee
- Member of the following Board Committees: Finance, Board Governance and Audit

Resolved (2011.06.24.28), Peter has earned the deep appreciation of the Board for his term of service as a Director, and the Board wishes Peter well in all future endeavours.

After presentation of the resolution, many Board members and liaisons provided individual thanks to Peter for his contributions to them and to ICANN. The Board member statements are available in full in the transcript of the meeting and are incorporated into the minutes by reference.

All Board members present unanimously approved of Resolution 2011.06.24.28, by acclamation.

The Chair provided some closing remarks:

I had a chance to say thank you all for the opportunities of having this wonderful opportunity on Monday night, and I won't repeat any of that. But it is my last chance to say just a couple things.

I would like, first of all, to take the opportunity that's been made available to me to post some final thoughts on the Web site which I can compose at slightly more leisure than is available through the course of an ordinary meeting.

I would just like to comment on the fact that it has been in the last few years an incredibly busy policy period. And again just listing some of them: XXX, the GNSO restructuring, redoing the board committees, the new gTLDs, ending the Joint Project Agreement. We've introduced simultaneous interpretation. We've built up a fellowship program. We have seen the first strategic plan developed and then worked through that. We've launched sTLDs. Dot travel and DotAsia are now parts of the landscape. We had the work on the President's Strategy Committee, building institutional confidence. It has been the most extraordinary period, with IDNs and IDN ccTLDs and DNSSEC. The list of things we have actually done in the last few years is just extraordinary.

Let me just be absolutely clear, I'm not the originator of any of that. None of it was my idea. But I've been able to help, I think, work on those processes, of course, supported by a cast of thousands, particularly in more than the last couple of years, of course, by a new CEO. Rod has been fantastic at managing and organizing the delivery of these enormous challenges.

Hugely satisfying, of course, to bring them all home.

I think of all of them, the most important historically we will look back and see was the Affirmation of Commitments. I know we're all excited about the gTLD policy, and that's clearly going to make a change to the look of the Internet. But in the long-term strategic history of ICANN, I think the changing of the relationship with the United States Government and the shift to accountability to the world in becoming transparent and accountable at that level is in the end going to be the biggest thing that will have happened in this time.

So as I say, I didn't originate any of that. But I have been able to work on it but, of course, supported by absolutely incredible staff. At the risk of offending those -- because we don't have the time -- I just want to focus on perhaps some of the longer serving and begin with Diane.

Absolutely extraordinary effort. Of course, Diane remembers when I was regarded as a rebel at ICANN and, in fact, was mischaracterized as an opponent of ICANN for quite a long time. I think no one was more surprised than Diane when I became the Chairman of the Board, not something remotely possible when I was a member of the Boston Working Group challenging things in 1998. Thank you, Diane, for putting up with me and supporting me so thoroughly.

Tribute also to further incredible staff John Jeffrey and the team, Dan and Amy and Samantha. Dan particularly. People have talked about the late-night sessions. Once I'd finished and gone down to have that social chat in the bar with Bertrand and the others, Dan and the others would be there typing up the resolutions, getting all the material ready. They worked extra hours, and so that's been extraordinary.

Of course, Kurt and all of the gTLD team and, of course, many others which we count. Very impressive to see the building of the very strong international quality management team of Jamie, Elise, Barbara and David and others all coming -- all beginning to work together powerfully, creating a tremendous amount of synergy amongst themselves and with the Board and the community.

Of course, I have to say thanks to the people who helped me get to this position, in particular, and work with me in the other capacities and that's Vint Cerf, obviously who I took over from. He was a great help. And also Paul Twomey with whom I worked closely for a number of years.

Things we could have done better. I think we need to keep a close eye on the structure of ICANN. It should always be an elegant tension as the members of the community contest with each other for resources, contest with each other for policy positions.

We've got a most unusual model with the provider-supplier-customer all in the same room making the policy, overseen, of course, in a particular special role by governments and then underpinned by the support of the At-Large Community of users. So there needs to be constant tension to make sure that balance on different issues is maintained.

And perhaps the best example of that recently is the debate around the RAA, making sure we are using the right mechanisms to make the appropriate policy changes.

I think things we need to keep an eye on in the future, we need to take a role in the inevitable market, whether we like it or not, in the IPv4 address space. And we need to pay attention to strengthening and getting on to some kind of long-term IANA relationship. We need to work on exactly what "consensus" means for all of us and what serving the "public interest" means.

Let me just give my view about that discussion that was yesterday about defining the "public interest." I think we should resist that with all our might and main. Whoever defines the "public interest" will have won the big chunk of the argument and will have excluded the others because there is no such thing as "the public interest."

There are many public interests, and they are always competing. Our job is to get it right. The obvious example are the proponents of free speech and the trademark interests. Trademark has a monopoly on speech. Both perfectly valid interests and keeping them and getting the balance right is the job. There is no such thing as "the public interest." The search has to be for identifying the elements and establishing the balance.

I want to also pay tribute to the past and present Boards for support. It's been an incredible honor to be elected four times as your leader. As some of you have hinted today in what should have been flowing tributes, I'm not actually perfect. I know that's a surprise to some. But I appreciate the way all of you have gone along with my defects, especially my technical grip on things and how that's been tolerated.

And I particularly want to acknowledge and thank the backup from Steve, from Thomas, from Suzanne and Ram and Harald before them, wonderful support from my favorite techies. It is unbelievably comfortable to have what are, in fact, world class -- the leading experts in the world supporting the policy-making process. So thank you for that.

Lots of other thank yous I can't go through the entire 21. But, again, perhaps picking among a galaxy of stars, Thomas, we have been here about the same length of time. I thank you for your patience and the way you have become the conscience of the Board in many ways.

Rita, obviously we've mentioned the strength, the articulate presentation of clear principles. Ramaraj, sitting silently, watching and then a razor sharp observation backed by truly superb memory, very helpful for keeping us on track. Bruce, an unbelievable resource for ICANN in all roles, having already served many years as GNSO chair to come on the Board and then continue to strive the extraordinary steady pace, the knowledge and the increasing wisdom. I'm very grateful for your friendship and counsel and support.

So let me thank everybody as a group. It has been an incredibly good team, good friendship.

And perhaps I'll close by thanking and welcoming the new directors, thank you for standing. Thank you for the service that you are about to give, particularly, of course, my old friend Chris Disspain, who takes my seat on behalf of the ccNSOs, having already proved excellent leadership among the ccTLD community and I'm very confident will bring that to the Board so that a quota of blue-eyed, silver-haired antipodean lawyers is maintained. Congratulations to your elections.

The Chair declared the meeting closed.

2011-06-24-Board-Minutes-Organizational-Meeting



**Minutes – Organizational Meeting of the
Board of Directors**

24 June 2011
Singapore

A transcript of the meeting is posted at
<http://singapore41.icann.org/meetings/singapore2011/transcript-board-meeting-2-24jun11-en.txt>.

An Organizational Meeting of the ICANN Board of Directors was held on 24 June 2011 in Singapore, convening immediately upon the adjournment of the Regular Meeting of the ICANN Board of Directors.

Steve Crocker called the meeting to order.

In addition to Steve Crocker the following Directors participated in all or part of the meeting: Rod Beckstrom (President and CEO), Sébastien Bachollet, Cherine Chalaby, Bertrand de la Chapelle, Chris Disspain, Bill Graham, Erika Mann, Gonzalo Navarro, Raymond A. Plzak, R. Ramaraj, George Sadowsky, Mike Silber, Bruce Tonkin, Katim Touray, and Kuo-Wei Wu.

The following Board Liaisons participated in all or part of the meeting: Heather Dryden, GAC Liaison; Ram Mohan, SSAC Liaison; Thomas Narten, IETF Liaison; Reinhard Scholl, TLG Liaison; and Suzanne Woolf, RSSAC Liaison.

1. Election of Board Chairman.....	1
2. Election of Board Vice Chairman	3
3. Appointment of Membership of Board Committees	3
4. Any Other Business.....	7
5. Entry on the IANA Special People Numbers Registry	9

Steve Crocker welcomed the new Board members, Chris Disspain and Bill Graham, to the stage, and explained that Bruce Tonkin, as the Chair of the Board Governance Committee, would be running the proceedings to select the new leadership of the Board.

1. Election of Board Chairman

Bruce Tonkin explained that for the first time, the Board is provided additional transparency in the process used for selection of the Board Chair, and is identifying the candidates. As there is likely to be a lot of information floating

around the community, the Board decided to be very clear about the process. Bruce noted that all three candidates are very worthy of the position.

Bruce noted that the Board had a discussion about what the role entails, and what the criteria should be. Each candidate had an opportunity to address the criteria, and the Board then questioned each candidate.

Bruce then moved the resolution and read it into the record:

Whereas, pursuant to the Board's adopted process, nominations for Board Chair were closed at the beginning of the Board workshop on 22 June 2011.

Whereas, the following Board members were identified as candidates for Board Chair: Sébastien Bachollet, Cherine Chalaby and Steve Crocker.

Whereas, the candidates for Board Chair made presentations to the Board.

Whereas, the Board then participated in a written straw poll by secret ballot, the results of which were used to inform the Board Governance Committee's (BGC) slate for Board Chair that the BGC presented to the Board for approval.

Whereas, the BGC has recommended that the Board elect Steve Crocker as the Chairman of the Board.

Resolved (2011.06.24.29), Steve Crocker is elected as Chairman of the Board.

R. Ramaraj seconded the resolution.

The Board then took the following action.

All Board members present unanimously approved of Resolution 2011.06.24.28.

2. Election of Board Vice Chairman

The Chair, Steve Crocker, assumed the leadership of the meeting. He confirmed that the Board followed essentially the same process for the consideration of the position of Board Vice Chairman as for the Chair.

The Chair then moved the following resolution and read it into the record:

Whereas, pursuant to the Board's adopted process, nominations for Vice Chair were closed at the beginning of the Board workshop on 22 June 2011.

Whereas, the following Board members were identified as candidates for Board Vice Chair: Sébastien Bachollet, Ray Plzak and Bruce Tonkin.

Whereas, the candidates for Board Vice Chair made presentations to the Board.

Whereas, the Board then participated in a written straw poll by secret ballot, the results of which were used to inform the Board Governance Committee's (BGC) slate for Board Vice Chair that the BGC presented to the Board for approval.

Whereas, the BGC has recommended that the Board elect Bruce Tonkin as the Vice Chairman of the Board.

Resolved (2011.06.24.30), Bruce Tonkin is elected as Vice Chairman of the Board.

Ray Plzak seconded the resolution.

The Board then took the following action:

All Board members present unanimously approved of Resolution 2011.06.24.30.

3. Appointment of Membership of Board Committees

Bruce Tonkin moved the following resolution and read it into the record:

Resolved (2011.06.24.31), membership of the Board committees is established as follows until the Annual General meeting:

Audit

Erika Mann (Chair)
Steve Crocker
Gonzalo Navarro

Compensation

Bruce Tonkin (Chair)
Steve Crocker
Rajasekhar Ramaraj

Executive

Steve Crocker (Chair)
Rod Beckstrom
Cherine Chalaby
Bruce Tonkin

Finance

Cherine Chalaby (Chair)
Sébastien Bachollet
Rajasekhar Ramaraj
George Sadowsky

Governance

Bruce Tonkin (Chair)
Cherine Chalaby
Bill Graham
Ram Mohan (Liaison)
Ray Plzak
Rajasekhar Ramaraj

Global Relations

Gonzalo Navarro (Chair)
Chris Disspain
Erika Mann
George Sadowsky
Katim Touray
Kuo-Wei Wu

IANA

Kuo-Wei Wu (Chair)
Bertrand de La Chapelle
Thomas Narten (Liaison)
Ray Plzak
Katim Touray
Suzanne Woolf (Liaison)

Public Participation

Mike Silber (Chair)
Sébastien Bachollet
Thomas Narten (Liaison)
Gonzalo Navarro
Katim Touray
Kuo-Wei Wu

Risk

Steve Crocker (Chair)
Rajasekhar Ramaraj
Mike Silber
Bruce Tonkin
Suzanne Woolf (Liaison)

Structural Improvements

Ray Plzak (Chair)
Bertrand de La Chapelle
George Sadowsky
Reinhard Scholl (Liaison)
Mike Silber

Bruce noted that one of the things that the Board Governance Committee is considering is managing succession planning to ensure that the Board is not dependent upon any one individual in a specific role. Of note, Ramaraj, the longtime Chair of the Finance Committee, is transitioning out of that role as ICANN's fiscal year is coming to a close. To assist, Ramaraj remains on the Finance Committee to provide a smooth transition to Cherine Chalaby. Another example is the transition of the Chair of the Risk Committee from Bruce to Steve Crocker, while Bruce remains on the committee to assist in the leadership transition. This type of succession planning is also occurring at the Nominating Committee level, where the Board recently approved the creation of a Chair-Elect position.

Cherine Chalaby seconded the resolution.

The Board then took the following action:

Fifteen Board members approved of Resolution 2011.06.24.31. Katim Touray opposed the Resolution. The Resolution carried.

Katim Touray provided the following statement regarding his opposition to the resolution and the manner of selection of the slate:

Thank you very much, Steve, and congratulations to both of you and Bruce and the rest of the Board on your appointments and elections to your respective positions and chairs in the various committees.

As I mentioned in an e-mail I sent out last night to the Board list, I am voting against the current slate of appointments to the various committees because I think there are serious flaws in the way we appoint and populate the various committees of the Board.

As you all well know, or at least most of you that have been on the Board for the past three or so years, there's an issue that has been raised a number of times. We have discussed it but we have never really addressed it. I'm glad to hear -- I'm glad to see that at least with regards to the Chair and Vice Chair, we have started to do something that's a little bit more transparent and that ICANN, as an organization that's built on a multistakeholder model, is more deserving of.

In my discussions yesterday with Bruce, we explored various ways and means of achieving exactly this. But I think until we get to that, it's important that I vote, in this case, against this particular slate of candidates and preponderance operations of the committees just to send a message, as it were. Because I think if we keep, you know, pushing the matter aside, we just would not have the pressure we need to really do what we need to do and that is do the right thing for ICANN.

And having said that, I will fully cooperate and work as much as I can with all of you to make sure ICANN gets the very best out of this Board.

4. Any Other Business

The Chair provided the following comments:

We have a lot of work in front of us. Two things I want to flag in particular, quite obviously having passed the resolution to move forward with the new gTLDs, we have enormous amount of work in execution. That will be, as we have said many times, a challenge all the way up and down. Heavy burden on the staff, heavy burden on the community, heavy burden on the board to execute what's in front of us that we have committed to, and undoubtedly there are extra items, rough edges, loose ends that will come up that need to be dealt with even while we're proceeding deliberately and rapidly down the defined path.

The other -- among the many, many commitments that we have, the other one I want to flag is the Affirmation of Commitments, the ATRT report, the resolutions that we passed, our complete commitment to all 27 recommendations.

I want to note that during the presentation of the Finance Committee this morning was a specific comment that these items have been supported in the budget. That is a very strong statement in terms of commitment to go and make this all happen.

Let me also now turn to the process that you have just seen of selecting Board leadership.

This was a competitive and very constructive and healthy process. I think the right way to look at this is that we have a considerable amount of talent and skills, and that is a very good position for us to be in.

I can tell you from having participated in this, Bruce organized the process and ran it, and it was very, very well done, and caused each of us to have to speak to a number of issues, and in the process I think all of us learned a great deal about the issues and we learned about each other. As I say, this was a positive experience that resulted not only in the business at hand of making a decision but of also laying the

foundation for some very constructive and ongoing interactions and cooperative processes.

So I'm looking forward very much to working with everybody on the Board. I'm particularly looking forward to working with Sébastien and with Cherine, and I think each of them wants to add some comments.

Sébastien Bachollet stated:

After six months of period, they say, I am returning for three years in the Board. It's unusual to have this six months after three years, but it was a process to allow the At-Large to work on the process to elect a full Board member, and I would like to take this opportunity to thank again the At-Large Community for their confidence.

About the election, my position, more to say that I am the best candidate, I think it's important that the Board get a choice. It's one of the major reasons for my candidacy. And I was happy that Cherine did the same for the Chair election.

Even if I don't see the result as the best way to show a much-needed internationalization of ICANN, I respect the result and I will support both Steve and Bruce in their new role as Chair and Vice Chair. And I will fulfill my duty in the committees I have the honor to serve.

A quick point. I need to disclose, as there are some changes in my Statement of Interest. As you know, it was published before Brussels that I have been invited to be a member of the board of the International Foundation for Online Responsibility, which is set up to be the sponsoring organization for the xxx sTLD, should ICM be awarded the contract for the dot xxx sTLD. They just issued a public statement that I am now a member of the Board of the International Foundation for Online Responsibility, which is the sponsoring organization responsible for policy setting for the dot xxx sTLD.

Thank you very much.

Cherine Chalaby congratulated the Chair on his appointment, and noted that he looks forward to working with the Chair and the Board as a team under the Chair's leadership. Cherine commented that ICANN has many challenges facing the organization, and he can be counted on to support ICANN as the Board works together.

The CEO congratulated Steve and Bruce on their appointments and welcomed the entire new Board.

5. Entry on the IANA Special People Numbers Registry

The Chair moved the following resolution and read it into the record:

Whereas, Peter Dengate Thrush, served as the Chairman of the ICANN Board of Directors from November 2007 through June 2011.

Whereas, we thank Peter Dengate Thrush for his leadership, dedication and significant accomplishments as the Chairman of the ICANN Board of Directors.

Resolved (2011.06.24.32), the Board requests that Peter Dengate Thrush be inducted as entry number 11 on the IANA Special People Numbers Registry (SPNR)

<<http://www.iana.org/assignments/special-registry/>> as follows:

IANA Special People Numbers Registry (SPNR)

Number	Name
0	Reserved
1	Jon Postel
2	Joyce K Reynolds
3	Bob Braden
4	Louis Touton
5	Daniel Karrenberg
6	Stephen Crocker

7	Scott Bradner
8	Stephen Wolff
9	Vint G. Cerf
10	Paul Twomey
11	Peter Dengate Thrush

Chris Disspain seconded the resolution.

The Board then took the following action:

All Board members present unanimously approved of Resolution 2011.06.24.32, by acclamation.

The Chair called the meeting to a close.

2011-06-25-Board-Minutes



Minutes
Board of Directors Meeting
25 June 2011
Singapore

At-Risk Component of President and CEO Compensation

A special Meeting of the ICANN Board of Directors was held on 25 June 2011 in Singapore at 16.00 local time.

Chairman Steve Crocker promptly called the meeting to order.

In addition to Chairman Steve Crocker the following Directors participated in the meeting: Bruce Tonkin (Vice Chairman), Sébastien Bachollet, Cherine Chalaby, Bertrand de La Chapelle, Chris Disspain, Bill Graham, Erika Mann, Raymond A. Plzak, George Sadowsky, Mike Silber, Katim Touray, and Kuo-Wei Wu.

The following Board Liaisons participated in all or part of the meeting: Heather Dryden, GAC Liaison; Thomas Narten, IETF Liaison, Reinhard Scholl, TLG Liaison; and Suzanne Woolf, RSSAC Liaison.

The Board noted that all Board Members present waived the notice requirement regarding this Meeting.

The Board discussed a recommendation of the Compensation Committee regarding the At-Risk component of the President and CEO's compensation.

The new Chair of the Compensation Committee presented the following information to the Board of Directors:

The Compensation Committee met on Saturday 18 June 2011 to discuss the CEO's reporting on the performance metrics that are used to make a recommendation to the Board.

The Compensation Committee presented the outcome of that discussion to the Board at its workshop on Thursday 22 June 2011 to seek feedback from the Board, and made a formal recommendation regarding the at-risk component of the President and CEO's compensation.

Each Board Member confirmed that they have no conflict of interest regarding setting compensation for the CEO/President.

The Board then took the following action:

Whereas, the Compensation Committee recommended that the Board approve a proportion of the at-risk component for the President and CEO for the period 1 July 2010 to 30 June 2011.

Resolved (2011.06.25.01), the Board approves the proportion of the at-risk



Minutes
Board of Directors Meeting
25 June 2011
Singapore

component of the CEO's compensation for the period 1 July 2009 to 30 June 2010, as proposed by the Compensation Committee.

**All Board members present unanimously approved of Resolution
2011.06.25.01.**

Specific items within this meeting shall remain confidential as an "action relating to personnel or employment matters", pursuant to Article III, section 5.2 of the ICANN Bylaws.

2011-07-28-01-Board-Submission-Redelegation-.om

ICANN BOARD SUBMISSION NO. 2011-07-28--01

TITLE: Redlegation of the .OM domain representing Oman
PROPOSED ACTION: For Board Review and Approval on Consent Agenda
IANA REFERENCE: 439217

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The ICANN Board is asked to consider and vote on the request to redelegation the .OM top-level domain, comprised of the ISO 3166-1 code representing Oman.

Sensitive Delegation Materials

PROPOSED RESOLUTION

Whereas, OM is the ISO 3166-1 two-letter country-code designated for Oman;

Whereas, ICANN has received a request for redelegation of .OM to the Telecommunications Regulatory Authority.

Whereas, ICANN has reviewed the request, and has determined that the proposed redelegation would be in the interests of the local and global Internet communities;

It is hereby resolved (___), that the proposed redelegation of the .OM top-level domain to the Telecommunications Regulatory Authority is approved.

PROPOSED RATIONALE

Why the Board is addressing the issue now?

Staff present delegation and redelegation requests for country-code domains to the Board for decision, once staff are satisfied the applicant has provided a sufficiently complete application that has a reasonable prospect of a positive Board decision. In line with ICANN's commitments to perform timely processing of requests relating to the IANA function, and the DNS root zone in particular, the ICANN Board seeks to evaluate such requests at its next scheduled Special Meeting.

What is the proposal being considered?

The proposal is to approve a request to IANA to change or designate the sponsoring organisation (also known as the manager or trustee) of a country-code top-level domain. In line with established practice, the ICANN Board is involved in making the decision to proceed with such requests as one step of this multi-step process.

Which stakeholders or others were consulted?

In the course of evaluating a delegation application, ICANN staff consults with the applicant, the current operator (if applicable), and other directly connected parties. In line with ICANN's practice of keeping incomplete root zone change requests in confidence, ICANN has not performed open consultation on this matter.

What concerns or issues were raised by the community?

Any concerns or issues are raised within the public report that will be published in conjunction with this action. This report will be published on the IANA website at <http://www.iana.org/> should the root zone change request have successfully completed final processing, usually 1-2 months after the Board's decision.

What significant materials did the Board review?

The Board is involved in assessing requests against a variety of public interest criteria. This criteria includes establishing the country-code is eligible (e.g. listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard); establishing the proposed manager is supported by the local Internet community; establishing the proposed operator is operationally and technically competent; establishing the proposed manager is based locally and bound under local law; establishing the proposed manager operates fairly and equitably; establishing that in cases there is a transfer of operations that an appropriate plan is in place to preserve ongoing stability of the domain; and establishing that the action is compatible with any applicable local laws and regulations. During the staff compilation process, the applicant is asked to provide a variety of materials in support of these various aspects. Pertinent information from these supplied materials and other staff research is provided to the Board, and published in a public report at the end of implementing an approved request.

What factors the Board found to be significant?

The Board considers factors described in the public report, in relation to the basic principles of country-code domain delegation described earlier.

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, and the local communities to which country-code top-level domains are designated to serve.

Are there fiscal 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 fiscal impact of the internal operations of country-code top-level domains within a country, other than ensuring the operator is based in country and has the appropriate mechanisms to allow the local Internet community to properly oversee the domain's ongoing operation.

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

For country-code top-level domain delegations, ICANN seeks to approve only such requests where reasonable concerns have been satisfactorily addressed, and the proposed new manager has demonstrated a sufficient level of operational and technical competency where such concerns should be minimal.

Submitted by:	Kim Davies
Position:	Manager, Root Zone Services
Date Noted:	18 July 2011
Email and Phone Number	kim.davies@icann.org Contact

2011-07-28-02-Board-Submission-FY12SSR

ICANN BOARD SUBMISSION NO. 2011-07-28-02

TITLE: **FY 12 SSR Framework**

PROPOSED ACTION: **For Board Acknowledgement**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

ICANN has completed the public comment process on the FY 12 SSR Framework, which is the baseline document for describing the foundation of ICANN's role in security, stability and resiliency of the Internet's unique identifiers. The FY 12 version was published on 2 May 2011 in a more streamlined format over the previous two SSR Plans. The document was published in two parts, Part A includes an overview of the Internet ecosystem and ICANN's role, while Part B describes ICANN's operational priorities for SSR in FY 12. The Framework also distinguishes from those areas in which ICANN has operational responsibility, areas where ICANN is a collaborator, contributor and facilitator, and those areas where ICANN is an observer of activities in the ecosystem led by others.

The Annex to this submission provides the background for the FY 12 SSR Framework, and a summary of the comments received at the conclusion of the comment period on 7 June 2011.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff is requesting that the Board acknowledge receipt of the FY 12 SSR Framework, based on the following:

1. ICANN conducted a public comment period on the document (from 2 May to 7 June 2011), along with several briefing sessions with the community before and during the comment period. A summary and analysis of comments was published on 8 June 2011 (<http://forum.icann.org/lists/ssr-fy12/msg00006.html>).
2. Five public comments were received, all were supportive of ICANN's efforts in SSR but asked for clarification of definitions
3. The ICANN Board previously accepted the initial SSR Plan for 2009 (FY 10) at the ICANN meeting in Sydney, Australia on 26 June 2009,

<http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-26jun09.htm#1.7>. The FY 11 SSR Plan was acknowledged at the ICANN meeting in Cartagena in December 2010.

<http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-10dec10-en.htm#1.8>.

4. Staff conducted a series of community briefings on the FY12 SSR Framework, before and during the ICANN meeting in Singapore. The briefings in Singapore included At Large, the Business Constituency of the GNSO, ccNSO Tech Day, and the Security team open session on the SSR Framework.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION:

Whereas, the FY 12 Security, Stability & Resiliency (SSR) Framework was posted for public comment from 2 May to 7 June 2011.

Whereas, a public comment summary and analysis was completed and published on 8 June 2011.

Whereas, staff conducted a community briefing during the Singapore meeting and is incorporating feedback into the operational priorities described in the SSR Framework, including benchmarks, objectives, milestones and a mechanism for assessing success in SSR activities.

Resolved (2011.__), the Board acknowledges receipt of the FY 12 SSR Framework.

RATIONALE:

Under the Affirmation of Commitments signed by ICANN and the US Department of Commerce on 30 September 2009, preserving the security, stability and resiliency of the DNS is recognized as a key commitment. The Affirmation acknowledges in Section 9.2 that ICANN has adopted a Security, Stability and Resiliency (SSR) Plan, which will be regularly updated to reflect emerging threats to the DNS, including unique identifiers. Previous SSR Plans were published in 2009 and 2010, and acknowledged by the ICANN Board at the international public meetings in Sydney, Australia (June 2009) and Cartagena, Colombia (December 2010).

This latest version of the SSR Framework has been updated in a more streamlined and accessible format, and was published in May 2011 to bring ICANN's baseline

documentation on SSR on schedule with the publication of the FY 12 ICANN Operating Plan and Budget cycle. The document provides guidance to the community on ICANN's role in SSR, describes areas in which ICANN has operational responsibility, areas in which ICANN is a collaborator, facilitator and contributor, and areas in which ICANN is an observer of activities led by others in the ecosystem. Community inputs received in the public comment period were generally supportive of the revised format, and asked for greater specificity and precision on definitions.

A Board paper detailing the SSR Framework and annex containing information on the comments received between 2 May and 7 June 2011 has been provided to the Board.

The document is separate from the overall ICANN Operating Plan and Budget and there are no anticipated fiscal impacts from this decision. The Framework serves as guidance on ICANN activities in SSR for the coming fiscal year.

Submitted by:	Patrick Jones
Position:	Sr. Mgr., Security
Date Noted:	17 July 2011
Email and Phone Number	Patrick.jones@icann.org Contact

2011-07-21-CEOReport

PRESIDENT & CEO'S REPORT – 21 July 2011 (reporting on activity following from Singapore Meeting):

COMMUNICATIONS

New gTLD Communications

The drive to make the world aware of new gTLDs has begun!

After the Board approved the program on 20 June in Singapore, more than 2,700 articles have appeared about new gTLDs in everything from AP and Reuters, to the NBC Evening News, to trade journals and publications such as Hindu Business Line.

A video providing an overview of the program to potential applicants has been released in English and is near completion in five more languages. It averaged a thousand views a day in its first four days live.

The new gTLD team issued an RFP to ad agencies for help in raising global awareness of new gTLDs. We received nine responses, currently in evaluation. Barring unforeseen delays, an ad agency should be contracted and on the job in August.

Redesigning ICANN.ORG

Our contractor, Four Kitchens, has done two rounds of art comps for the web team and will initiate a refresh of the home page before August ends. This is a quick interim solution to demonstrate progress to the community, and is just a cosmetic updating.

A fuller study of the site's information architecture will take place toward the goal of rearranging the site to make everything more findable. The full re-launch of the site will be accomplished by year's end, including much more robust support for those who access it by phone.

Singapore meeting

ICANN41 was a noteworthy success – of course, because of what the Board accomplished on so many fronts – but also because the Meetings Team developed a superb fall-back when circumstances in Amman caused us to move the meeting. The Singapore venue was world class.

SECURITY

Major accomplishments

1. Completion of FY 12 SSR Framework - this was a new format, intended to be more streamlined, less repetitive and clear for the community. The document received very favorable community support for new format. (On Board agenda for 28 July)
2. Growing support for DNS capacity building training – We have interest from the

law enforcement community in training at the Dakar meeting & beyond, an outcome from meetings with law enforcement representatives including Interpol in Singapore

3. Support to DNSSEC program, with key signing ceremonies in Culpeper & LAX & SysTrust audit completion
4. Successful ICANN meeting in Singapore, no major security incidents
5. Completion of first Root Zone Partners Table Top contingency exercise with NTIA & VeriSign (May 2011)
6. Cross-community working group on DNS Security & Stability Analysis met face to face in Singapore and commenced its work. The team is also providing input as requested by the Affirmation Review Team on SSR.

For this Trimester, through October, Jeff is consolidating the Security team, looking at what we're being asked to deliver by the community, by internal stakeholders, and how we can serve to enhance ICANN's mission in SSR. A focus area is to schedule our FY 12 capacity building & DNSSEC trainings, support the Affirmation of Commitments review on SSR and cross-community working group on DNS Security & Stability Analysis, support the new gTLD program with vulnerability & contingency testing on TAS, IDN efforts, work with Compliance on collaborative activities involving malicious domain issues, continue global security engagement & awareness activities with stakeholders, & support Global Partnerships, IANA & Government Relations with activities related to the IANA functions contract renewal.

Internal Security Information Redaction

The team is also continuing work on DNS metrics, which will be a topic at the upcoming DNS-EASY/3rd DNS SSR Symposium in Rome, Italy in October (<http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-06jul11-en.htm>).

Since Singapore -

Dave Piscitello spoke at the ESCC/Internet2 Joint Techs Conference in Anchorage, Alaska.

Whit Diffie and Rick Lamb spoke at the Security Confab in Monterey, California.

Patrick Jones spoke at the Brand Protection Council meeting of the American Apparel & Footwear Association in New York City.

John Crain is planning a follow-up communications contingency exercise at IETF in Quebec City next week.

Geoff Bickers is supporting the Meetings team with security preparations for the upcoming ICANN meeting in Dakar.

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIPS

Some of the major activities for Global Partnerships in the last trimester will also carry over into the T1 work in FY12:

These include work on the IANA renewal by generating public comments from the regions to the NTIA NOI, and now for the FNOI. GP has alerted members of the community to the FNOI and discussed the differences between the questions asked in the two rounds and the reasons for participating in the FNOI whether or not the stakeholder had already submitted comments for the NOI. Another topic for discussion has been explaining the what the 6 month extension means in the IANA renewal process.

A second area of on-going work involves the question of continuance of the existing Internet Governance Forum model (multi-stakeholder participation in planning and using the consensus driven bottom up decision making process). ICANN has continued to participate in the MAG (multi-stakeholder advisory group) as part of the planning process for the 6th International IGF to be held in Nairobi Kenya in September. This includes major themes and tracks, topics for panels and tracking participation and logistics such as the topics and placement of the ICANN Open Forum. GP also actively participated in the liaison work in collaboration with the business and technical community as participants in the CSTD working group. The mandate of the working group was extended to allow the group to continue to meet until a consensus set of recommendations for the IGF improvements could be agreed and brought to the full CSTD for its report.

GP continues to support the Fellowship program. The Singapore program has completed through the gathering of the participants reports and generating certificates. The application process for the Dakar meeting has also recently closed and there are 78 applicants moving through the evaluation process.

Another area of continued work involves support for the new gTLDs program. GP has on-going work with the Communications and new gTLDs team to identify locations and existing meetings to leverage for launch events and informational panels and workshops. In addition we are reviewing the new materials under development for appropriate linguistic and audience messaging for the regions.

HUMAN RESOURCES

Employment Information

New hires include the addition of Jonathan Dennison to the Contractual Compliance Team and Joseph de Jesus to the Constituency Travel Support team.

AOC & ATRT

Implementation of the Accountability & Transparency Review Team's recommendations (including supporting Board, GAC, NomCom and community work on ATRT implementation) and facilitating two additional community reviews called for in the Affirmation of Commitments is an ongoing priority and both efforts progressed this past month.

With the Board's action on the ATRT Recommendations in Singapore (including new guidance from Board Committees on various Recommendations) Staff is updating implementation plans, applying new approaches to communicating ATRT and related efforts to the community, and is developing proposed metrics for Board Committee consideration.

In the area of "Board Governance, Performance & Composition," progress continues on implementation of the outstanding ATRT Recommendations (see ATRT Project List for details), and translations of Approved Resolutions and Board Minutes, Resolution rationale, and Board briefing materials have been publicly posted on time.

For ATRT Recommendations related to "Governmental Advisory Committee's Role, Effectiveness and Interaction with Board," with the issuance of the Board-GAC Joint Working Group Report and guidance from the BGRC, staff is updating proposed implementation plans and materials to assist the GAC in its follow-up work. Staff also is making arrangements for use of increased support for government participation (especially developing countries) in the GAC, and for use of additional funding for multilingual access to ICANN activities.

In the area of "Public Input & Public Policy Processes," the ICANN Language Services Policy and Procedures (guidelines for translation, interpretation, and other language-related services) is being finalized for public posting, a streamlined Public Comment Webpage recently was launched (along with a list of "Upcoming Public Comments"), and new templates are being used for public comments to increase uniformity and clarity of the postings and summary reports. A draft stratification list – designed to direct the community's attention to topics of interest on the public comment forum web page – is being reviewed by a focus group of community members.

To advance Recommendations on "Review Mechanism(s) for Board Decisions," staff updated the Reconsideration Request web page with status indicators for all Requests, and information on Board action arising out of the committee recommendations. Staff also is working with BGC-assigned topic leaders for recommendations in this area on more detailed implementation plans, including proposed plans to seek input from a committee of independent experts on the restructuring of ICANN's three review mechanisms.

WHOIS Policy Review Team

The Team has begun work on a first draft of their report with a goal of issuing it for public comment and discussion at the ICANN meeting in Dakar, and finalizing it shortly thereafter for submission to the Board. To reach agreement on the construct and basic elements of the report, the Team continues to hold periodic conference calls and members have planned a working session in Mdr in September. They posted material for online public input and held several working sessions and community discussions at the ICANN Singapore meeting to advance their work, and this week three Team members are in Mdr collecting information from ICANN's Compliance Staff. A Request for Proposals recently was issued by the Team for a study on WHOIS consumer trust aspects and they hope to factor the results into their September work session. Staff continues to provide the Team support, including briefings, research and information sharing, as well as meeting organization and administrative assistance.

Security, Stability & Resiliency Review Team

The Team is following a schedule similar to the WHOIS Team with a goal of issuing a draft report for community discussion and review before the end of this calendar year and providing the Board with their final report early in 2012. They posted material for online public input and held several working sessions and community discussions at the ICANN Singapore meeting to advance their work. This week a subgroup of the Team is meeting at ICANN's Washington D.C. offices to outline their draft report and agree on a list of individuals to interview to further inform their work. A draft report or summary may be available for discussion at ICANN's Dakar meeting. Staff continues to provide the Team support, including briefings, research and information sharing, as well as meeting organization and administrative assistance.

REGISTRARS

- Publication of Registrant Rights and Responsibilities on ICANN website (27 June)
- New Accreditation Application fee went into effect 1 July, along with enhanced due diligence measures
- Revised/updated automation implementation time line in accordance with new gTLD schedule announced in Singapore
- Confidential and Business Proprietary
- Registrar Training Program Beta Testing Completed
- Additional translated web pages posted

IDNS

- Held all-day closed sessions with case study teams during the Singapore meeting
- Work by six case study teams is ongoing through regularly scheduled teleconference calls

- ICANN is facilitating meetings by providing subject matter experts, phone and administrative support for each team meeting
- Devanagari team is having its face-to-face meeting in Pune, India on 21&22 July Schedule is aggressive but teams are still aiming for issues report by 30 September

gTLD REGISTRIES

On 24 June 2011, the Proposed .NET Renewal Registry Agreement (see <http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-11apr11-en.htm>) was approved by the Board (see <http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-24jun11-en.htm#4>).

CONTRACTUAL COMPLIANCE

Key performance strides were made in three areas: operational, ongoing Compliance activities and AOC WHOIS Review.

1. Operational

The new Senior Director, Maguy Serad attended her first ICANN meeting in Singapore. She met many members of the community and made well received presentations to five stakeholder groups (Registrar, Registry, ALAC, BC and IPC) where she shared with the community her priority and approach to Compliance and a number of very important Compliance initiatives, including:

- registrar RAA self-assessment
- registry data escrow audit
- collaboration with the law enforcement community

In addition, working with John Jeffrey, Maguy has recently completed a review and restructuring of the Compliance department. The new structure is intended to provide team members a clear career path and well-fined roles and responsibilities.

2. Ongoing Compliance Activities

- a) One (1) formal notice of breach was issued to a registrar (Distribute.IT) and around 200 informal compliance notices were sent to registrars.
- b) 1,722 consumer complaints were received and 1,611 tickets were processed.
- c) WDRP Audit Report - The 2010 Annual Whois Data Reminder Policy (WDRP) Contractual Compliance Audit Report was published
<http://www.icann.org/en/compliance/reports/wdrp-audit-2010-report-13jul11-en.pdf>.

Key findings of the audit include:

- 99% (945 of 954) of the ICANN-accredited registrars responded to the 2010 WDRP audit.
- 98.4% of the registrars required to send WDRP notices were in compliance with the form and content requirements for the notices.

All registrars that were found non-compliant with notice content requirements were notified of their non-compliance and given an opportunity to cure. Only a small number of registrars (ten) remain under review to assess registrar compliance with notice content requirements.

3. AoC WHOIS Review

Part of the AoC WHOIS Review scope is to assess ICANN's performance against the AoC requirements that ICANN:

- implements measures to maintain timely, unrestricted and public access to accurate and complete WHOIS information, including registrant, technical, billing, and administrative contact information; and
- enforces its existing policy relating to WHOIS, subject to applicable laws.

With guidance from Denise Michele, Compliance staff has been providing information and briefing the Review Team since late last year. Recent activities include a meeting between members of the Compliance team and the AoC WHOIS Review team in Singapore and a site visit by members of the "WHOIS Review Compliance SubTeam" to ICANN's Marina del Rey office on 21 July 2011. Through these efforts and interactions, it is hoped that members of the WHOIS Review team have gained "an in-depth understanding of how the Compliance staff does its job and spends its time" in enforcing existing WHOIS policy.

Compliance staff member, Khalil Rasheed was recently promoted to a Senior Manager role with WHOIS as one of his key areas of responsibility.

PROJECT OFFICE

- Kicked off the 2012-2015 Strategic Plan Development Process by posting the timeline that has been established for the annual review and development process. See link <http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-2-30may11-en.htm> The high-level Strategic Plan Development Process Timeline commits to an organized, efficient process. The development cycle for this year's Strategic Plan recognizes ICANN's ongoing commitment to the bottom-up multi-stakeholder process and decision-making model. As such, it contains time for extensive consultation, several workshops with the Community, and the Board.

- Supported release of our New Financial System (Microsoft Dynamics GP.) This replaces our legacy finance system, FundWare, as of July 1, 2011. The objectives for implementing this new system were to:
 - Provide a robust, scalable solution which supports our current and future requirements, future growth, and internationalization goals
 - Improve operational efficiency and effectiveness
 - Increase automation and reduce manually intensive processes
- Supported New gTLD Program material postings and 7 sessions in Singapore – draft Applicant Guidebook, 5 explanatory memos and 4 supporting materials (including: gTLD Registry Transition Processes, Summary of Changes to Registry Agreement, Board Response to GAC on Root Zone Scaling, Evidence of "Use" Requirement for Trademark Protections, IDN Variants, April 2011 Discussion Draft Public Comment Summary & Analysis, New gTLDs Communications Plan and Trademark Clearinghouse Implementation)

POLICY

GNSO - Meetings

- Staffed/supported over 37 formal, scheduled meetings, as well as numerous preparatory meetings and several important informal meetings, such as preparatory meetings for the Forum on DNS Abuse, the Trademark Clearinghouse Session, and the Session on the Current State of the UDRP; meetings with various Whois Review Team members); policy department briefing of the CEO, Chairman, Vice Chairman and executive team. Multiple sessions were held on:
 - Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Final Report
 - Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery Final Report
 - Creation of Best Practices For Dealing with Illicit Domain Names
 - Registration Abuse Policy Recommendations
 - Policy Development Policy (PDP) Revision
 - Proposed New gTLD Applicant Guidebook and IDN Variants
 - The Current State of the UDRP
 - Workshop on Developing Metrics for Competition, Consumer Choice and Consumer Trust
 - Geographic Regions Working Group
 - GNSO Standing Committee on Improvement Implementation
 - Joint SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group
 - IDN Practical Experiences
 - Joint GNSO Council / ICANN Board Meeting Discussion of Community Working Groups (CWGs) and Revolving Door Policies

- Joint GAC/GNSO Registrar Stakeholder Group Discussion on the Law Enforcement RAA Recommendations
- Joint ccNSO/GNSO Discussion on CWGs, and perspectives on Strategic Plan and budget

- **Actions/Group Accomplishments:**

- Adoption of recommendations on Inter-Registrar transfers (IRTP Part B) and initiation of a PDP on IRTP Part C.
- Approved a resolution for staff to produce a red line of changes to the GNSO Council Operating Procedures for recommendations from the Operations Steering Committee on Proxy Voting and to submit the redlined document and explanation of changes for public comment.
- Prepared status letter on Whois studies, which was signed and presented to the GAC by Peter Dengate Thrush and Rod Beckstrom.
- Clarified history and status of Whois studies for the GAC.
- Met with the “Consumer Protection” Subgroup of the Whois Review Team and provided detailed guidance on developing terms of reference for an RFP to measure Whois and Consumer Trust.
- Obtained commitment from three large Registrars/Privacy Providers to participate in the Whois relay and reveal study, which is important because it will ensure that the study results reflect not only those requesting information, but those who receive relay and reveal requests.
- Posted blog news item announcing the selection of Interisle Consulting Group as the research entity to conduct the relay and reveal study, which paved the way to solicit participants for the study in Singapore.
- Successful preview of Staff’s perspective to be included in the “Discussion Paper on the Creation of Non-Binding Best Practices for Dealing with Illicit Domain Names.” The session was very well attended and provided valuable input for Staff as this paper is finalized and presented to the GNSO Council after Singapore.
- Successful Forum on DNS Abuse - highlighted by presentation by the participation of INTERPOL’s Mick Moran and Singapore Professor Ang Peng Hwa, which probed the role of ICANN in dealing with cyber-crime issues. Symantec’s Kai Koon Ng, based in Singapore, participated in the panel on latest developments in the fight against e-crime and DNS abuse. This is one of the only sessions on the agenda that focuses on regional issues and showcases regional speakers.
- Successful sessions on Saturday and on Wednesday on the Preliminary Issue Report on the Current State of the UDRP. Experts from various stakeholders shared their perspectives and reactions to the Staff recommendations contained in the Preliminary Issue Report. Valuable input received will help Staff refine its recommendations that a PDP should not be conducted at this time on the UDRP.

- Highly Interactive round table on the Implementation of the Trademark Clearinghouse. Key implementation advice from various stakeholders will guide ICANN's RFP process for implementing the Trademark Clearinghouse.
- Multiple different GNSO WG updates to the GNSO Council
- The GNSO Council Standing Committee met face-to-face for the first time and established its working methods.
- New PDP Model presented to the GNSO Community. Presentation and discussion of the Final Report to the GNSO Council should lead to the adoption of the model after conclusion of the public comment period.
- Internationalized Registration Data Work Group (IRD-WG): Jim Galvin, Co-Chair of the IRD-WG, gave updates to the GNSO Council and to the public on the status of the WG's efforts to develop a final report.
- DNS Security & Stability Analysis (DSSA) Working Group: The DSSA-WG held its first face-to-face meeting. The meeting was well attended and work progressed on the WG's first objective: the development of a Work Plan.
- IDN Variant Project (VIP): The IDN VIP held a full day of meetings on Saturday with the various Case Study Teams. Julie supported the Greek Case Study Team which, despite the absence of the Team's coordinator and the attendance of only two team members, was able to draft an initial work plan and to begin to define the scope of the character set to be considered. In addition, the IDN VIP and Case Study Team members participated in public sessions on Sunday and Monday, and updates to various Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees.
- Excellent Secretariat Support provided resulted in the transcripts of the GNSO Working Sessions and other sessions posted quickly on the meeting nodes and the GNSO calendar page. GNSO Council meeting ran smoothly, meeting staff excelled in short turn around to change room. Draft minutes have been sent to the GNSO Council chairs for review and are posted on the Council list.
- Engaged in numerous conversations with members of the community regarding WHOIS and other policy issues.

CEOMonthlyOnePageMetricsJuly152011Board



CEO Monthly One - Page Metrics Report (Board)

Report date: 15 July 2011

(millions)

Actual Financial Data*4	Fiscal YTD 31 May 2011	Budget Variance
Operating Revenues	\$ 63.0	4.83%
Operating Expenses	\$ 51.9	-0.92%
Contribution from Operations	\$ 9.1	45.87%

Actual Financial Data	As of 31 March 2011
Assets	\$ 100.2
Liabilities	\$ 18.9
Cash	\$ 28.5
Reserve Fund	\$ 52.0

IDN Fast Track Billing Activity*5	ITD
Requests processed	18
IDN fees billed	\$600k
IDN fees collected	\$132K

Staffing *6 (as of 30 April)	Now
# of Staff	124
Open Positions	21
Retained Searches	5

Hires/Terminations*6	Month	FYTD
New Hires	1	17
Involuntary Terminations	0	2
Voluntary Terminations	1	16
Total Terminations	1	18

Participation ICANN Meetings	Singapore - 41st ICANN Meeting	% of Attendees
Participants	1,346	100%
Staff (w/Contractors and Vendors)	117	8.70%
Supported Travelers	126	9.40%

Support Services at Meetings	Singapore - 41st ICANN Meeting	% of Sessions
Sessions Conducted	168	100.0%
Live Audio Streaming	118	70.2%
Telephone Conferencing	102	60.7%
Interpretation	38	22.6%
Live Scribing	41	24.4%
Audio Transcription	125	74.4%
Web Chat Rooms	72	42.9%

"L" Root Service	Month	YTD
Uptime	100%	100%
Requests Served	32 Billion	130 Billion
Average Requests per second	12,000	12,000

*** Footnotes:**

- 1) Data is FY 11 Trimester 3 - ending 26 June 2011
 - a) Includes community working groups, work teams, committees, task forces only
 - b) Includes At-Large advisories and statements to Board and SOs only
 - c) ASO global policy proposals "in progress" are those being tracked by ICANN staff
- 2) Based on ICANN confidentiality restrictions, there is a 90 day lag of data available
- 3) Data as of 15 June 2011; Identifies the Number of unique IDN Fast Track applications received to date.
- 4) FY11 Data through 31 May 2011, in process of closing the FY11 year
- 5) From inception January 2010 through 31 May 2011
- 6) Data as of 31 May 2011; Key Hires – Alina Syunkova, Board Support; Key Departures – none; Key promotions – Khalil Rasheed, Contractual Compliance Manager – Whois Brian Peck, Policy Director; Key Searches – VP Europe, Ombudsman, Chief of Staff, CFO, VP Africa
- 7) Data as of 30 June 2011, identifies the number of IANA Services requests during a given month
- 8) Data is from 1 January 2011 through 31 March 2011
- 9) This statistic is now calculated against the full ISO 3166-1 alpha 2 list of a total of 241 delegatd ccTLDs.
- 10) No change from last month. However, there was a significant increase in the overall amount of both IPv4 and IPv6 traffic to our web sites.
So IPv6 traffic is increasing in proportion with IPv4 traffic

Documents Produced	Trimester 3	FYTD Translations	Cost per word (in USD)
Public Comment Periods Opened	15		
Produced Documents	37		
Translation Requests	164	4.346 m words	\$0.10

Policy Development *1	T3 - Initiated	In Progress	Completed
ASO global policy proposals *c	0	1	0
ccNSO work groups *a	0	12	0
GNSO work groups *a	1	19	0
SSAC projects	1	3	4
At-Large statements *b	14	2	12

Growing Community Interest	Now
Number of ccNSO Members	116
Number of At Large Structures	134

Deployment IPv4	IANA / 8 Blocks Available	IANA Percentage Available
IPv4 space remaining	0	0.00%

Deployment IPv6 *10	Total
IPv6 traffic to ICANN Sites	0.98%

IANA Services*7	Month Open	Month New	Month Closed	Month Outstanding
Root Zone Requests	21	46	45	22
IETF Requests	79	401	421	59
RIR Requests	0	0	0	0

Domain name registrations in gTLD's *2 (as of December)	New Registrations YTD	Total Registrations
gTLD Total	11,244,643	127,694,306

IDN FastTrack Requests *3	Month	Total
Total Requests	0	34
Number of countries/territories with IDNs in the RZ	0	20

ccTLD commitments*9	Trimester 3	Signed Total	% of Signed Total
New ccTLD Accountability Frameworks	0	64	27%

Registrar Data Escrow	Now	% of gTLD Registrations Protected
No. registrars enrolled	870	99.50%

Involuntary Terminated or Non-Renewed Registrars *8	YTD	% of Total Registrars
Terminated	4	0.41%