15 MAY 2016 BOARD MEETING
Reference Materials

TABLE OF CONTENTS – REFERENCE MATERIALS

To: ICANN Board
From: The SSAC Chair
Via: The SSAC Liaison to the ICANN Board

The purpose of this letter is to bring you up-to-date on a proposed change to the membership of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) and to provide an explanation for the attached request for Board action. This change is the result of ongoing new member evaluations conducted by the SSAC Membership Committee and approved by the SSAC.

The SSAC Membership Committee considers new member candidates and makes its recommendations to the SSAC. The SSAC has agreed with the Membership Committee's recommendation to nominate John R. Levine as a new member. John is an active participant in both the IETF and MAAWG having contributed positively in both fora. He brings a breadth of technical expertise and a well-deserved reputation for excellent technical debate. The SSAC believes John would be a significant contributing member of the SSAC.

The SSAC Membership Committee respectfully requests that the Board appoint John R. Levine to the SSAC for a 3-year term beginning immediately upon approval of the board and ending on 31 December 2019. Attached is his résumé for your reference.

The SSAC welcomes comments from the Board concerning this request.

Patrik Fältström, SSAC Chair

Employment

(1987-present) Taughannock Networks (Ta-GONN-ick), Trumansburg, N.Y.

Writer, Lecturer, and Consultant. Wrote or co-authored numerous books including the best-selling *Internet for Dummies* and related titles, with over eight million copies in print. Speaks to many trade and general groups; gave invited talk at the Federal Trade Commission spam forum and authentication summit, International Telecommunications Union WSIS spam conference, and the Messaging Anti-Abuse Working Group. Expert witness in civil and criminal court cases related to patents, software copyright, e-mail, and other technical areas. Testified on spyware for the U.S. Senate Commerce Committee, and consulted extensively with the FTC about the implementation of the CAN SPAM act. Member of Industry Canada Task Force on Spam.

(2012-2013) Interisle Consulting Group, Hopkinton MA

Part of a team doing technical analyses of applications for new top level domains (TLD) for ICANN, the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers. Built an extensive set of automation tools to track several thousand applications and reviews.

(2006-2008) Domain Assurance Council, Inc., Trumansburg, N.Y.

Co-founder and director of non-profit trade association. DAC was set up to identify and standardize technology for e-mail security based on domain names. We developed Vouch-by-Reference, a technique that permits certifying organizations to publish lists of domains they certify, that mail systems can query in real time. The Internet Engineering Task Force accepted VbR and published it as RFC 5518.

(2005-2006) Blackvine Consulting, G.P., Montreal, Québec.

Partnership doing project consulting to government and industry in Canada. Created an in-depth study on international aspects of Canadian spam for Industry Canada.

(1989-2007) Segue Software, Lexington, Mass.

Co-founded Segue, a NASDAQ listed software company. Initially did DOS to UNIX re-engineering, including Lotus 1-2-3 for UNIX and the Norton Utilities for UNIX; later Segue became a leading provider of Web and client/server testing software. Was a corporate director and audit committee member until the company merged into Borland Software in 2007.

(1993-96) Journal of C Language Translation, Cambridge, Mass.

Edited and published quarterly technical journal about computer language and compiler technology and standards. Contributors included P. J. Plauger, Dennis Ritchie, and many others.

(1984-87) Javelin Software, Cambridge, Mass.

One of the authors of Javelin, an award-winning PC modeling and analysis program. Wrote systems and numeric parts of the program, e.g., financial functions, wrote and managed program development building tools and process. Also acted as corporate DP

director managing 800 ordering, credit card processing, shipping logistics, etc.

(1979-84) Interactive Systems Corp., Santa Monica Calif. and Cambridge, Mass.

Was a principal developer at Interactive, the first commercial UNIX vendor, opened their Boston Technical Office which grew to about 20 employees. Primary kernel architect for IBM's AIX 1.0, wrote the original UNIX C compiler and assembler for AIX, and INfort, the first commercial Fortran 77 system.

Related Activities

(2015-2018) The Internet Society (ISOC)

Appointed as Trustee of ISOC, the oldest and largest organization that promotes the open development, evolution, and use of the Internet for the benefit of all people throughout the world.

(2005-present) M3AAWG (Messaging, Malware, Mobile Anti-Abuse Working Group)

Senior Technical Advisor to the premier industry anti-abuse organization. Provides advice to management, technial facilitation at meetings, writes and rewrites white papers, and other related activities.

(2005-2007, 2014-2015) Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN)

One of three North American members of the ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee) which is charged with representing the Internet community outside the specific domain constituencies. With some other new members, he tried to make the ALAC a more effective conduit between Internet users and ICANN. Continues as the respresentative of ALAC constituent organization CAUCE (see below.)

Member of the ICANN 2014-2015 Nominating Committee, appointed by the Internet Architecture Board on behalf of the Internet Engineering Task Force.

(2003-2013) IRTF Anti-Spam Research Group

Chaired the ASRG. He rechartered the ASRG, established informal contacts with large Internet providers including MAAWG and Open Group, and set up new working groups. ASRG evaluates and experiments with potential anti-spam technology and forward promising ideas to the IETF for standards work.

(1997-present) Network Abuse Clearing House (abuse.net)

Operates contact database and complaint forwarding service for Internet users. Currently handles over 50,000 requests per day.

(1997-present) Coalition Against Unsolicited Commercial Email (CAUCE)

President of grass-roots organization opposing junk e-mail, with over 13,000 members. In 2006 reorganized CAUCE as a not-for-profit trade association and served as corporate secretary and treasurer, and now president.

(1995-present) Network manager

Operates a private network hosting over 300 Internet domains and web sites with over 300,000 web pages, and 500 e-mail users.

(1986-present) Moderator, comp.compilers usenet group

> Moderates technical interest group on compilers (programs that translate among different computer languages). Estimated readership of 100,000.

Public Service

(1997-2007) Mayor and Trustee, Village of Trumansburg N.Y.

> Elected member of the governing board of trustees in 1997, and later mayor in 2004 of his village (pop. 1500) in upstate New York. As trustee, served as Water and Sewer Commissioner. Dealt with municipal utilities regulation, notably cable franchise and telecommunication towers. As mayor, supervised village staff of 12 full time and about 40 part time employees.

Publications

> **Books** (some books from before 2000 are omitted)

> *The Internet for Dummies*, 14th edition in press, Wiley Publishing, 2015 (with Margaret Levine Young).

> *flex and bison*, O'Reilly Media, 2009.

> *Mobile Internet for Dummies*, Wiley Publishing, 2008 (with M. O'Farrell et al.)

> *Windows Vista: the Complete Reference*, Osborne/McGraw Hill, 2007 (with Margaret Levine Young et al.)

> *qmail*, 2004, O'Reilly Media.

> *UNIX for Dummies*, 5th edition, Wiley Publishing, 2004 (with Margaret Levine Young).

> *Fighting Spam for Dummies*, Wiley Publishing, 2004 (with Ray Everett-Church and Margaret Levine Young).

> *Internet Privacy for Dummies*, Wiley Publishing, 2002 (with Ray Everett-Church and Gregg Stebben).

> *Windows XP Home Edition: the Complete Reference*, Osborne/McGraw Hill, 2002 (with Margaret Levine Young).

> *Linkers and Loaders*, 2000, Morgan Kauffman/Academic Press.

> *Understanding Javelin Plus*, 1987, Sybex (with M. L. Young and J. M. Young).

Education

Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

> B.A., 1975, Computer Science and Mathematical Economics. PhD, 1984, Computer Science, advised by A.J. Perlis. Thesis was *A Data Base System for Small Interactive Computers*.
>
> Revision date: 2015/07/09 21:39:51 (1.10)

Charter of the
gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group
Adopted by RySG Vote on 4 November 2015

I.   Mission and Principles

A. The gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG) is a recognized entity within the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) formed according to Article X, Section 5 (September 2009) of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) Bylaws.

B. The primary role of the RySG is to represent the interests of gTLD registry operators (or sponsors in the case of sponsored gTLDs) ("Registries") who:

1. Are currently under contract with ICANN to provide gTLD registry services in support of one or more gTLDs;

2. Agree to be bound by consensus policies in that contract; and

3. Voluntarily choose to be members of the RySG.

The RySG may include Interest Groups as defined by Article IV. The RySG represents the views of the RySG to the GNSO Council and the ICANN Board of Directors with particular emphasis on ICANN consensus policies that relate to interoperability, technical reliability and stable operation of the Internet or domain name system.

C. The guiding principles for the RySG, including its leaders and Interest Groups are fairness, openness, and transparency in all RySG policies, practices, and operations. The service standards for leadership positions include impartiality, accountability, and conflicts of interest declarations. The behavioral expectations of all RySG Members, Interest Groups and participants include adhering to ICANN Bylaws and Policies; supporting the consensus model; treating others with dignity, respect, courtesy, and civility; listening attentively to understand others; acting with honesty, sincerity, and integrity; and maintaining community good standing.

II.   RySG Membership

The RySG has two categories of membership:

- Membership by registries ("Registry Members"); and
- Membership by trade associations representing registries ("Association Members").

Both categories of membership allow for either full membership or observer membership, depending on eligibility criteria.

A. Eligibility

1. Registries

All Registries are eligible for membership in the RySG upon the "effective date" set forth in the Registry's agreement with ICANN. For all purposes under this Charter (including voting), each operator or sponsor shall be considered a single Registry Member of the RySG (whether providing registry services for one or more than one gTLD or IDN version of a gTLD). Further, in cases where an operator or sponsor has a controlling interest in another registry operator or sponsor, either directly or indirectly, the controlled registry operator or sponsor shall not be considered a separate Member of the RySG.

Membership shall be terminated if a Member's agreement with ICANN is terminated or a Member voluntarily terminates its membership.

A Registry that is owned or controlled by, or under common ownership with, or affiliated with any entity that votes in another stakeholder group or constituency in either house of the GNSO is not eligible for voting membership in the RySG. Any question regarding eligibility or exceptions shall be determined by a vote of the RySG.

2. Associations

In order to join the RySG as a full Member with voting rights, the potential Association Member must meet the following criteria:

- The Association must be created primarily to represent registry operators;
- The Association's voting membership must be composed only of gTLD registry operators;
- The Association may also allow applicants or potential applicants to be gTLD registry operators to become members of the Association, but these applicants/potential applicants may not have a vote within the Association; and
- At least one Association member must be a gTLD registry operator that is NOT a RySG Member.

The RySG would evaluate eligibility via the Executive Committee to vet applications. The Executive Committee has final decision-making authority on any association membership application and may use discretion if unique circumstances make it appropriate to do so.

B. **Observer Status**

The RySG provides observer status for entities that may not be eligible for full membership per Paragraph II.A. and for entities that have applied, or have demonstrated both the intention and the means to apply, for a contract with ICANN to provide gTLD registry services in support of one or more gTLDs. Such entities are referred to as "Observer Members". Observer Members have no voting rights in the RySG and are subject to the Protocol for Observer Status adopted by the RySG, effective 16 May 2012, or as subsequently amended.

Associations that do not meet the eligibility criteria, but that include registry operators as a substantial portion of their membership, may join the RySG as Observer Members with no voting rights.

C. Applications

1. Entities applying for RySG membership must provide all required information on the application form provided by the RySG. Each eligible ~~Registry~~ ==Member== must identify at least one Voting Delegate on its application and may also identify alternate Voting Delegates if desired. Eligible ~~Registries~~ ==Members== may also designate up to five (5) non-voting delegates. Members may modify their delegations by written notice to the Secretariat or, absent a Secretariat, to the Chair. ~~Registries~~ ==Applicants== which satisfy the membership criteria will be accepted as members immediately upon receipt of the initial dues and satisfactorily completed application form.

2. Entities interested in applying for Observer status must provide all required information on the application form provided by the RySG. Each eligible Observer Member must identify at least one Delegate on its application and may also designate up to three (3) additional delegates. Observers may modify their delegations by written notice to the Secretariat or, absent a Secretariat, to the Chair. ~~Observers~~ ==Applicants== which satisfy the criteria for Observer status will be accepted as Observers immediately upon receipt of the initial dues and satisfactorily completed application form.

D. Membership Classification

Members shall be classified as "Active" or "Inactive." An Active Member must meet eligibility requirements, must be current on dues, and must be a regular voter in RySG activities. A Member shall be classified as Active unless it is classified as Inactive pursuant to the provisions of this paragraph. Members become Inactive by failing to participate in three consecutive RySG voting processes. An Inactive Member shall continue to have membership rights and duties except being counted as present or absent in the determination of a quorum. An Inactive Member immediately resumes Active status at any time by voting.

E. Voting Rights

All Active Members have voting rights except as provided in Article II.G. Membership may be suspended if a Member does not pay its fees as previously invoiced within sixty (60) days after a written warning on nonpayment is sent to the Member; suspension shall continue until such time as the fees have been paid. Suspension of membership for nonpayment of dues shall be accomplished by vote of a majority of the Active Members upon a motion for that purpose. A Member may request verification of member status prior to the initiation of any vote.

F. Membership Lists

The RySG shall collect, maintain, and publish on its website a list of Active and Inactive Members, and Observers, with names identified by membership category or Observer status. The list shall be updated at least quarterly. In the case of corporate or organizational ==or Association== Members or Observers, the list shall include contact information for the delegate(s) who represent each Member or Observer. Personal contact data of delegates shall not be made publicly available, but that information shall be provided to ICANN Staff when requested.

G. Member Participation

Each Member organization of the RySG may participate in the RySG in accordance with this Charter. Only delegates are eligible to participate in RySG activities. Spokespersons of Interest Groups may participate in a non-voting capacity in RySG meetings, but only the delegate, or alternate authorized to vote, of each Member of the RySG may vote as provided in Article X. No Member that is entitled to vote, or has voted within the preceding three months, in any other GNSO Stakeholder Group or Constituency shall be entitled to vote in any RySG proceeding. No Member that has transferred its voting rights from the RySG in the previous 6 months shall be entitled to vote in any RySG proceeding.

Each delegate who is affiliated, directly or indirectly, with another domain industry organization(s) in addition to the Member or Observer by which such delegate has been appointed must maintain and file with the RySG Secretariat a current statement of interest (SoI) describing all such affiliations. The RySG Secretariat shall distribute copies of the SoIs to the delegate mailing list as they are filed. When the RySG is considering an issue that may be related to such affiliations, delegates must declare all associated interests before participating in the work.

At all times while participating in RySG activities, delegates are to represent the interests of their respective organizations and shall not compromise the ability of other delegates to do the same. Failure to comply with the provisions of this paragraph may result in exclusion from participation in some or all of RySG activities, including, but not limited to, exclusion from the mailing list, by vote of the RySG.

Each Active Member of the RySG shall have the right to:

Vote. Vote in all general elections of the RySG including, but not limited to officers and Council Representatives; and, whenever a general membership vote has been called by an authorized officer of the RySG.

Participate in Leadership Elections. Run for, or nominate other Members to, RySG elected positions by complying with the procedures described in Article VIII, Elections;

Participate in Working Groups. To join any GNSO Working Group (WG) in an individual capacity;

Participate in Committees. To join any committee formed by the RySG.

Receive Communications.
a) Have access to the RySG Website, Public List, and any other communications mechanisms established pursuant to Article VII, Communications; and
b) Be given timely notice on the Public List of all scheduled meetings, policy development discussions, position paper developments, and votes.

Participate. Be afforded the opportunity to participate in RySG discussions, whether via teleconference, e-mail list, website, or in person, on all policy and administrative issues for which notice is given on the Public List;

Submit Agenda Items. Submit agenda items for RySG meetings. If there are too many agenda items to include in the time available, the Chair may limit the agenda to items to those submitted at least ten (10) days prior to the scheduled meeting and those seconded by a member of the applicable committee; and

Receive Mentoring. Upon request, a new RySG Member will be assigned a mentor by the Chair to answer questions, offer guidance, and provide direction.

III. Structure of the RySG

A. Secretariat

The RySG shall have a Secretariat. The Secretariat will be responsible for ensuring that operational support is provided as needed for the RySG and the Executive Committee. Particular tasks may include but are not limited to:

- Processing membership applications
- Fulfilling administrative functions, including preparing and keeping minutes of meetings
- Coordinating email and web site service
- Coordinating and facilitating meetings
- Assisting with voting
- Maintaining Member and Delegate contact information
- Confirming Member status (Active or Inactive) prior to each meeting.
- Maintaining delegate and Member information for each Interest Group.
- Publishing on the RySG web site a list of all active and inactive Working Groups, Committees and Interest Groups and their minutes, action points, decisions, resolutions and final work products within a reasonable period of time after any given meeting.

Staffing of the Secretariat need not be from a Member. The Chair shall appoint the Secretariat upon authorization by vote of the RySG.

B. Working Groups

The RySG may appoint individuals to be responsible for representing the RySG on Working Groups (WGs). Such appointments will be open to the entire membership. The RySG will publish and advise its Members of calls for WG participants. Members designated to represent the RySG shall keep the RySG membership regularly apprised of the WG activity.

C. Committees

The RySG will advise its Members of the formation of committees and publish a call for participants if applicable. Committee members shall keep the RySG membership regularly apprised of the committee activity.

D. Interest Groups

For the purposes of collaborating on issues of common interest within the RySG and coordinating efforts within it, RySG Members may organize themselves into Interest Groups. A RySG Member may join more than one Interest Group simultaneously. Membership in an Interest Group is voluntary. One person and one or more alternates may be designated by each Interest Group as spokespersons to represent all members of the Interest Group in RySG matters other than voting. An Interest Group does not have voting rights in the RySG.

The internal structures, leadership positions, and operations of each Interest Group will be left to its membership and the charter it creates. Each Interest Group will be expected to conform to the general principles set forth in Article I of this Charter.

Each Interest Group shall have the following special rights and responsibilities:

1. Develop and issue policy and position statements with particular emphasis on ICANN consensus policies that relate to interoperability, technical reliability and stable operation of the Internet or domain name system provided that opportunity is given to other RySG Members to comment in advance and provided that any statement that is not an RySG position is clearly identified as such; and

2. Participate in the GNSO policy development processes.

Each Interest Group shall:

1. Notify the RySG of the effective dates of its formation and dissolution;

2. Provide the following information to the RySG:
   - A list of its members;
   - The names of persons designated as spokespersons for the Interest Group and alternates;
   - A copy of its charter; and
   - Changes in membership at least quarterly.

E. Observer Interest Groups

An Interest Group formed by Observers ("Observer Interest Group") shall be subject to the same requirements as set forth in Paragraph III.D. above except for voting.

F. Rules of Procedure for Working Groups, Committees and Interest Groups

The procedures adopted by the GNSO Council for its Working Groups shall, to the extent applicable, be the rules of procedure for Working Groups, Committees and Interest Groups.

IV. Officers

A. General Provisions

Each officer of the RySG must be an authorized voting delegate (or alternate) of an Active Member.

Unless otherwise specified, each officer position shall be elected for a term of two years and shall hold office until a successor is elected or until the officer dies, resigns, is removed, becomes disqualified, or if the Member that the officer represents is suspended or terminated.

The officer positions will have staggered terms. The Treasurer and Vice Chair of Administration will be elected in odd-numbered years while the Chair and Vice Chair of Policy will be elected in even-numbered years.

In the event of a vacancy occurring with any officer position, an election shall be held to elect a successor; any alternate position does not automatically succeed to the post.

No officer may serve in the same position for more than two full consecutive terms. A term of 18 months or more shall be deemed a full term. An officer who has served for two consecutive terms in the same position shall not be eligible for re-election to that position until after the expiration of one full term.

B. Chair

The RySG shall have a Chair who shall be elected at the RySG meeting following the ICANN Annual meeting in even-numbered years. The Chair shall act as the chief executive officer of the RySG.

C. Vice Chair of Policy

The RySG shall elect a Vice Chair of Policy who shall be elected at the RySG meeting following the ICANN Annual meeting in even-numbered years. The Vice Chair of Policy shall assist the Chair in conducting RySG business. Such duties would include, but are not limited to: chairing conference calls when the Chair is unavailable; representing the RySG in Working Groups and other ICANN-related meetings as necessary; managing the drafting, approval and submission of RySG public comments; and working with other members of the Executive Committee on RySG business as appropriate.

D. Vice Chair of Administration

The RySG shall elect a Vice Chair of Administration who shall be elected at the RySG meeting following the ICANN Annual meeting in odd-numbered years. The Vice Chair of Administration shall assist the Chair in conducting RySG business. Such duties would include, but are not limited to: chairing conference calls and/or representing the RySG in meetings when either the Chair or other Vice Chair are unavailable; managing RySG ballots and elections; conveying information to the Members; performing the duties of the Vice Chair of Policy when necessary; and encouraging prospective Members to join the RySG.

E. Treasurer

The RySG shall have a Treasurer who shall be elected at the RySG meeting following the ICANN Annual meeting in odd-numbered years. The Treasurer will be responsible for ensuring that

proper financial records are kept for the RySG, collecting membership fees assessed by the Members and preparing and managing annual budgets. The Treasurer shall prepare an annual draft budget and submit it to the RySG for approval by vote. The Treasurer shall make disbursements in accordance with the approved budget, and may, from time to time, make additional disbursements if authorized by vote of the RySG.

F. Assistant Treasurer

The RySG shall elect an Assistant Treasurer at any RySG meeting. The Assistant Treasurer shall be elected for a term specified at the time of election. The Assistant Treasurer shall not be considered an Officer of the RySG for the purposes of this Charter. The Assistant Treasurer will be responsible for assisting the Treasurer in the Treasurer's duties and responsibilities in such manner as the Treasurer shall direct.

V. Executive Committee

A. Composition

The RySG shall have an Executive Committee (EC) composed, ex officio, of the Chair, Vice Chair of Policy, Vice Chair of Administration, Treasurer, the RySG Representatives elected to the GNSO Council and the immediate past Chair of the RySG as a non-voting member for a term of one year following completion of his or her term as Chair.

B. EC Responsibilities

1. Hold EC Meetings

    a) The Chair shall call meetings as necessary (but no less than one meeting per year) to address the duties of the EC set forth in this Charter, and shall:

       1) Develop meeting agendas;

       2) Schedule and conduct EC meetings;

       3) Provide notice of meetings.

    b) The RySG Secretariat shall:

       1) Record EC meetings and decisions;

       2) Make publicly available on the RySG website or other public communication vehicle information regarding the EC meetings, and decisions; and

       3) Maintain an EC private communication vehicle if needed (e.g., mailing list, wiki, etc.) for administration purposes, which shall be archived and available to Members of the RySG.

       4) Use the services of the GNSO Secretariat for the above functions, to the extent that such services are available.

c) EC meetings may be conducted face-to-face, or through teleconference, email, wiki, or other online mechanisms.

2. Facilitate Policy Coordination Meetings

Upon request from a Member, the EC may invite all RySG Members to join in a meeting, held via whatever means is most convenient and allows all participants to communicate on an equal basis, to discuss GNSO policy development issues.

3. Manage and Administer Elections

When required according to the provisions of this Charter, the EC shall be responsible and accountable, with GNSO Secretariat assistance when available, for organizing, announcing, supervising, and operating elections for GNSO Council representative vacancies and RySG officer vacancies as prescribed in Article VIII, Elections.

4. Support the GNSO Council and the ICANN Board

The EC shall cooperate with and support the GNSO Council and the ICANN Board.

a) If requested by the ICANN Board, select Nominating Committee delegate(s) as directed by the RySG membership through consensus or a vote if required;

b) Encourage and support recruitment, outreach, and training efforts targeted at expanding the RySG through identification and introduction of new Members; and

c) Request ICANN Staff assistance when necessary to facilitate the goals, objectives, and duties of the RySG.

5. Evaluate Membership Applications
The EC will evaluate all applications for membership to the RySG. The EC has final decision-making authority on any RySG or Association membership application and may use discretion if unique circumstances make it appropriate to do so.

C. **Executive Committee Rules of Procedure**

1. Decision Making Process

All members of the RySG EC will participate in making decisions.

a) Decisions will be made by consensus whenever possible.

b) All significant decisions, whether by consensus or vote, require the participation of the full RySG membership.

c) Any RySG Member may request the EC to assess consensus or conduct a vote on any decision or representation of a RySG position.

d) If the EC cannot resolve a decision by consensus, the Chair shall conduct a vote. If there is a tie, the matter shall be referred to the full RySG membership for a vote.

2. Announcement and Reporting of EC Meetings and Decisions

Wherever practicable, EC meetings will be recorded and posted in an easily accessible and identified manner on the RySG's public communication vehicle.

a) EC decisions will be reported and published within two business days of the decision being fully ratified by RySG Members as applicable and duly documented;

b) Each report will clearly reflect the EC members who participated in the process, their votes, and any supplemental statements they submitted for the record.

VI. Meetings

A. Scheduling

The RySG shall hold face-to-face meetings in conjunction with each public ICANN meeting unless otherwise decided by vote of the RySG. Other face-to-face meetings may be held if approved by vote of the RySG. The Secretariat shall provide at least thirty (30) days advance notice for all face-to-face meetings except in cases of urgent need. Whenever possible, the RySG shall provide the opportunity to participate in face-to-face meetings by teleconference from remote locations.

The RySG may also hold meetings by teleconference. Except in cases when the RySG votes to hold a meeting with shorter notice because of an urgent need to schedule a meeting, the Secretariat shall provide at least fourteen (14) days advance notice for all teleconference meetings. Any or all Interest Groups may consolidate all or a portion of any Interest Group meetings with the RySG.

B. Quorum

If 25% or more of the total number of all Active Members is present at a meeting, quorum has been attained and the meeting shall proceed. If a quorum is not attained, the meeting shall be adjourned. Whenever a vote is taken, Active Members not present at the meeting (or not voting) may vote by email for a period not to exceed seven days following the meeting (an "Extended Meeting"). At the end of the Extended Meeting, if the total number of Active Members voting (including recorded abstentions) on any matter is less than 50% of the total number of all Active Members, then the vote shall not be valid.

C. Record of Meetings

Minutes of all meetings shall be kept in electronic form or audio form, or both, if feasible, and copies of the minutes (if available) shall be sent to the membership as soon as conveniently possible after each meeting. Private deliberations and conversations need not be recorded.

The Secretariat shall publish on the RySG website a list of all active and inactive Working Groups, Committees and Interest Groups and their minutes, action points, decisions, resolutions and final work products within a reasonable period of time after any given meeting.

D. Record Retention

All records that the ICANN Board asks GNSO structures to maintain must be retained by the RySG for at least a four-year period to ensure that a full three-year record is available for each renewal or reconfirmation period.

VII. Communications

A. Notices

All notices shall be sent to the RySG email list.

B. Mailing List

The RySG shall have a mailing list that is limited to delegates of Members and Observers of the RySG. By vote of the RySG in any given case, the mailing list may be opened to Members of the public. The RySG may have reserved lists if needed. Delegates will be automatically enrolled on the RySG email list but may opt out by notifying the Secretariat. Delegates must make reasonable efforts to notify the Secretariat of any email changes. A list of delegates subscribed to the RySG e-mail list and their Member affiliations will be published by the Secretariat from time to time.

C. Publication

The outcome of all RySG policy decisions shall be open and publicly archived, with posting rights limited to Members unless otherwise determined by vote of the RySG. RySG business, work products, finance and accounts, and submissions to Staff and other ICANN entities shall be made available to the entire RySG membership unless there are valid grounds for restricting distribution as determined by vote of the RySG.

D. Public Meetings

The RySG shall publish reports concerning what transpires at its public meetings (both regular and ad hoc). Prior notice shall be provided via a public calendar made available on the RySG web site. Meeting reports may take the form of MP3 files or other recordings, transcripts, minutes, summaries, or action item reports as determined by the RySG. At a minimum, every meeting report shall include attendance, an agenda of planned and actually discussed topics, and any decisions or actions items that stemmed from those discussions. If votes or consensus calls are taken at a meeting, the report shall indicate the outcomes as well as those meeting participants who offered positions. Individual records of specific votes cast or positions articulated are not required to be maintained unless so directed by the RySG.

E. Office Holders

The RySG shall publish on its website and maintain a list of all office holders, past and present, to inform Members and to provide transparency for term limits.

F. Website

The RySG shall maintain a website on which it publishes the information as required in this Charter. The address of that website shall be publicized and linked to the main GNSO website.

Information published on the website shall not include the mailing address, email address, physical address or telephone number of any person unless that person has given permission.

VIII. Elections

A. Nominating Procedure

Only an Active Member's authorized voting delegate (or alternate) may nominate a candidate for any RySG elected position. A different Active Member's authorized voting delegate (or alternate) must second the candidate within the publicized nominating period in order for that candidate to stand for election. The candidate must confirm their intention to run and offer a qualifications statement within the nominating period to be eligible to stand for election.

B. Officers

~~Elections of Officers shall be staggered, with the Treasurer and Vice Chair of Administration elected in odd-numbered years and the Chair and Vice Chair of Policy elected in even-numbered years. Elections shall be conducted in accordance with the voting procedures described in Article X below and in compliance with applicable provisions of the ICANN Bylaws then in effect, if any, including those relating to geographic diversity and eligibility.~~
Elections shall be conducted in accordance with the voting procedures described in Article X below and in compliance with applicable provisions of the ICANN Bylaws then in effect, if any, including those relating to geographic diversity and eligibility. Officer terms are covered in Section IV.

C. RySG Representatives to the GNSO Council

The RySG shall elect such number of representatives (the "RySG Representatives") to the GNSO Council as is set forth in the Bylaws of ICANN. Elections shall be conducted in accordance with the voting procedures described in Article X below and in compliance with all applicable provisions of the ICANN Bylaws then in effect, including those relating to geographic diversity and eligibility. In order to promote broad representational diversity in accordance with principles contained in the ICANN Bylaws, no more than one (1) of the elected RySG Representatives may come from the same geographic region as defined in the ICANN Bylaws.

Each RySG Representative shall be elected for a term of two years and shall hold office until his or her successor is elected or until he or she sooner dies, resigns, is removed, becomes disqualified, or if the Member that the RySG Representative represents is suspended or terminated. The Bylaws and Operating Procedures of the GNSO shall govern term limits and eligibility of RySG Representatives. No person may serve as a RySG Representative and as an Officer of the RySG at the same time.

RySG Representative terms shall begin and end at the end of an annual ICANN meeting. No more than two terms shall end in the same year. Any vacancy occurring in a RySG Representative position shall be filled by election in accordance with this Article and Article X below, and the term of the RySG Representative elected to fill a vacancy shall be for the remainder of the original

term. In the case of an election for an expiring term, the election process must be initiated at least 90 days prior to the end of such term. If a vacancy occurs within such 90-day period, the RySG may elect a Temporary Alternate to complete the term.

As provided in the ICANN Bylaws, the RySG is allotted three seats on the GNSO Council; those seats will be elected as follows in accordance with the voting procedures in Article X:

1. In even numbered calendar years:

    a) One RySG Representative will be elected by a simple majority of all Active Members where each Member receives one vote (Simple Vote).

    b) A second RySG Representative will be elected by a simple majority of all Active Members using the RySG Weighted Voting Model.

    c) Which voting method is used first shall be determined at random.

2. In odd numbered calendar years:

    a) One RySG Representative will be elected by a simple majority of Active Members of both a Simple Vote and a Weighted Vote.

    b) In the event there are opposing majorities on the Simple and Weighted Votes for the third councilor, the following will occur:

        1) A group of at least three and no more than five volunteers will form a working group and make every effort to identify a candidate that both the Simple Vote and Weighted Vote will support.

        2) While this search continues the outgoing RySG Representative will continue to present his or her vote in the GNSO Council on behalf of the RySG pursuant to Article X.

        3) The search will be limited to 10 calendar days. If after that time there is no agreement between the Simple and Weighted Vote on a new candidate, which shall be determined in a new vote, then the conflicting majorities will be resolved through the regular mechanism where the Simple and Weighted Vote are in conflict, i.e., the Weighted Vote shall prevail. However, the opposition of the Simple Vote will be noted and recorded in the RySG public record.

The RySG shall communicate the results of elections of RySG Representatives to the GNSO Council and to its Members.

D. Other RySG Positions

Elections of persons to hold other positions established by ICANN Bylaws, including, without limitation, RySG representatives to the ICANN Nominating Committee, shall be conducted from time to time as required by the applicable ICANN Bylaws. Elections shall be conducted in accordance with the voting procedures described in Article XI below and in compliance with all applicable provisions of the ICANN Bylaws then in effect, including those relating to geographic diversity and eligibility.

IX. GNSO Council Representative Responsibilities

A. Responsibilities

Each RySG Representative is responsible for communicating to the GNSO Council the full range of views of the Members of the RySG, including, but not limited to, RySG consensus positions.

If the RySG has not provided direction on a substantial issue, RySG Representatives shall either request deferral of the vote if possible or abstain from voting in the GNSO Council on that issue until direction is given by the RySG. In case of doubt whether an issue is substantial, each RySG Representative shall abstain from voting in the GNSO Council on that issue until direction is given by the RySG. In cases where a RySG position has not been formed or where there are minority positions, then an RySG Representative must state that and then share the minority positions as well as his or her own personal view (provided it is identified as such). The RySG Representative shall cast RySG votes as determined by the RySG if a vote has been taken. Article X, Voting, includes a table that identifies how RySG representatives are required to vote on the GNSO Council under various conditions.

RySG Council Representatives are expected to make best efforts to attend all RySG meetings, Executive Committee meetings, and GNSO Council meetings. In cases where they miss a RySG or Executive Committee meeting, they are responsible for obtaining the essential information from that meeting in a timely manner. In cases where they are unable to participate in a GNSO Council meeting, they are required to follow the GNSO Operating Procedures to ensure that all efforts are made to ensure that the RySG is represented in all votes for which the RySG has stated a position. Given the GNSO Council's size and the voting thresholds that have been defined, it is important that votes of the RySG be registered, through RySG elected representatives, on every substantial issue that comes before the Council for action.

Councilors are expected to:

- Actively participate in the regular affairs of the GNSO Council including, *inter alia*, attending its scheduled meetings, staying abreast of the technical and administrative agenda, engaging in relevant email and live discussions, reading minutes, evaluating reports, listening to meeting recordings (in the event of absence), asking questions that foster learning, voting responsibly on all matters before the Council, and periodically reviewing the performance of the Chair and Vice-Chairs.

- Request and receive sufficient information, including support from the RySG in order to carry out their responsibilities. When a problem manifests itself or some issue does not make sense, a Councilor has a duty to inquire into the surrounding facts and circumstances and seek guidance.

B. Councilor Absences

1. Planned:

a) If a GNSO Council member anticipates being unable to a regularly-scheduled GNSO Council meeting, the Councilor shall ensure that one of the applicable remedies in the GNSO Operating Procedures are followed so that the RySG does not lose a vote in any actions before the Council.

b) If a GNSO Council member anticipates being unable to attend two or more regularly-scheduled GNSO Council meetings consecutively, the Councilor shall notify the RySG and the GNSO Secretariat that a "Leave of Absence" is being requested and ensure that a remedy described in GNSO Operating Procedures is followed.

2. Unplanned:

When a GNSO Council member fails to attend two regularly-scheduled GNSO Council meetings consecutively without prior notification to the GNSO Secretariat, the GNSO Secretariat will advise the RySG that the Councilor has satisfied the conditions for an effective "Leave of Absence" at which time the remedy described in the GNSO Operating Procedures is available.

X.   Voting

A. Consensus and Voting

In general, the RySG should operate using a consensus approach. Every effort should be made to arrive at decisions that most or all of the Members are willing to support. Voting should be used only in one or more of the following circumstances:

1. Reasonable effort has been made to reach consensus and there is agreement that it will not be possible to reach consensus in required timeframes.

2. An official vote is needed for the purposes of an election, action on a motion or determination of the level of support for a RySG position.

Whenever an election is to be held or a vote is to be taken on a RySG position, motion, Charter amendment or any other subject matter requiring a vote pursuant to this Charter, RySG voting will occur as follows except as noted elsewhere in this Charter for the election of GNSO Councilors:

1. There will first be a vote of all Active Members with each Member receiving one vote (**Simple Vote**). Except under urgent circumstances, a period not to exceed four calendar days will be allowed for email voting.

2. Immediately after the Simple Vote, any Active Member may request alternate voting procedures (**Weighted Vote**1[1]). Furthermore, the Chair, with general concurrence of the membership, may grant a period of time not to exceed four calendar days in which Members may request a Weighted Vote.

---

[1] *Note that a Weighted Vote is not an option in the case of a vote for the GNSO Council seat that requires a Simple Vote.*

3. If no Member objects to the results of Simple Voting, then the Simple Vote will be used as applicable.

4. If any Member requests a Weighted Vote, the Simple Vote will not be used and a Weighted Vote will occur as defined below.

B. Weighted Vote Procedures

~~A Weighted Vote shall involve counting of votes in the following two ways, computing an average, and the result will be applied using the voting thresholds defined below: (1) one vote per member (Simple Vote); (2) one vote using Weighted Voting as defined in the following table.~~

~~Using data from the previous calendar year or such other period as the RySG may decide, each member will be assigned votes by taking the average of assigned values using the table below where voting tiers are defined both by 1) total number of domain names registered at the end of the period and 2) the total amount of ICANN fees paid (registrations and fees are aggregated to include all TLDs represented by the member pursuant to Section II.A. above).~~	~~Assigned Value~~	
~~Voting Tiers~~		
~~1~~	~~24,999~~	~~1~~
~~25,000~~	~~49,999~~	~~3~~
~~50,000~~	~~99,999~~	~~10~~
~~100,000~~	~~499,000~~	~~30~~
~~500,000~~	~~999,999~~	~~35~~
~~1,000,000~~	~~1,999,999~~	~~40~~
~~2,000,000~~	~~4,999,999~~	~~45~~
~~5,000,000~~	~~9,999,999~~	~~50~~
~~10,000,000~~	~~Unlimited~~	~~60~~

The number of a Weighted Vote for each Member shall be determined by referring to the chart below for two separate numbers. First, a number shall be determined according to the quantity of that Member's domain names as set forth in the chart below, and second, a number shall be determined according to the total amount of that Member's annual ICANN fees paid as set forth in the chart below. An average of the two numbers will then be determined, and this will be the number of votes for that Member in a Weighted Vote.

Voting tiers shall be determined by using data from the previous calendar year or such other period as the RySG may decide (registrations and fees are aggregated to include all TLDs represented by the Member pursuant to Paragraph II.A. above).

Voting Tiers

Number of Registrations or	Number of Member Votes	Number of Votes for

Amount of ICANN Fees	(non-Association)	Association Member[2]
< 10K	1	1
≥10K & <50K	5	5
≥50K & <100K	10	10
≥100K & <500K	15	15
≥500K & <1M	20	20
≥1M & <3M	25	25
≥3M & <5M	30	30
≥5M & <10M	40	40
≥10M	50	50

Non-Association Member Example:

If Registry A had 55,000 domain name registrations under management at the end of the previous calendar year and paid ICANN fees in the total amount of $~~40,000~~110,000 for that year: 1) Registry A would be in the third voting tier for number of names registered (resulting in an assigned value of 10) and in the ~~second~~ fourth voting tier for amount of fees paid (resulting in an assigned value of ~~3~~15); 2) the average of 10 and ~~3~~15 is ~~6.5~~12.5 so Registry A would receive ~~6~~12.5 votes under the Weighted Vote procedure.

Association Member Example:

If the largest association member organization of Association Member X that is not a Member (Voting or Observer) of the RySG has 60,000 domain name registrations and pays $30,000 in fees to ICANN, then Association Member X would be in the ten-vote tier for registrations and the five-vote tier for fees, resulting in an average of (10+5)/2 = 15/2 = 7.5 weighted votes. Note that the number of votes for the association member would not be affected by any other factor except those of Association Member X; it would not matter how many total members the association had or how many registrations other members had or how many fees other association members paid.

C. Exceptions for Ten Largest Registries

The voting tiers set forth in the chart above are subject to revision to preserve a majority of voting rights for the "Ten Largest Registries," as determined by this paragraph. ~~For the sake of defining~~

---

[2] *Voting tier determined by the single association member with the highest registration count that is not otherwise a member (voting or observer) of the RySG.*

~~voting tiers as used in the table above, the~~ The "ten Largest Registries" are defined as the RySG Members that have the ten highest numbers when each Member's aggregated total number of domain names registered at the end of the period is averaged with the aggregated total amount of ICANN fees paid by that Member for the period. ==If, after this computation, or at any time in the future, for whatever reason, the Ten Largest Registries do not have (1) at least 50% of the total of the sum of the averaged numbers for all Members and (2) more than 50% of allocated votes, then the ranked voting weights shall be adjusted so that the Ten Largest Registries have a majority of the voting rights.== ~~In the event that, whether by the addition of registries, consolidation of registries, change of fees or any other reason, the Ten Largest Registries have at least 50% of the total RySG registrations but less than 50% of allocated votes, then the ranked voting weights shall be adjusted so that the ten Largest Registries again have a majority of the voting rights.~~

D. Voting Thresholds

1. Election of RySG Officers and RySG motions not otherwise covered below: a simple majority of Active Member Simple Vote; if necessary, a simple majority of both the Simple and Weighted votes

2. Council Representative S: simple majority of Active Member Simple Vote

3. Council Representative R: simple majority of Active Member Weighted Vote

4. Council Representative C: simple majority of Active Members of both Simple Vote and Weighted Vote (aka, Special Vote). If a vote does not result in one person receiving a simple majority of Active Member votes using both a Simple Vote and a Weighted Vote, then a special meeting should be held where all interested parties cooperatively work together to develop a solution for resolving the election. If after reasonable efforts it does not seem possible to resolve the election, then the seat will be filled as follows:

If a candidate receives a supermajority of a Weighted Vote, that candidate will be elected.

If no candidate receives a supermajority of a Weighted Vote and a candidate receives at least 75% of a Simple Vote, then the latter candidate will be elected.

If no candidate receives a supermajority of a Weighted Vote or at least 75% of a Simple Vote, then the candidate receiving a simple majority Weighted Vote will be elected.

1. Supermajority: 2/3 of Active Members

2. RySG Supermajority policy statements: 2/3 of Active Members of both the Simple and Weighted votes (Note: this is for reporting purposes only.)

3. RySG Simple majority policy statements: simple majority of Active Members of both the Simple and Weighted votes

4. Partial policy statements:

   a) At least a simple majority of Active Member Simple Vote but not Weighted Vote.

   b) At least a simple majority of Weighted Vote but not Simple Vote

The following table summarizes how RySG Representatives are required to vote on the GNSO Council in response to the following conditions:

Vote Type and Results	Rep S	Rep R	Rep C
Simple vote in favor	Yes	Yes	Yes
Simple vote opposed	No	No	No
Special RySG Supermajority	Yes	Yes	Yes
Special RySG Simple Majority	Yes	Yes	Yes
Special: Majority of Simple but Weighted Opposed	Yes	No	No
Special: Majority of Weighted but Simple Opposed	No	Yes	Yes
No RySG Direction	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain

XI.   Finances

A. Members

Each Member shall pay (a) an initial membership fee upon joining the RySG, (b) a fixed annual membership fee, and (c) a variable annual membership fee according to a budget adopted by vote of the RySG no less frequently than on an annual basis. A Member joining after the beginning of a year shall pay a prorated portion of the annual fees.

An Association Member will pay the fee associated with the next highest tier; the fee tier will also be determined by the single association member organization with the largest number of registrations that is not otherwise a Member (Voting or Observer) of the RySG. In the event that an Association Member enters the top tier, a new payment tier will be introduced. The initial one-time fee, annual fixed fee and voting under the simple voting scheme would all be identical for non-association Members and Association Members. Based on the 2015 RySG budget and current tiers, the following payment structure would exist for non-association vs. Association Members:

# of Registrations	RySG Member Fee	Association Member Fee[3]
0 - 9,999	$500	$1,000
10,000 - 49,999	$1,000	$1,500

3 Fee tier determined by the single association member with the highest registration count that is not otherwise a member (voting or observer) of the RySG.

50,000 - 99,999	$1,500	$2,000
100,000 - 499,999	$2,000	$2,500
500,000 - 999,999	$2,500	$3,000
1,000,000 - 2,999,999	$3,000	$3,750
3,000,000 - 4,999,999	$3,750	$5,000
5,000,000 - 9,999,999	$5,000	$6,500
10,000,000 - 19,999,999	$6,500	$7,000
20,000,000 and greater	$7,000	$10,000

B. Records

The RySG shall maintain detailed records of funds received and disbursed on a calendar basis according to generally accepted accounting principles. That financial information shall be reported in a general way on the RySG web site (e.g., charts or tables as determined by the RySG) and updated at least annually. Specific requests for detailed financial information will be made available on a case by case basis to the ICANN Board or RySG members under appropriate nondisclosure terms.

XII. Amendments to Charter

The RySG may from time to time amend this Charter by vote as provided in Article X. Document change controls shall be used in circulating proposed amendments.

XIII. Transition Provisions

For the purposes of determining eligibility for election when this Charter takes effect, those Officers, RySG Representatives and any other persons holding positions established by ICANN Bylaws then holding office, who have not previously been subject to term limits, shall be deemed to be in their first terms in office.

Staff Report of Public Comment Proceeding

TITLE:	Charter Amendments of the GNSO gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group

Publication Date:	14 April 2016
Prepared By:	Robert Hoggarth

Public Comment Proceeding		**Important Information Links**
Open Date:	22 February 2016	Announcement
Close Date:	4 April 2016	Public Comment Proceeding
Staff Report Due Date:	19 April 2016	View Comments Submitted

Staff Contact:	Robert Hoggarth	**Email:**	robert.hoggarth@icann.org

Section I: General Overview and Next Steps

In November 2015, the gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG) of the GNSO submitted a set of Charter revisions to the ICANN Staff for processing in compliance with Phase I of the Process For Amending GNSO Stakeholder Group and Constituency Charters.

In sum, the RySG has amended its existing Charter to address a number of items – including those flagged by the ICANN Board in its ICANN54 Dublin Public Meeting resolution approving the last recent set of RySG Charter amendments (see - Board Resolution 2015.10.22.14). Among them, the most substantial charter amendments proposed by the RySG at this time are in the following areas:

- Creation of a new class of "Association" members;

- Changes to the weighted voting categories and measures of the group; and

- Adjustments to the community fee structure to accommodate the addition of association members.

As part of its Phase II Board Process responsibilities, ICANN staff assessed the amendments and determined that the proposals do not present any direct fiscal or liability concerns to the ICANN organization.

The ICANN Bylaws provide that "each GNSO Stakeholder Group … and each of its associated Constituencies shall maintain recognition with the ICANN Board." To assist with its own review and analysis of the amendments, the Board's Organizational Effectiveness Committee (OEC) subsequently directed Staff to open a Public Comment Forum to solicit community input concerning the RySG Charter amendments.

The public comment forum was opened on 22 February 2016. The period for public comments closed on 4 April 2016.

Next Steps:

This report will be forwarded to the OEC, which will provide a recommendation to the Board concerning the RySG Charter amendments. This report will also be published for the community's

review at the above link (see Important Information Links). The OEC will have an opportunity to discuss the amendment documents and the report of community input at its next meeting.

Section II: Contributors

At the time this report was prepared, a total of one (1) community submission had been posted to the forum. The contributing party is identified in the table below.

Organizations and Groups:

Name	Submitted by	Initials
Brand Registry Group	Martin Sutton	BRG

Individuals:

Name	Affiliation (if provided)	Initials
None		

Section III: Summary of Comments

General Disclaimer: This section intends to summarize broadly and comprehensively the comments submitted to this public comment proceeding but does not address every specific position stated by each contributor. The preparer recommends that readers interested in specific aspects of any of the summarized comments, or the full context of others, refer directly to the specific contributions at the link referenced above (View Comments Submitted).

As noted in Section II above, only one set of community comments was submitted regarding the RySG charter amendments. The BRG comments filed on 4 April 2016 generally addressed two of the three amendment areas proposed by the RySG. This brief summary addresses each topic in turn.

Overall BRG Comments:

The BRG notes that is has been an active participant in the RySG Evolution Working Group "to help the RySG identify suitable changes to their Charter that would support broader engagement from the growing community of registries, but in an orderly, inclusive and scaleable form." The BRG says that it "supports the proposed Charter amendments which will help to manage the RySG's growing membership and the diversity of views this may bring."

The BRG says it "encourages the ICANN Board to approve the proposed changes to the Charter and recommends a timely review of the revised voting allocation and process."

Support for creation of a new class of "Association" members:

The BRG notes that it has been an advocate for the Association Membership model. It anticipates that other types of registries, such as GEO TLDs, will also support and benefit from this approach."

In its comments the BRG notes the unique place that brand registries hold within the registry community. The group states that while BRG members "favour representation within the ICANN community to safeguard their interests, it is not always possible to maintain active and direct participation within stakeholder groups or constituencies." For these registry operators, the BRG says,

"the option of an Association Membership model offers a more effective channel without the need to devote significant resources. This model already exists in other constituencies but up until now, was unavailable within the RySG." The BRG says it "welcomes the introduction of the Association Membership, which will support broader engagement but in an orderly and scaleable form."

Changes to the weighted voting categories and measures of the group:

The BRG notes, "the introduction of new membership criteria has raised significant challenges for the RySG, particularly in relation to voting rights. According to BRG, with the RySG having relatively few members prior to the new gTLD 2012 round, "decisions were frequently made through consensus or simple majority voting rather than calling upon the weighted voting mechanism." Now, as new members join the stakeholder group with very different registry models and more diverse views, the BRG says, the "weighted voting mechanism is far more likely to come into play and could disadvantage new entrants, especially where the business objective is not dependent upon significant volumes of second-level domains."

The BRG says, "the aspects of voting have been debated at length within the RySG Evolution WG and the wider RySG membership." Based on these discussions, the BRG says it "considers the proposed voting allocations and process to be a reasonable initial approach and supports these changes."

However, in view of the increasing diversity introduced to the RySG membership, the BRG asserts that "these new processes will need to be tested and reviewed to ensure that member vote allocations and voting processes work effectively in practice and fairly for all RySG members. For this reason, the BRG recommends a review [be] … undertaken "within a reasonable time frame."

Section IV: Analysis of Comments

General Disclaimer: *This section intends to provide an analysis and evaluation of the comments submitted along with explanations regarding the basis for any recommendations provided within the analysis.*

Only one comment was submitted in this proceeding – by a group (BRG) that has already been an active participant in the stakeholder group's amendment development process. That one comment was supportive of the amendments. No opposition to the amendments has been recorded.

The BRG suggests that the new voting processes established by the latest RySG amendments should be "tested and reviewed … within a reasonable time frame" to ensure that member vote allocations and voting processes work effectively. If the Board chooses to approve these amendments (and there is no stated view in opposition), the staff is prepared to collaborate with the RySG to provide the Board with a review of the success of the new processes after reasonable opportunity has existed to observe and measure any of those changes and impacts.

TITLE: **Conduct at ICANN Meetings**

Document/Background Links

The following attachments are relevant to the Board's consideration of the proposed revised Expected Standards of Behavior and retention of an expert, as appropriate, with experience in drafting and implementing relevant anti-harassment policies to assist in the development of a Community anti-harassment policy/procedure to be followed at ICANN Public meetings:

- Attachment 1 is the proposed revised Expected Standards of Behavior.
- Attachment 2 is the GNSO letter dated 25 April 2016 entitled "Conduct at ICANN Meetings."
- Attachment 3 is an email sent from David Olive to Community Leaders summarizing direction thus far entitled "Conduct at ICANN Meetings"

Submitted by: Amy A. Stathos, Deputy General Counsel

Date Noted: 6 May 2016

Email: amy.stathos@icann.org

ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior

(Adopted on May 6, 2012)

Those who take part in ICANN multi-stakeholder process, including Board, staff and all those involved in Supporting Organization and Advisory Committee councils, undertake to:

- **Act** in accordance with ICANN's Bylaws. In particular, participants undertake to act within the mission of ICANN and in the spirit of the values contained in the Bylaws.

- **Adhere** to ICANN's conflict of interest policies.

- **Treat** all members of the ICANN community equally, irrespective of nationality, gender, racial or ethnic origin, religion or beliefs, disability, age, or sexual orientation; members of the ICANN community should treat each other with civility both face-to-face and online.

- **Respect** all members of the ICANN community equally and behave according to professional standards and demonstrate appropriate behavior. ICANN strives to create and maintain an environment in which people of many different backgrounds and cultures are treated with dignity, decency, and respect. Specifically, participants in the ICANN process must not engage in any type of harassment. Generally, harassment is considered unwelcome hostile or intimidating behavior -- in particular, speech or behavior that is sexually aggressive or intimidates based on attributes such as race, gender, ethnicity, religion, age, color, national origin, ancestry, disability or medical condition, sexual orientation, or gender identity.

- **Act** in a reasonable, objective and informed manner when participating in policy development and decision-making processes. This includes regularly attending all scheduled meetings and exercising independent judgment based solely on what is in the overall best interest of Internet users and the stability and security of the Internet's system of unique identifiers, irrespective of personal interests and the interests of the entity to which an individual might owe their appointment.

- **Listen** to the views of all stakeholders when considering policy issues. ICANN is a unique multi-stakeholder environment. Those who take part in the ICANN process must acknowledge the importance of all stakeholders and seek to understand their points of view.

- **Work** to build consensus with other stakeholders in order to find solutions to the issues that fall within the areas of ICANN's responsibility.

The ICANN model is based on a bottom-up, consensus driven approach to policy development. Those who take part in the ICANN process must take responsibility for ensuring the success of the model by trying to build consensus with other participants.

- **Facilitate** transparency and openness when participating in policy development and decision-making processes.

- **Support** the maintenance of robust mechanisms for public input, accountability, and transparency so as to ensure that policy development and decision-making processes will reflect the public interest and be accountable to all stakeholders.

- **Conduct** themselves in accordance with ICANN policies.

- **Protect** the organization's assets and ensure their efficient and effective use.

- **Act** fairly and in good faith with other participants in the ICANN process.

- **Promote** ethical and responsible behavior. Ethics and integrity are essential, and ICANN expects all stakeholders to behave in a responsible and principled way.

2

ICANN | GNSO
Generic Names Supporting Organization

25 April 2016

Conduct at ICANN Meetings

To: Mr. Akram Atallah
Interim CEO and President, Global Domains Division, ICANN

Dear Akram,

On behalf of the GNSO Council, we would like to thank you for your recent blog post ("Conduct at ICANN Meetings"). Members of the Council, and all of the GNSO Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies, share the goal of ensuring that all ICANN community members are able to participate and contribute within an environment that does not tolerate discrimination and that remains free of harassment. Without passing judgment on any specific incident, we are encouraged by the commitment from Staff and the Board to engage the community on this subject. When considering a policy to address this area, we respectfully ask for consideration regarding these key questions:

- Would a policy enhance the current 'Expected Standards of Behavior' or remain independent?
- How will reporting procedures be defined and who will be included in the reporting structure i.e. ICANN Staff, Office of the Ombudsman, or other entity?
- What mechanism will be in place to enforce the policy and protect those involved in known incidents?
- Given ICANN's rather unique, open, volunteer, multi-stakeholder character as an institution, would it be useful to consider how other comparable organizations (such as the IETF) have dealt with reporting and enforcement?

We call upon the GNSO community to engage and participate, as we anticipate additional topics and questions will arise from these efforts. It is worth noting that other community groups have begun work in this area (for example, the recent Statement issued by the NCUC Executive Committee). We urge ICANN staff to incorporate these initial questions during the commencement of this exercise. We all agree that a new policy must ensure a healthy environment for all.

Thank you.

Donna Austin, GNSO Vice-Chair
James Bladel, GNSO Chair
Heather Forrest, GNSO Vice-Chair

Attachment 3

From: David Olive <david.olive@icann.org>
Subject: Conduct at ICANN Meetings
Date: May 4, 2016 at 6:47:39 AM PDT
To: Contact Information Redacted

Cc: Amy Stathos <amy.stathos@icann.org>, Duncan Burns
<duncan.burns@icann.org>, Mary Wong <mary.wong@icann.org>

Dear Community Leaders:

Thank you for continuing to provide ICANN with your and your respective group's
(SO/AC/SG/Constituency/RALO) input concerning the appropriate approach for
ICANN's development of standards, policies and processes regarding allegations of
harassment at future ICANN meetings. It would seem that most community groups
prefer the third option that I had suggested following our last call on 12 April, i.e.:

*"Do not convene a formal group, but leave it to each community
(SO/AC/SG/Constituency/RALO) and individual participants to provide suggestions to,
and comment on possible recommendations from, the Board as a result of further
Board discussions and expert consultations on the topic."*

The Business Constituency (BC), in supporting this option, nevertheless suggested
refining it such that the process will be for ICANN staff, in consultation with experts,
to draft recommendations that are posted for public comments. Following a review
of public comments received, the proposal will be sent to the Board for its approval.

If there are no objections, ICANN will proceed along the lines of the third option as
refined by the BC. We will also inform the Board that this is the community's
preference.

A number of specific exemplars that can be looked at by ICANN in drafting the proposal has been provided by various Community leaders and members, either as part of group calls on the topic or individually. These include:

- The Ada Initiative: https://adainitiative.org/continue-our-work/ada-initiative-event-anti-harassment-policy/
- The IETF (Internet Engineering Task Force): https://www.ietf.org/iesg/statement/ietf-anti-harassment-policy.html
- The Internet Governance Forum: http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/aboutigf/igf-code-of-conduct
- The NTEN (Nonprofit Technology Network) : http://www.nten.org/ntc/about-the-ntc/code-of-conduct/
- RIPE (Réseaux IP Européens): https://ripe72.ripe.net/on-site/code-of-conduct/
- The United Nations and its specialized agencies' anti-harassment staff policies (some of these are collected here: http://www.ficsa.org/component/sobipro/?task=download.file&fid=37.1329&sid=1266&Itemid=0

In addition, the GNSO Chair and Vice Chairs sent a letter on behalf of the GNSO Council to Akram Atallah, our President and CEO, on 27 April 2016. The letter suggested a number of considerations to be taken into account in developing an anti-harassment policy and procedure for the Community. A copy of the letter can be viewed at: http://gnso.icann.org/en/correspondence/bladel-to-atallah-25apr16-en.pdf.

I expect that these, and other similar resources, will provide a starting point for ICANN to begin work on a draft proposal, for which we will seek expert advice as recommended by the Community, as well as Community input. The Board is expected to discuss this matter during its workshop in Amsterdam on 13-15 May 2016.

In addition, and in parallel, the Board is looking at enhancements to the language in ICANN's Expected Standards of Behavior, so as to ensure an overall awareness that ICANN does not condone harassment or other inappropriate conduct by or directed at members of the Community.

Thank you.

With best regards,

David

David A. Olive
Senior Vice President, Policy Development Support

General Manager, ICANN Regional Headquarters –Istanbul
Hakki Yeten Cad. Selenium Plaza No:10/C K:10 34349 Fulya, Besiktas, Istanbul
Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN)

Email: david.olive@icann.org
www.icann.org

Annex A

Input Tracking – GNSO PDP Recommendations on Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues

The purpose of this checklist is to assist the Board in assuring that all parties with an interest have had an opportunity to participate and weigh in on the recommendations arising out of the GNSO PDP, and to provide a summary of how those inputs were considered. This checklist should be included with the Board paper transmitting the policy recommendations to the Board for decision.

ISSUE: Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Policy Development Process

DATE OF COUNCIL APPROVAL: 21 January 2016

Public Comment[1]

Identify all documents submitted for public comment as part of the consideration of this issue and the dates of the public comment forums. Also identify the total number of commenters. Also note any open mic/forum sessions on the topic. Include link to the summary and analysis of public comments.[2] In the "outreach efforts" column, please identify the actions taken to publicize the comment period or meeting to encourage participation.

Comment Period Dates or Meeting Date	Dates opened / closed or Meeting Date	Number of commenters	Outreach Efforts
Publication of Preliminary Issue Report for public	12 December 2011	10	Broadly circulated, including announcement on

---

[1] This checklist is not intended as a replacement for full public comment summaries. Rather, this checklist is a supplement to the comment summarization work, to identify in a quick manner that key inputs were received and taken into consideration prior to the issue reaching the Board.

[2] Required public comment sessions upon presentation of the GNSO Recommendations to the Board will be tracked separately.

			ICANN website: https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2-2011-12-12-en
comments			
Public session at ICANN48	21 November 2013		Recording and transcripts of community discussion: http://archive.icann.org/meetings/buenosaires2013/en/schedule/thu-ppsa.html
Public session at ICANN49	27 March 2014		Recording and transcripts of community discussion: https://singapore49.icann.org/en/schedule/thu-ppsa
Public session at ICANN50	25 June 2014		Recording and transcripts of community discussion: https://london50.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-ppsai
Public session at ICANN51	15 October 2014		Recording and transcripts of community discussion: https://la51.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-ppsai
Public session at ICANN52	11 February 2015		Recording and transcripts of community discussion: https://singapore52.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-ppsai
Public session at ICANN53	24 June 2015		Recording and transcripts of community discussion: https://buenosaires53.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-ppsai
Publication of Initial Report for public	5 May – 21 July 2015	Over 11,000 individual	Broadly circulated, including

comments		submissions (many of which were based on an online template), an online petition signed by over 10,000 persons (many of whom also submitted additional comments) and over 150 specific responses to an online survey	announcement on ICANN website: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ppsai-initial-2015-05-05-en
Public session at ICANN54	21 October 2015		Recording and transcripts of community discussion: https://meetings.icann.org/en/dublin54/schedule/wed-ppsai
Publication of Final Recommendations subject to Board consideration	5 February – 16 March 2016	5	Broadly circulated, including announcement on ICANN website: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ppsai-recommendations-2016-02-05-en

Tracking of GNSO or Stakeholder Inputs

For each GNSO Stakeholder Group, Constituency or Advisory Committee identified below, identify if any input was received, and provide a brief summary of how those inputs were considered. The brief summary should include whether the stakeholder group at issue voiced any opposition to the items under consideration and whether any changes were recommended to the recommendations. Note: In some cases, certain Stakeholder Groups may make comments through component constituencies instead of through a collective statement of the Stakeholder Group. Only comments that are provided on behalf of one of the identified SGs or Constituencies should be recorded in this section.

Group	Requested	Received	Summary of Action on Input

GNSO Council	Yes	Yes	Final recommendations approved on 21 January 2016: http://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#201601
Registrar Stakeholder Group	Yes	No (individual members commented)	
Registry Stakeholder Group	Yes	No (individual members commented)	
Commercial Stakeholder Group	Yes	No (individual Constituencies commented)	
Business Constituency	Yes	Yes, in response to initial WG outreach, Initial Report and Final Report	WG reviewed and addressed relevant input received from this group
IPC Constituency	Yes	Yes, in response to initial WG outreach, Initial Report and Final Report	WG reviewed and addressed relevant input received from this group
ISP Constituency	Yes	Yes, in response to initial WG outreach and Initial Report	WG reviewed and addressed relevant input received from this group
Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group	Yes	Yes, in response to initial WG outreach and Initial Report	WG reviewed and addressed relevant input received from this group
Non-Commercial Users Constituency	Yes	No (individual members commented)	
Not for Profit Operational Concerns Constituency	Yes	No	

ccNSO	Yes	No	
ASO	Yes	No	
At-Large Advisory	Yes	Yes, in response to	WG reviewed and addressed relevant input received from this group

4

Committee		initial outreach and Initial Report	
Governmental Advisory Committee[3]	Yes	Yes, in response to the Initial Report via the Public Safety Working Group	WG reviewed and addressed relevant input received from this group
RSSAC	Yes	No	
SSAC	Yes	No	

Specific Outreach and Emerging Interests

If the working group or the GNSO Council performed any specific outreach to groups not identified above for advice or assistance on the issues under discussion, please identify the groups/entities consulted, the inputs received and how they were considered. In addition, if a definable group of collective interests emerge during a PDP and is not listed above, those collective inputs should be identified below. In the "outreach efforts" column, please identify the actions taken to identify key interested parties to encourage their participation. Also note if there are any groups identified as key that did not respond to outreach efforts.

Entity/Group	Outreach efforts	How inputs were considered
n/a	n/a	n/a

---

[3] Formal GAC advice to the Board will be tracked through the GAC Register of Advice.

5

Annex B

GNSO Council Recommendations Report to the Board regarding Adoption of the Final Recommendations from the Policy Development Process Working Group on Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues

1. Executive Summary

On 21 January 2016 the GNSO Council voted unanimously to approve all the recommendations contained in the Final Report from the GNSO Working Group that had been chartered to conduct a Policy Development Process (PDP) on privacy and proxy services accreditation issues. This Recommendations Report is being sent to the Board for its review of the PDP recommendations, which the GNSO Council recommends be adopted by the Board. All the final PDP recommendations received Full Consensus support from all the members of the Working Group (please see Annex A for a summary of all the approved recommendations).

The Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation issues (PPSAI) PDP Working Group had been chartered to "provide the GNSO Council with policy recommendations regarding the issues identified during the 2013 RAA negotiations, including recommendations made by law enforcement and GNSO working groups, that were not addressed during the 2013 RAA negotiations and otherwise suited for a PDP; specifically, issues relating to the accreditation of Privacy & Proxy Services." As part of its deliberations on this issue, the Working Group was tasked to consider, at a minimum, the issues outlined in the Staff Briefing Paper that had been published in September 2013 on the topic. These issues covered various aspects of a possible accreditation program for privacy and proxy services, including the relay and reveal of requests for customer contact information, requirements for the contactability and responsiveness of service providers to complaints of abuse, and the rights and responsibilities of privacy and proxy service customers.

1

The PDP Working Group published an Initial Report for public comment in May 2015. Following an extensive review of all the public comments received, the Working Group finalized its recommendations and completed its Final Report, which was submitted to the GNSO Council on 7 December 2015.

The policy recommendations, if approved by the Board, will impose obligations on contracted parties. The GNSO Council's unanimous vote in favor of these items exceeds the voting threshold required by Article X, Section 3.9.f of the ICANN Bylaws regarding the formation of consensus policies. Under the ICANN Bylaws, the Council's supermajority support for the PDP recommendations obligates the Board to adopt the recommendations unless, by a vote of more than two-thirds, the Board determines that the policy is not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN.

2. If a successful GNSO Vote was not reached, a clear statement of all positions held by Council members. Each statement should clearly indicate (i) the reasons underlying each position and (ii) the Constituency(ies) or Stakeholder Group(s) that held that position.
N/A

3. An analysis of how the issue(s) would affect each Constituency or Stakeholder Group, including any financial impact on the Constituency or Stakeholder Group.
Any policy recommendation regarding the accreditation of privacy and proxy service providers will affect a number of Constituencies and Stakeholder Groups, in particular, those that offer and those that are customers of privacy or proxy services. The Working Group included members from all the GNSO's Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies as well as the At Large Advisory Committee and several individuals. The GNSO's Constituencies and Stakeholder Groups were therefore adequately represented during the Working Group phase of the PDP.

4. An analysis of the period of time that would likely be necessary to implement the policy.

2

The creation of an accreditation program for privacy and proxy service providers and the implementation of all the recommendations from the PDP will take a substantial period of time due to the scale of the project and the fact that this will be the first time ICANN has implemented such a program for this industry sector. While the Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) may serve as a reference point for the program, the PDP Working Group's Final Report acknowledged that this may not be the most appropriate model for a number of reasons.

The 2013 RAA contains an interim specification relating to the offering of privacy and proxy services by ICANN-accredited registrars and their affiliates. This specification is due to expire either on 1 January 2017 or upon the launch of an accreditation program, whichever first occurs. ICANN staff believes that it will be necessary to extend the duration of the interim specification by at least 12-18 months to allow for a fully considered implementation of the PDP recommendations. This is due to the complexity of the recommendations and in light of ICANN's typical practice of providing contracted parties at least six months' notice to come into compliance with new policy requirements after policies are fully implemented. In accordance with the terms of the 2013 RAA, this extension of the duration of the interim Specification on Privacy and Proxy Registrations will have to be agreed upon by ICANN and the Registrar Stakeholder Group.

5. The advice of any outside advisors relied upon, which should be accompanied by a detailed statement of the advisor's (i) qualifications and relevant experience; and (ii) potential conflicts of interest.
No outside advisor provided input to the Working Group.

6. The Final Report submitted to the GNSO Council
The Final Report of the Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues PDP Working Group was submitted to the GNSO Council on 8 December 2015 and can be found here in full: Final Report.

Translations of the Final Report have been requested in all the other official languages of the United Nations as well as in Portuguese.

7. A copy of the minutes of the Council deliberation on the policy issue, including all opinions expressed during such deliberation, accompanied by a description of who expressed such opinions.

Please refer to the GNSO Council's resolution adopting the final recommendations from the PDP Working Group at http://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#201601 as well as the transcript and minutes from that Council meeting, at http://gnso.icann.org/en/meetings/transcript-council-21jan16-en.pdf and http://gnso.icann.org/en/meetings/minutes-council-21jan16-en.htm respectively.

8. Consultations undertaken

External

As mandated by the GNSO's PDP Manual, the Working Group reached out shortly after its initiation to ICANN's Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees as well as the GNSO's Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies to seek their input on the Charter questions. See https://community.icann.org/x/SRzRAg for all the responses received (these were from the Business Constituency, the Intellectual Property Constituency, the Internet Service Providers & Connectivity Providers Constituency, the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group and the At Large Advisory Committee).

Also in line with the PDP Manual, the Working Group's Initial Report was published for public comment following its release on 5 May 2015 (see: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ppsai-initial-2015-05-05-en). All the public comments received were compiled into a uniform Public Comment Review Tool and reviewed by the Working Group (see https://community.icann.org/x/KIFCAw). Due to the unusually large volume of comments received (including over 11,000 public comments and almost 150 survey responses), the Working Group created four Sub Teams to review the comments, and extended its timeline to ensure that it could carefully and thoroughly consider all the input received.

In addition, the Working Group held two face-to-face meetings immediately prior to the ICANN meetings in Los Angeles (on 10 October 2014) and Dublin (on 16 October 2015). It also conducted open community sessions during all ICANN

meetings held between the launch of the Working Group and the completion of its Final Report. Transcripts, documents and recordings from the two Working Group face-to-face meetings can be found here: https://community.icann.org/x/AiHxAg (Los Angeles) and https://community.icann.org/x/uaxYAw (Dublin). Transcripts and recordings of all Working Group meetings can be found on the Working Group wiki space at: https://community.icann.org/x/9iCfAg.

Internal

Regular updates were provided to the PDP Working Group by ICANN's Contractual Compliance and Registrar Services teams. Some of these team members attended Working Group calls on a regular basis and joined the Group for their two face-to-face meetings. The implementation advice and overall feedback provided by these staff members was very helpful in facilitating consensus formation among the Working Group, especially in relation to questions regarding the workings of the registrar accreditation process, ICANN's practice in handling complaints from registrants, and possible implementation considerations.

9. Summary and analysis of Public Comment Forum to provide input on the Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues PDP Recommendations, as adopted by the GNSO Council prior to ICANN Board consideration.

A public comment forum was opened on 5 February 2016 to solicit feedback on the recommendations prior to ICANN Board consideration:

https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ppsai-recommendations-2016-02-05-en.

Following the close of the public comment period on 16 March 2016, a Report of Public Comments will be prepared and published.

10. Impact/implementation considerations from ICANN staff

Implementation of the final recommendations from the PPSAI PDP Working Group will require significant ICANN staff resources. Implementation of this accreditation program will likely include, at a minimum, the development of privacy/proxy accreditation application, screening, data escrow, contracting, and Contractual Compliance procedures and requirements. Implementation will also require resolution of complicated practical issues related to Working Group recommendations

5

surrounding Whois disclosure; the transfer of privacy/proxy-registered domains between accredited privacy/proxy services and ICANN-accredited registrars; and de-accreditation of privacy and/or proxy services.

The interim RAA Specification on Privacy and Proxy Registrations, which will expire when this accreditation program goes into effect (provided the Specification is extended as noted in Section 4, above) links all of its requirements to registrar contractual obligations. Though some policy requirements to such obligations will be added during this implementation, Staff expects that most privacy and proxy services will continue to be affiliated with ICANN-accredited registrars (meaning, they share common ownership and management) following the implementation of this accreditation program. As a result, Staff expects that these relationships could continue much as they do today after the new accreditation program is implemented, albeit with new policy requirements.

However, the WG directed that access to privacy/proxy accreditation should not be limited to entities that are affiliated with ICANN-accredited registrars. As a result, implementation may require the creation of a beginning-to-end accreditation program for entities who do not currently have either a direct or indirect relationship with ICANN. This element of the accreditation program will be more complicated to implement and operate.

Annex A: Final Recommendations from the Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues PDP WG (extracted from the Executive Summary of the Final Report)

The WG has reached **FULL CONSENSUS** on all the following recommendations:

I. DEFINITIONS:

1. The WG recommends the adoption of the following definitions, to avoid ambiguities surrounding the common use of certain words in the WHOIS context. The WG recommends that these recommendations be used uniformly by ICANN, including generally in relation to WHOIS beyond privacy and proxy service issues:

   - *"Privacy Service"* means a service by which a Registered Name is registered to its beneficial user as the Registered Name Holder, but for which alternative, reliable contact information is provided by the privacy or proxy service provider for display of the Registered Name Holder's contact information in the Registration Data Service (WHOIS) or equivalent services[1].
   - *"Proxy Service"* is a service through which a Registered Name Holder licenses use of a Registered Name to the privacy or proxy customer in order to provide the privacy or proxy customer use of the domain name, and the Registered Name Holder's contact information is displayed in the Registration Data Service (WHOIS) or equivalent services rather than the customer's contact information.

---

[1] The definitions of Privacy Service and Proxy Service reflect those in the 2013 RAA. In this context, the 2013 RAA also defines "Registered Name" as a domain name within the domain of a gTLD, about which a gTLD Registry Operator (or an Affiliate or subcontractor thereof engaged in providing Registry Services) maintains data in a Registry Database, arranges for such maintenance, or derives revenue from such maintenance, and "Registered Name Holder" is defined as the holder of a Registered Name.

NOTE: In relation to the definitions of a Privacy Service and a Proxy Service, the WG makes the following additional recommendation:

- o Registrars are not to knowingly[2] accept registrations from privacy or proxy service providers who are not accredited through the process developed by ICANN. For non-accredited entities registering names on behalf of third parties, the WG notes that the obligations for Registered Name Holders as outlined in section 3.7.7 of the 2013 RAA would apply[3].

- *"Affiliate"*, when used in this Final Report in the context of the relationship between a privacy or proxy service provider and an ICANN-accredited registrar, means a privacy or proxy service provider that is Affiliated with such a registrar, in the sense that word is used in the 2013 RAA. Section 1.3 of the 2013 RAA defines an "Affiliate" as a person or entity that, directly or indirectly, through one or more intermediaries, controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with, the person or entity specified.
- *"Publication"* means the reveal[4] of a person's (i.e. the licensee or beneficial owner of a registered domain name) identity/contact details in the WHOIS system.
- *"Disclosure"* means the reveal of a person's (i.e. the licensee or beneficial owner of a registered domain name) identity/contact details to a third party Requester without Publication in the WHOIS system.

---

[2] In this context, "knowingly" refers to actual knowledge at the time that the registration is submitted to the registrar. As implementation guidance, this knowledge would normally be obtained through a report to the registrar from ICANN or a third party.

[3] Section 3.7.7.3 of the 2013 RAA reads as follows: "Any Registered Name Holder that intends to license use of a domain name to a third party is nonetheless the Registered Name Holder of record and is responsible for providing its own full contact information and for providing and updating accurate technical and administrative contact information adequate to facilitate timely resolution of any problems that arise in connection with the Registered Name."

[4] As the single word "reveal" has been used in the WHOIS context to describe the two distinct actions that the WG has defined as "Disclosure" and "Publication", the WG is using "reveal" within its definitions as part of a more exact description, to clarify which of the two meanings would apply in any specific instance. The rest of this Initial Report generally uses the terms "Disclosure" and "Publication" to refer to the relevant specific aspect of a "reveal".

8

- The term *"person"* as used in these definitions is understood to include natural and legal persons, as well as organizations and entities.
- *"Law enforcement authority"* means law enforcement, consumer protection, quasi-governmental or other similar authorities designated from time to time by the national or territorial government of the jurisdiction in which the privacy or proxy service provider is established or maintains a physical office. This definition is based on Section 3.18.2 of the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement, which provision spells out a registrar's obligation to maintain a point of contact for, and to review reports received from, law enforcement authorities[5]; as such, the WG notes that its recommendation for a definition of "law enforcement authority" in the context of privacy and proxy service accreditation should also be updated to the extent that, and if and when, the corresponding definition in the RAA is modified.
- *"Relay"*, when used in the context of a request to a privacy or proxy service provider from a Requester, means to forward the request to, or otherwise notify, the privacy or proxy service customer that a Requester is attempting to contact the customer.
- *"Requester"*, when used in the context of Relay, Disclosure or Publication, including in the Illustrative Disclosure Framework described in Annex B, means an individual, organization or entity (or its authorized representatives) that requests from a privacy or proxy service provider either a Relay, or Disclosure or Publication of the identity or contact details of a customer, as the case may be.

II. NO DISTINCTION IN TREATMENT; WHOIS LABELING REQUIREMENTS; VALIDATION & VERIFICATION OF CUSTOMER DATA:

2. Privacy and proxy services ("P/P services") are to be treated the same way for the purpose of the accreditation process.

---

[5] See https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/approved-with-specs-2013-09-17-en.

3. The status of a registrant as a commercial organization, non-commercial organization, or individual should not be the driving factor in whether P/P services are available to the registrant. Fundamentally, P/P services should remain available to registrants irrespective of their status as commercial or non-commercial organizations or as individuals. Further, P/P registrations should not be limited to private individuals who use their domains for non-commercial purposes.

4. To the extent that this is feasible, domain name registrations involving P/P service providers should be clearly labelled as such in WHOIS[6].

5. P/P customer data is to be validated and verified in a manner consistent with the requirements outlined in the [WHOIS Accuracy Program Specification](#) of the 2013 RAA (as may be updated from time to time). In the cases where a P/P service provider is Affiliated with a registrar and that Affiliated registrar has carried out validation and verification of the P/P customer data, re-verification by the P/P service provider of the same, identical, information should not be required.

MANDATORY PROVISIONS TO BE INCLUDED IN PROVIDER TERMS OF SERVICE & MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS TO BE COMMUNICATED TO CUSTOMERS:

6. All rights, responsibilities and obligations of registrants and P/P service customers as well as those of accredited P/P service providers need to be clearly communicated in the P/P service registration agreement, including a provider's obligations in managing those rights and responsibilities and any specific requirements applying to transfers and renewals of a domain name. In particular, all accredited P/P service providers must disclose to their customers

---

[6] While this may be possible with existing fields, the WG has also explored the idea that the label might also be implemented by adding another field to WHOIS, and is aware that this may raise certain questions that should be appropriately considered as part of implementation. For clarity, references to "WHOIS" in this Final Report are to the current globally accessible gTLD Registration Directory Service as well as any successors or replacements thereto.

the conditions under which the service may be terminated in the event of a transfer of the domain name, and how requests for transfers of a domain name are handled.

7. All accredited P/P service providers must include on their websites, and in all Publication and Disclosure-related policies and documents, a link to either a request form containing a set of specific, minimum, mandatory criteria, or an equivalent list of such criteria, that the provider requires in order to determine whether or not to comply with third party requests, such as for the Disclosure or Publication of customer identity or contact details.

8. All accredited P/P service providers must publish their terms of service, including pricing (e.g. on their websites). In addition to other mandatory provisions recommended by the WG, the terms should at a minimum include the following elements in relation to Disclosure and Publication:

- Clarification of when those terms refer to Publication requests (and their consequences) and when they refer to Disclosure requests (and their consequences). The WG further recommends that accredited providers expressly include a provision in their terms of service explaining the meaning and consequences of Publication.
- The specific grounds upon which a customer's details may be Disclosed or Published or service suspended or terminated, including Publication in the event of a customer's initiation of a transfer of the underlying domain name[7]. In making this recommendation, the WG noted the changes to be introduced to the Inter Registrar Transfer Policy ("IRTP") in 2016, where following a Change of Registrant[8] a registrar is required to impose a 60-day inter-registrar transfer lock.

---

[7] The WG believes there should be no mandatory restriction on providers being able to terminate service to a customer on grounds stated in the terms of service, subject to any other specific limitation that may be recommended in this report by the WG. The WG notes that it is probably not possible to create a general policy that would in all cases prevent Publication via termination of service where the customer is ultimately shown to have been innocent (i.e. not in breach).
[8] This is defined as a material, i.e. non-typographical, change to either the registrant name, organization or email address (or in the absence of an email contact, the administrative contact listed for the registrant).

11

- Clarification as to whether or not a customer: (1) will be notified when a provider receives a Publication or Disclosure request from a third party; and (2) may opt to cancel its domain registration prior to and in lieu of Publication or Disclosure. However, accredited P/P service providers that offer this option should nevertheless expressly prohibit cancellation of a domain name that is the subject of a UDRP proceeding.

- Clarification that a Requester will be notified in a timely manner of the provider's decision: (1) to notify its customer of the request; and (2) whether or not the provider agrees to comply with the request to Disclose or Publish. This should also be clearly indicated in all Disclosure or Publication related materials.

9. In addition, the WG recommends the following as best practices for accredited P/P service providers[9]:

- P/P service providers should facilitate and not obstruct the transfer[10], renewal or restoration of a domain name by their customers, including without limitation a renewal during a Redemption Grace Period under the Expired Registration Recovery Policy and transfers to another registrar.

- P/P service providers should use commercially reasonable efforts to avoid the need to disclose underlying customer data in the process of renewing, transferring or restoring a domain name.

- P/P service providers should include in their terms of service a link or other direction to the ICANN website (or other ICANN-approved online location such as the provider's own website) where a person may look up the authoritative definitions and meanings of specific terms such as Disclosure or Publication.

---

[9] The WG recognizes that implementation of these recommendations may involve the development of new procedures.

[10] See also the WG's observations below under Recommendation #21 regarding the additional risks and challenges that may arise when the P/P service provider is independent of (i.e. not Affiliated with) an ICANN-accredited registrar, and which may be of particular concern in relation to transfers and de-accreditation issues.

CONTACTABILITY & RESPONSIVENESS OF PRIVACY & PROXY SERVICE PROVIDERS:

10. ICANN should publish and maintain a publicly accessible list of all accredited P/P service providers, with all appropriate contact information. Registrars should be advised to provide a web link to P/P services run by them or their Affiliates as a best practice. P/P service providers should declare their Affiliation with a registrar (if any) as a requirement of the accreditation program[11].

11. P/P service providers must maintain a point of contact for abuse reporting purposes. In this regard, a "designated" rather than a "dedicated" point of contact will be sufficient, since the primary concern is to have one contact point that third parties can go to and expect a response from. For clarification, the WG notes that as long as the requirement for a single point of contact can be fulfilled operationally, it is not mandating that a provider designate a specific individual to handle such reports.

12. P/P service providers should be fully contactable, through the publication of contact details on their websites in a manner modelled after Section 2.3 of the 2013 RAA Specification on Privacy and Proxy Registrations, as may be updated from time to time.

13. Requirements relating to the forms of alleged malicious conduct to be covered by the designated published point of contact at an ICANN-accredited P/P service provider should include a list of the forms of malicious conduct to be covered. These requirements should allow for enough flexibility to accommodate new types of malicious conduct. By way of example, Section 3 of the Public Interest Commitments (PIC) Specification[12] in the New gTLD

---

[11] The WG discussed, but did not reach consensus on, the possibility of requiring a registrar to also declare its Affiliation (if any) with a P/P service provider.

[12] See http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/agreement-approved-20nov13-en.pdf; Section 3 provides that "Registry Operator will include a provision in its Registry-Registrar Agreement that requires Registrars to include in their Registration Agreements a provision prohibiting Registered Name Holders from distributing malware, abusively operating botnets, phishing, piracy, trademark or

Registry Agreement or Safeguard 2, Annex 1 of the GAC's Beijing Communique[13] could serve as starting points for developing such a list.

14. The designated point of contact for a P/P service provider should be capable and authorized to investigate and handle abuse reports and information requests received.

STANDARD FORM & REQUIREMENTS FOR ABUSE REPORTING & INFORMATION REQUESTS:

15. A uniform set of minimum mandatory criteria that must be followed for the purpose of reporting abuse and submitting requests (including requests for the Disclosure of customer information) should be developed. Forms that may be required by individual P/P service providers for this purpose should also include space for free form text[14]. P/P service providers should also have the ability to "categorize" reports received, in order to facilitate responsiveness. P/P service providers must also state the applicable jurisdiction in which disputes (including any arising under the Illustrative Disclosure Framework in Annex B) should be resolved on any forms used for reporting and requesting purposes.

RELAYING (FORWARDING) OF THIRD PARTY REQUESTS:

---

copyright infringement, fraudulent or deceptive practices, counterfeiting or otherwise engaging in activity contrary to applicable law, and providing (consistent with applicable law and any related procedures) consequences for such activities including suspension of the domain name."

[13] See https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/gac-to-board-11apr13-en.pdf; Safeguard 2, Annex 1 provides that ""Registry operators will ensure that terms of use for registrants include prohibitions against the distribution of malware, operation of botnets, phishing, piracy, trademark or copyright infringement, fraudulent or deceptive practices, counterfeiting or otherwise engaging in activity contrary to applicable law."

[14] With the specific exception of Disclosure requests from intellectual property rights holders (see Recommendation #19 below), the WG discussed but did not finalize the minimum elements that should be included in such a form in relation to other requests and reports. The WG notes that this recommendation is not intended to prescribe the method by which a provider should make this form available (e.g. through a web-based form) as providers should have the ability to determine the most appropriate method for doing so.

14

16. Regarding Relaying of Electronic Communications[15]:

- All communications required by the RAA and ICANN Consensus Policies must be Relayed.
- For all other electronic communications, P/P service providers may elect one of the following two options:
    i. Option #1: Relay all electronic requests received (including those received via emails and via web forms), but the provider may implement commercially reasonable safeguards (including CAPTCHA) to filter out spam and other forms of abusive communications, or
    ii. Option #2: Relay all electronic requests received (including those received via emails and web forms) from law enforcement authorities and third parties containing allegations of domain name abuse (i.e. illegal activity)
- In all cases, P/P service providers must publish and maintain a mechanism (e.g. designated email point of contact) for Requesters to contact to follow up on or escalate their original requests.

17. Regarding Further Provider Actions When There Is A Persistent Delivery Failure of Electronic Communications:

- All third party electronic requests alleging abuse by a P/P service customer will be promptly Relayed to the customer. A Requester will be promptly notified of a persistent failure of delivery[16] that a P/P service provider becomes aware of.
- The WG considers that a "persistent delivery failure" will have occurred when an electronic communications system abandons or otherwise stops attempting to deliver an electronic communication to a customer after a

---

[15] The WG agrees that emails and web forms would be considered "electronic communications" whereas human-operated faxes would not. The WG recommends that implementation of the concept of "electronic communications" be sufficiently flexible to accommodate future technological developments.

[16] The WG notes that failure of "delivery" of a communication is not to be equated with the failure of a customer to "respond" to a request, notification or other type of communication.

certain number of repeated or duplicate delivery attempts within a reasonable period of time. The WG emphasizes that such persistent delivery failure, in and of itself, is not sufficient to trigger further provider obligation or action in relation to a relay request unless the provider also becomes aware of the persistent delivery failure.

- As part of an escalation process, and when the above-mentioned requirements concerning a persistent delivery failure of an electronic communication have been met, the provider should upon request Relay a further form of notice to its customer. A provider should have the discretion to select the most appropriate means of Relaying such a request. A provider shall have the right to impose reasonable limits on the number of such requests made by the same Requester for the same domain name.

- When a service provider becomes aware of a persistent delivery failure to a customer as described herein, that will trigger the P/P service provider's obligation to perform a verification/re-verification (as applicable) of the customer's email address(es), in accordance with the WG's recommendation that customer data be validated and verified in a manner consistent with the WHOIS Accuracy Specification of the 2013 RAA (see the WG's Recommendation #5, above, and the background discussion under Category B, Question 2 in Section 7, below).

- However, these recommendations shall not preclude a P/P service provider from taking any additional action in the event of a persistent delivery failure of electronic communications to a customer, in accordance with its published terms of service.

DISCLOSURE OR PUBLICATION OF A CUSTOMER'S IDENTITY OR CONTACT DETAILS:

18. Regarding Disclosure and Publication, the WG agreed that none of its recommendations should be read as being intended to alter (or mandate the alteration of) the prevailing practice among P/P service providers to review requests manually or to facilitate direct resolution of an issue between a Requester and a P/P service customer.   It also notes that disclosure of at least

some contact details of the customer may in some cases be required in order to facilitate such direct resolution. In relation to Publication that is subsequently discovered to be unwarranted, the WG believes that contractual agreements between providers and their customers and relevant applicable laws will govern, and are likely to provide sufficient remedies in such instances.

19. The WG has developed an illustrative Disclosure Framework to apply to Disclosure requests made to P/P service providers by intellectual property (i.e. trademark and copyright) owners. The proposal includes requirements concerning the nature and type of information to be provided by a Requester, non-exhaustive grounds for refusal of a request, and the possibility of neutral dispute resolution/appeal in the event of a dispute. The WG recommends that a review of this Disclosure Framework be conducted at an appropriate time after the launch of the program and periodically thereafter, to determine if the implemented recommendations meet the policy objectives for which they were developed. Such a review might be based on the non-exhaustive list of guiding principles developed by the GNSO's Data and Metrics for Policy Making (DMPM) WG, as adopted by the GNSO Council and ICANN Board. As noted by the DMPM WG, relevant metrics could include industry sources, community input via public comment or surveys or studies. In terms of surveys (whether or providers, customers or requesters), data should be anonymized and aggregated. Please refer to Annex B for the full Disclosure Framework.

20. Although the WG has reached consensus on an illustrative Disclosure Framework for handling requests from intellectual property (i.e. trademark and copyright) rights-holders, it has not developed a similar framework or template that would apply to other Requesters, such as LEA or anti-abuse and consumer protection groups. The WG is aware that certain concerns, such as the need for confidentiality in relation to an on-going LEA investigation, may mean that different considerations would apply to any minimum requirements that might be developed for such a framework. In this regard, in its Initial Report the WG had sought community feedback on specific concerns relating to the handling of LEA requests, such as whether or not providers should be

mandated to comply with them. Based on input received, the WG recommends that accredited P/P service providers should comply with express requests from LEA not to notify a customer where this is required by applicable law. However, this recommendation is not intended to prevent providers from either voluntarily adopting more stringent standards or from cooperating with LEA. In the event that a Disclosure Framework is eventually developed for LEA requests, the WG recommends that the Framework expressly include requirements under which at a minimum: (a) the Requester agrees to comply with all applicable data protection laws and to use any information disclosed to it solely for the purpose to determine whether further action on the issue is warranted, to contact the customer, or in a legal proceeding concerning the issue for which the request was made; and (b) exempts Disclosure where the customer has provided, or the P/P service provider has found, specific information, facts, and/or circumstances showing that Disclosure will endanger the safety of the customer.

DEACCREDITATION & ITS CONSEQUENCES:

21. Regarding de-accreditation of a P/P service provider:

The WG reiterates its previous observation that increased risks to a customer's privacy may be involved when a customer is dealing with a P/P service provider who, even if accredited by ICANN, is not Affiliated with an ICANN-accredited registrar. De-accreditation was noted as one topic where additional problems may arise. The WG therefore recommends that the following general principles be adopted and followed when a more detailed P/P service de-accreditation process is developed during implementation. As with transfers of domain names that occur other than as a result of de-accreditation of a P/P service provider, these principles are based on the WG's belief that customer privacy should be a paramount concern. As such, reasonable safeguards to ensure that a customer's privacy is adequately protected in the course of de-accreditation of a customer's P/P service provider – including when transfer of a customer's domain name or names is involved – should be integral to the rules governing the de-accreditation process.

Principle 1: A P/P service customer should be notified in advance of de-accreditation of a P/P service provider. The WG notes that the current practice for registrar de-accreditation involves the sending of several breach notices by ICANN Compliance prior to the final step of terminating a registrar's accreditation. While P/P service provider de-accreditation may not work identically to that for registrars, the WG recommends that ICANN explore practicable ways in which customers may be notified during the breach notice process (or its equivalent) once ICANN issues a termination of accreditation notice but before the de-accreditation becomes effective. The WG recommends that de-accreditation become effective for existing customers 30 days after notice of termination. The WG notes that, in view of the legitimate need to protect many customers' privacy, the mere publication of a breach notice on the ICANN website (as is now done for registrar de-accreditation) may not be sufficient to constitute notice.

Principle 2: Each step in the de-accreditation process should be designed so as to minimize the risk that a customer's personally identifiable information is made public.

Principle 3: The WG notes that the risk of inadvertent publication of a customer's details in the course of de-accreditation may be higher when the provider in question is not Affiliated with an ICANN-accredited registrar. As such, implementation design of the de-accreditation process should take into account the different scenarios that can arise when the provider being de-accredited is, or is not, Affiliated with an ICANN-accredited registrar.

In addition to the three principles outlined above, the WG recommends specifically that, where a Change of Registrant (as defined under the IRTP) takes place during the process of de-accreditation of a proxy service provider, a registrar should lift the mandatory 60-day lock at the express request of the beneficial user, provided the registrar has also been notified of the de-accreditation of the proxy service provider[17].

---

[17] The WG notes that the new changes to the IRTP give a registrar the discretion to lift the lock at the beneficial user's request, and that no specific exceptions were created at the time the policy was reviewed.

ADDITIONAL GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

In addition to the recommendations it developed for each of its Charter questions, the WG also recommends that the following general principles be adopted as part of the P/P service provider accreditation program.

First, the next review of the IRTP should include an analysis of the impact on P/P service customers, to ensure that adequate safeguards are in place as regards P/P service protection when domain names are transferred pursuant to an IRTP process. Where a P/P service customer initiates a transfer of a domain name, the WG recognizes that a registrar should have the same flexibility that it has currently to reject incoming transfers from any individual or entity, including those initiated by accredited P/P services. Nevertheless, the WG recommends that, in implementing those elements of the P/P service accreditation program that pertain to or that affect domain name transfers and in addition to its specific recommendations contained in this Final Report, ICANN should perform a general "compatibility check" of each proposed implementation mechanism with the then-current IRTP.

Secondly, the WG recommends that ICANN develop a public outreach and educational program for registrars, P/P service providers and customers (including potential customers) to inform them of the existence, launch and features of the P/P service accreditation program.

Thirdly, the WG recommends that providers should be required to maintain statistics on the number of Publication and Disclosure requests received and the number honored, and provide these statistics in aggregate form to ICANN for periodic publication. The data should be aggregated so as not to create a market where nefarious users of the domain name system are able to use the information to find the P/P service that is least likely to make Disclosures.

Finally, the WG has concluded that the registrar accreditation model with its multiple steps, governed by the RAA, may not be entirely appropriate for P/P services; however, it is a useful starting point from which relevant portions may be adapted to apply to P/P service providers. The implications of adopting a particular accreditation

model will need to be worked out as part of the implementation of its policy recommendations, if adopted.

REFERENCE MATERIALS - BOARD SUBMISSION NO. 2016.05.15.2b

TITLE: **Status Update on Investigation into Allegations of Misconduct by Applicant for .HOTEL**

Privileged and Confidential

Submitted By: Amy A. Stathos, Deputy General Counsel

Dated Noted: 9 May 2016

Email: amy.stathos@icann.org

Privileged and Confidential

1

REFERENCE MATERIALS - BOARD SUBMISSION NO. 2016.05.15.2c

FY 17 Special Community Request Explanations
Recommendations Team Report
April 2016

The text in this document reflects the written explanations/rationales that will be part of the overall spreadsheet report detailing the FY17 Special Community budget request recommendations prepared by staff for review by the Board Finance Committee. Staff is available to discuss any and all of the recommendations set forth herein.

Notable Summary Statistics:

Number of requests for support – FY17 = 59
Special Request Funds Approved in this list For FY17 = 646,400
Special Request Funds Approved in FY16 (for comparison) = 657,100
Special Request Funds Approved in FY15 (for comparison) = 680,150

Format Information:

For format and organizational purposes, this document is primarily designed to provide staff recommendations for resolving each FY17 community request. The text of each entry is proposed to be the final Board action on each request. For identification purposes, each entry in this document also includes a very brief description of each request. For more detail, please consult the community wiki (https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=58725377) for full copies of each request.

** ** **

Specific Community Requests Recommendations (in order of Finance Team entry from community):

FY17-01-SSAC-Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) Travel for Internet Governance Forum Workshop

Request for Guadalajara IGF Workshop support
(Yes)(4,000)

A single traveller approved: The granting of support is contingent on: 1. MAG approval of the panel 2. A submission of a detailed report from the approved traveller within 30-days of meeting that addresses each itemized metric as per

request (audience turnout/engagement at session, number and diversity of contacts and relationships established during the IGF). The report is to be submitted to: sbr-outcomes@icann.org. Travel arrangements to be coordinated by SSAC staff and Constituency Travel Team. If it is to be continued in future budget years, this resource will need to become a part of the core ICANN Budget in FY18 and not be supported as a special budget request.

FY17-02-GAC-Support for GAC Travelers to the three (3) ICANN meetings in FY17

Request to increase number of supported travelers at regular ICANN Public Meetings by 20 - from current 30 to 50 travelers.
(No)(0)

30 GAC travelers are already in the core Constituency Travel budget. Based on Board guidance during FY16 budgeting process and Principle 22 of the Community Special Budget Request Principles (vFY17-2015), expanded travel slots for FY17 must be requested during the public comment period for the FY17 Strategic Operating Plan and Budget, as part of the main budget process. The community has been informed of this and encouraged to pursue the request in that venue.

FY17-03-RySG-Travel support to attend ICANN meetings

Request to remove "pilot" fellow parameters.
(Yes)(0)

The RySG makes a good case for removing the original pilot fellowship travel guidelines from the two fellowship pilot slots introduced two years ago. Continued implementation of this pilot effort in FY17 will authorize RySG use of the current seven slot allocation consistent with the criteria proposed by the RySG: 1. Demonstration of need; 2. A statement of interest; 3. Explanation of how a traveler can benefit by participating in the meeting; and 4. A traveler's commitment to participate in all Registry-related sessions and travelers' commitment to an active role in the RySG going forward.

The RySG can begin implementing this approach beginning at ICANN 56. As a condition of potential future use of this resource, after ICANN 57 and no later than 15 January 2017, the RySG must submit an assessment report on the implementation of this pilot effort. This report should include names and affiliations of all supported travelers at ICANN 56 and 57 and progress against metrics cited in the original request.

The report should be submitted to sbr-outcomes@icann.org. Due to substantial traveler support increases across the organization, meeting space planning and hotel room blocks arrangements, the community will not have the flexibility to reallocate unused slots to other public meetings throughout the year. Unused slots

2

cannot be carried forward and will remain unused. Implementation to be coordinated between RySG Secretariat, GNSO Secretariat and Constituency Travel Team.

Due to substantial traveler support increases across the organization, meeting space planning and hotel room blocks arrangements, the community will not have the flexibility to reallocate unused slots to other public meetings throughout the year. Unused slots cannot be carried forward and will remain unused.

FY17-04-RySG-Translation and Transliteration Services

Request For Pilot Translation of Community Documents
(Yes/Core – See Language Language/Translation Services)(0)(Core)

ICANN Language Services will accommodate this request as part of the overall Language Services core budget, based on ICANN language services guidelines. Initially 6 UN languages as a pilot effort accompanied by discussions with staff of potential targeted languages. See FY17-65 below.

FY17-05-ICANN Academy WG - A pilot ICANN Academy course on Chairing Skillset Development

Request for New Pilot Academy Course at FY17 Meeting C
(Yes)(15,000)

Limited resources are available in FY17 to expand the time frames of the ICANN Academy to accommodate this new full training course as proposed. It is hoped that as proposed, the existing academy curriculum can be adjusted to incorporate a chairing skillset training component on a pilot basis during Meeting C in FY17. If successful, then permanent program expansion can be considered in FY18. FY17 resources to be made available only include availability of professional trainer at Meeting C on a pilot basis (with the expectation that future courses would be done by course alumni) and regional travel support for two training attendees. It is understood that remaining academy "students" for this training will otherwise be supported travelers at Meeting C.

FY17-06-BC-Leadership Development & Support especially from Developing Countries (enhancing business leaders participation in ICANN and promotion of the M/S approach) – Local Leaders

Pilot travel support of local business leaders for developing region recruitment
(Yes)(16,000)

This is an initiative that could ultimately be applied to other communities. On a pilot basis, one local senior business leader approved per each of the four requested

3

meetings (ICANN57, ICANN59, 11th IGF, and the CSTD/WSIS). Regional diversity required as per information included in the request whereby local business leaders would be selected by the BC to encourage promotion of multistakeholder model through voices from new frontier regions from Africa, Asia and Latin America.

Participants to participate in ICANN's meetings and orientations, including joining some of the ICANN Newcomer and Fellowship activities if suitable, but would be primarily focused on participation with the BC and relevant workshops and topics that support the local business leader's ability to complete a small project back in their country.

Evaluation of pilot to be based on the metrics and deliverables presented in this request – including participation in ICANN public meeting events/sessions and specific Business Constituency meetings and further agreement to continue participation in ICANN and in the BC post-meeting).

As a condition of future pilot support, a report is to be submitted by the BC evaluating the value of attendance to the meeting against the metrics above to sbr-outcomes@icann.org within 30 days of attending each meeting. Implementation by BC Secretariat and the Constituency Travel team. All participation and project information would need to be included in the report. If successful, this pilot effort could be extended to other community groups in FY18.

FY17-07-BC-Leadership Travel

Request to expand BC leader travel support to Public Meetings
(No)(0)

3 BC travel slots are already allocated in the core Constituency Travel budget for FY17. Based on Board guidance during FY16 budgeting process and Principle 22 of the Community Special Budget Request Principles (vFY17-2015), in order to expand the Constituency Travel guidelines and increase the BC's allocated slots by one additional slot, a comment/request should be submitted during the public comment period for the FY17 Operating Plan & Budget as part of the main budget process. The community has been informed of this and encouraged to pursue the request in that venue.

FY17-08-BC-Outreach Event

Request to expand outreach event support
(No - CROPP) (0)

Support for aspects of this proposal in FY17 will be available through the existing Community Regional Pilot Program (See FY17-60 below). The FY17 CROPP program will include modifications that can help resource the proposed activity on a more limited scale.

4

FY17-09-BC-Outreach Materials

Graphic design, translations, printing, delivery and editorial support
(Yes)(0)

Creation of informational community content is a capability that the Communications Team has developed over the past few years. The Communications Team is being allocated FY17 resources to support community content production requests. For this particular request, the Communications Team will collaborate with the ISPCPC Leadership on developing the appropriate materials to achieve the goals outlined in the proposal. See line FY17-61 below - Media & Publications Support. Implementation by Communications Team.

FY17-10-BC-Policy Consultant

Request for consultant staff support
(No – DDPPP)(0) (Core)

Based on senior executive discussions with community leaders, a resource to test community support for document production related needs was approved as a pilot program in FY16 for use by interested communities. Staff will continue to collaborate with community leaders to define the most efficient way to introduce and experiment to determine if this is a resource that can be effective for the community and effectively managed by staff. Pilot program will continue for first several months of FY17. Budgeted for in Policy Team FY17 520 budget - see Professional Services. See also FY17-62 below (DDPPP).

FY17-11-BC-Secretariat Support/Admin Services.

Continue existing support in FY17
(Yes-Core)(0) (Core)

The pilot program initiated in FY15 will continue for FY17. ICANN staff will provide part-time in-kind support on a pilot basis for administrative staff support resources to non-contracted GNSO communities (equivalent of approximately 12 hours a week of support) in FY17. Funds will not be provided directly to the community. Support will be offered on a "functional" basis and managed by the ICANN staff (i.e., specific staff assigned to specific functions like elections, telephone support, etc.). Staff will continue to coordinate specific points of contact for the community to ensure that requests for service are provided in a timely manner. Budgeted for in Policy Team FY17 520 budget - see Professional Services. See FY17-22/FY17-42 and see FY17-63 below - GNSO Secretariat Support.

FY17-12-NCSG and CSG-Intersessional meeting of the Non Contracted Parties House

5

Meeting again in FY17
(Yes-Core)(0)(Core)

Previous pilot programs have demonstrated the success and efficacy of this activity. ICANN staff to use community feedback and the models from the 2015, 2016 NCPH Intersessional Meetings to plan and conduct this activity at a time mutually agreed to by staff and community - likely late January 2017. In Policy Team core budget - 520. See also request FY17-28. See also FY17-64 - NCPH Intersessional Meeting.

FY17-13-LACRALO-Capacity Building workshop on DNSSEC, IPv6 technical community for the academic network "reaccium" (sic)

(Yes-Core)(0)(Core)

The ICANN Security Team is available to support this request and is able to coordinate with the appropriate regional team to develop program and conduct a workshop. RALO leadership and Policy staff supporting the At Large community to confer with Regional VP who will collaborate with ICANN's Security Team to implement.

FY17-14-RSSAC- RSSAC at IETF

RSSAC Caucus Support at IETF
(Yes) (40,000 – amount less than requested)

Increased support to assist the RSSAC in its growth is an important goal and is appropriate on a pilot basis. Full funding for this proposal is not available for FY17, but this proposal to be resourced at $40,000 USD to accommodate 4 travelers at economy airfare rates plus meeting room expenses at two IETF meetings in FY17. Submission of detailed report from each traveller within 30 days of meeting that addresses: meeting experience, meetings held, contacts made and assessment of experience is required and precondition of any potential future continuation of the pilot effort. Reports to be submitted to sbr-outcomes@icann.org. Implementation by RSSAC support staff and Constituency Travel Team.

FY17-15-RSSAC- RSSAC Travel Support for ICANN Meetings

Request To Expand Travel Support at public meetings
(No)(0)

Five (5) RSSAC travel slots are currently allocated in the core Constituency Travel budget for FY17. Based on Board guidance during FY16 budgeting process and Principle 22 of the Community Special Budget Request Principles (vFY17-2015), expanded travel slots for FY17 must be requested during the public comment period for the FY17 Strategic Operating Plan and Budget, as part of the main budget

process. The community has been informed of this and encouraged to pursue the request in that venue.

FY17-16-RSSAC- RSSAC Workshops

Continue Pilot Effort
(Yes)(60,000 – amount less than requested)

Expanded efforts under the reorganized RSSAC are critical to encouraging community participation and providing momentum to RSSAC community work/advice efforts. Although resources do not exist to fully fund the resources requested for FY17, after a successful pilot workshop effort in FY16 (see FY16-08) the resources made available in FY16 will be made available again in FY17. It is hoped that these resources will enable the RSSAC to conduct the requested workshops under the successful FY16 model.

FY17-17-ALAC-Strategic Working Session for ALAC and RALO Leaders at ICANN Public Meetings 57 and 58

Saturday Strategic Meeting at two public meetings
(Yes)(6,000 – staff facilitator only)

This activity can be supported as part of the Meeting C agenda (Day One) and additional catering will be provided for meeting attendees. Staff facilitator to be used and economy travel costs provided. Approved for one meeting only (ICANN 57) .

FY17-18 - RALO-Real-time Captioning of Adobe Connect Meetings In English, Spanish, and French

Continue Pilot effort
(Yes)(5,000)

Approved to continue existing pilot for an additional 3 months (6 conference calls in total) consistent with the FY16 Pilot program parameters. This will give pilot effort 15 total calls experience to evaluate resource capabilities.

FY17-19 - ALAC-Fixing the bugs in ICANN's machine translation tool used for the LACRALO mailing lists

(Yes)(2,000)

Internal staff discussions have confirmed the importance of addressing this matter with existing staff resources as soon as possible. Policy Staff supporting the ALAC will coordinate this work with the ICANN IT Team. Development resources provided.

7

FY17-20-ISPCP GNSO- Constituency outreach material

Graphic design, translation, printing and delivery
(Yes – see FY17-61)(0)(Core)

Creation of informational community content is a capability that the Communications Team has developed over the past few years. The Communications Team is being allocated FY17 resources to support community content production requests. For this particular request, the Communications Team will collaborate with the ISPCPC Leadership on developing the appropriate materials to achieve the goals outlined in the proposal. See FY17-61 below - Media & Publications Support. Implementation by Communications Team.

FY17-21-ISPCP GNSO-Travel Funding of ISPs in Developing Countries to ICANN meetings

Request for technical/business leader outreach/recruitment
(Yes)(13,500)

Approved to continue the FY16 pilot effort to gather more data in preparation for FY18; 1 traveler per ICANN meeting is approved. As a condition of future resourcing, a written report is to be submitted by ISPCP to sbr-outcomes@icann.org no later than 30 days after the trip outlining the achievements against the metrics (increased ISPCP membership, active participation in DNS SSR working groups, and follow-up activities that stem from these groups) to collect data for FY18.

FY17-22-ISPCP GNSO-Secretariat Services

Continue secretariat support
(Yes-Core – GNSO Secretariat Support - See FY17-63)(0)(Core)

The pilot program initiated in FY15 will continue in FY17. ICANN staff will provide part-time in-kind support on a pilot basis for administrative staff support resources to non-contracted GNSO communities (equivalent of approximately 12 hours a week of support) in FY17. Funds will not be provided directly to the community. Support will be offered on a "functional" basis and managed by the ICANN staff (i.e., specific staff assigned to specific functions like elections, telephone support, etc.). Staff will continue to coordinate specific points of contact for the community to ensure that requests for service are provided in a timely manner. Budgeted for in Policy Team FY17 520 budget - see Professional Services. See also FY17-11 and FY17-42 and see FY17-63 below GNSO Secretariat Support.

FY17-23-ISPCP GNSO- Constituency outreach support

Request for global outreach event support

8

(No – CROPP see FY17-60)(0)

Support for aspects of this proposal in FY17 will be available through the existing Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program. The FY17 CROPP program will include modifications as per FY17-60 that can help resource the proposed activity.

FY17-24-ISPCP Constituency- Leadership Travel

Continued leadership travel support to public meetings
(Yes)(0)(Core)

This travel support is already in the core constituency travel support budget.

FY17-25-RrSG-Funding of six (6) additional travel slots for participation in ICANN meetings scheduled for FY 2017

Request to continue pilot
(Yes)(54,000 – amount lower than requested)

Resources are only available to approve support for four travelers in FY17, consistent with the previously authorized FY16 pilot program (FY16-11). The request for additional RrSG travel support follows the experience of the RySG pilot efforts that were proven successes and a continuation of the pilot effort is justified.

Of the four travelers approved for this community pilot activity, two (2) travelers selected by RrSG Leadership will be authorized to promote engagement in GNSO activities and drive Policy WG participation. Two (2) additional support slots will be designated to promote education and engagement efforts - starting with ICANN 57. Although this is a continuation of the initial FY16 pilot effort for the RrSG, selection for the second two additional slots no longer need to follow the guidelines of the ICANN Fellowship program. However, the RrSG is asked to implement the same traveler criteria consistent with those proposed by the RySG in request FY17-03; specifically: 1. A statement of interest; 2. Explanation of how a traveler can benefit by participating in the meeting; and 3. A traveler's commitment to participate in all Registrar-related sessions and travelers' commitment to an active role in the RrSG going forward.

Due to substantial traveler support increases across the organization, meeting space planning and hotel room blocks arrangements, the community will not have the flexibility to reallocate unused slots to other public meetings throughout the year. Unused slots cannot be carried forward and will remain unused.

As a condition of future resourcing, a written report is to be submitted by the RrSG to sbr-outcomes@icann.org no later than 30 days after the trip outlining the achievements against the metrics (increased RrSG membership, active participation

9

in working groups, and follow-up activities that stem from these groups) to collect data for FY18.

FY17-26- RrSG - Translation and Transliteration Services

Request For Pilot Translation of Community Documents
(Yes/Core – See FY17-65 Language/Translation Services)(0)(Core)

ICANN Language Services is available to resource a number of FY17 community proposals as part of overall Language Services core budget - based on ICANN language services guidelines. The Language Services Team should be contacted directly to assist in these areas.

FY17-27-RrSG-Enhanced level of support for live video streaming for our RrSG face-to-face sessions at each of the 3 ICANN meetings in FY 2017

Request to continue pilot effort
(Yes)(16,000)

Experience with pilot effort has been a positive one for RrSG community and is proving value for service to more communities. IT Team is steadily building out infrastructure to support this capability at all ICANN Meetings and will invest in additional equipment to automate this function in FY17.

FY17-28- NCSG and CSG - Intersessional meeting for Non Contracted Parties (NCPH)

Intersessional Meeting in FY17
(Yes/Core – see FY17-64 NCPH Intersessional)(0)(Core)

Previous pilot programs have demonstrated the success and efficacy of this activity. ICANN staff to use community feedback and the models from the 2015, 2016 NCPH Intersessional Meetings to plan and conduct this activity at a time mutually agreed to by staff and community - likely late January 2017. In Policy Team core budget - 520. See also request FY17-12; supported by the FY17 core policy team budget. See also FY17-64 NCPH Intersessional Meeting.

FY17-29 – GNSO - Council-Data & Metrics Requests for Policy Development - Pilot Project

Request for pilot support
(No)(0)

The Data & Metrics Requests for Policy Development - Pilot Project request has merit, however this is a core policy development activity that should be funded in

core budget, if possible. GNSO Council to be advised to submit a comment/request during the public comment period for the FY17 Operating Plan and Budget.

FY17-30-NPOC-NPOC Ambassador Program

Request to fund new outreach pilot program
(No– CROPP & Publications/Media Support)(0)

This is an interesting concept that has the potential for coordination with other ICANN outreach and engagement activities. No specific new resources are being made available for this initiative in FY17, because substantive resource support will available through the existing CROPP and Media & Publications support program (see FY17-60 and FY17-61 below). Coordination and implementation by/with GSE and Communications Teams as appropriate.

FY17-31-NCUC -Translation/Interpretation support for NCUC outreach events
(No – Language Services FY17-65)(Core)

ICANN Language Services is available to resource a number of FY17 community proposals as part of overall Language Services core budget - based on ICANN language services guidelines. The Language Services Team should be contacted directly to assist in these areas of translation support. See FY17-65, Language/Translation Services. The interpretation aspect of this proposal cannot be resourced with FY17 funds at this time, but coordination with the meetings and language services teams may provide guidance and preparation for FY18 support.

FY17-32-NCUC -Expanded IT and tools support for NCUC Community - Policy Consultations

Dedicated IT tool for community policy consultation work
(No)(0)

Thanks to an initial inquiry from the NCUC, the ICANN Community Applications and ICANN IT teams has previously and extensively investigated options for document collaboration and other productive community tools. Document collaboration is on the IT/Community Applications roadmap beginning for FY18. Community Applications staff is committed to follow up in planning discussions with the community during FY17, in preparation for FY18.

FY17-33-NCUC - Knowledge/Skills Seminar for NCUC Members – Policy Practicum

Request for intensive practicum training sessions
(No)(0)(Core)

A number of initiatives sponsored by ICANN staff and the GNSO currently give newcomers opportunities to learn about Working Groups and active participation in the Policy Development Process (see https://www.icann.org/newcomers and see e.g., http://gnso.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-04mar15-en.htm). Although no additional resources are currently available for FY17, staff is directed to work with the NCUC leadership to see if some of these resources (WG newcomer webinars, GNSO toolkit, etc.) can be adapted or expanded to address specific NCUC needs.

FY17-34-NCUC - NCUC Policy Conference
Request For Pre Public Meeting Policy Conference
(No)(0)

Unfortunately, implementation of the new ICANN meeting strategy substantially limits the ability to schedule add-on programming beyond the public meeting footprint. Experience with implementation of the new strategy over the next fiscal year will help determine whether these types of events can be scheduled in the future.

FY17-35-NCUC - NCUC Outreach events: targeted efforts

Side-event support for global or regional conferences
(No – CROPP see FY17-60) (0)

This request can be accommodated collaborating with regional GSE teams or by using the existing Community Outreach Pilot Program, with the modifications proposed to the program for FY17, whereby each eligible GNSO Constituencies may select either 4 trips or 2 outreach events of a cost up to 7,500 USD to be carried out during the FY17. See CROPP description below (FY17-60).

FY17-36-NCUC - NCUC workshop at IGF/Mexico and outreach – Accountability in Global Internet Governance

Guadalajara IGF Workshop Support
(Yes)(8,000)

Two travellers approved but granting of support is contingent on: 1) MAG approval of panel; and 2) submission of detailed report from each traveller within 30-days of meeting that addresses each itemized metric as per request (audience turnout/engagement at workshops, number of new NCUC members - LAC and Dev. Countries, number and diversity of contacts and relationships established, number of bilaterals, number of existing NCUC members reached at IGF). Report to be submitted to sbr-outcomes@icann.org and is condition of future resource allocations.

FY17-37-NCUC - Bringing expertise to new PDP

12

Request For expert professional services support on RDS/Whois PDP
(No)(0 – see FY17-62 below)

Resources for this type of community-specific expertise are not available in FY17. The recently initiated document production pilot program is investigating this type of support. To the extent that knowledge is gained from that program, aspects from this request may be possible in future years. See FY17-62 below.

FY17-38-NCUC - Online Capacity building to train NCUC members for policy work

Request to develop online training in comment and other input skills
No)(0)

A number of programs already exist that are intended to educate new or inexperienced community members. Although no additional resources are available in FY17 for this particular proposal, staff is directed to work with the NCUC leadership to see if it is possible to adapt/expand some of these existing resources (e.g. ICANN Learn/GNSO Learn) to meet the specific NCUC needs. Also please note applicability to request FY17-61 (Media & Publications Support)

FY17-39-GNSO - IPC-IPC travel support to ICANN meetings

Request to expand travel support to public meetings
(No)(0)

Three (3) IPC travel slots are currently allocated in the core Constituency Travel budget for FY17. Based on Board guidance during FY16 budgeting process and Principle 22 of the Community Special Budget Request Principles (vFY17-2015), expansion of the Constituency Travel Guidelines must now be done through the regular budget process. In order to expand the Constituency Travel guidelines and increase the IPC's allocated slots by one (or three) additional slot, a request/comment should be submitted during the public comment period for the FY17 Operating Plan & Budget as part of the main budget process. The community has been informed of this and encouraged to pursue the request in that venue.

FY17-40-GNSO - IPC-IPC Outreach Activities

Expanded outreach support
(No – but CROPP & Media/Publications Support)(0)

The staff Communications and GSE Teams are directed to work with the IPC on: 1) Case-by-case CROPP exception considerations to allow for inter-regional travel where necessary and reasonable; and 2) to collaborate with IPC leadership on

13

appropriate video/materials production efforts within established guidelines. Additionally, as it is being evolved for FY17, the CROPP program can provide event support for up to 2 outreach activities per constituency in FY17. See FY17-60 below for CROPP FY17 parameters applicable to the IPC and FY17-61 for Media/Publications Support. Finally, research funds are not available for FY17, but it is hoped that IPC collaboration with regional engagement teams can expand capabilities for information gathering and establish a case for a pilot effort in FY18.

FY17-41-GNSO - IPC-IPC Promotional/Informational Publication Development

News/promotion/informational materials to supplement IPC website
(Yes – See FY17-61)(0)

Creation of informational community content is a capability that the Communications Team has developed over the past few years. The Communications Team is being allocated FY17 resources to support community content production requests. For this particular request, the Communications Team will collaborate with the IPC Leadership on developing the appropriate materials to achieve the goals outlined in the proposal. See FY17-61 below – Media/Publication Support. Implementation by Communications Team.

FY17-42-GNSO - IPC-IPC Secretariat

Continue secretariat support
(Yes-Core – GNSO Secretariat Support - See FY17-63)(0)(Core)

The pilot program initiated in FY15 will continue in FY17. ICANN staff will provide part-time in-kind support on a pilot basis for administrative staff support resources to non-contracted GNSO communities (equivalent of approximately 12 hours a week of support) in FY17. Funds will not be provided directly to the community. Support will be offered on a "functional" basis and managed by the ICANN staff (i.e., specific staff assigned to specific functions like elections, telephone support, etc.). Staff will continue to coordinate specific points of contact for the community to ensure that requests for service are provided in a timely manner. Budgeted for in Policy Team FY17 520 budget - see Professional Services. See also FY17-11 and FY17-22 and see FY17-63 below GNSO Secretariat Support.

FY17-43-GNSO - IPC-IPC website modernization

Continued pilot website support
(Yes - Core)(0) (Core)

Memberclicks implementation and ongoing resourcing to support the current pilot effort are to be continued and provided for in the ICANN core FY17 budget.

14

FY17-44-NCSG - IGF Workshop on Civil Society engagement and Multistakeholder experience through the IANA Transition

Guadalajara IGF Workshop Support
(Yes)(12,000)

Maximum of three (3) travellers approved (one each from NCSG, NCUC and NPOC communities). The granting of support (and potential future allocations) is contingent on: 1) MAG approval of panel; and 2) submission of detailed report from each traveller within 30 days of meeting that addresses: audience turnout/engagement at workshops, number of new NCSG members - LAC and Dev. Countries, number and diversity of contacts and relationships established, number of bilaterals, number of existing NCSG members reached at IGF). Report to be submitted to sbr-outcomes@icann.org

FY17-45-ALAC -Access by RALOs for funding of local engagement activities

Local regional accounts requested
(No)(10,000 - See comments)

Collaboration with regional GSE Teams is the appropriate mechanism to take advantage of these proposed short-term opportunities as provided for in the core engagement team regional budgets. Nominal seed funding of 10,000 USD being provided to regional GSE teams to share in response to this proposal.

FY17-46-At-Large/RALOs-RALO Leader Development Session at ICANN 57 Second Pilot Activity

Friday Afternoon developmental m*eeting at Meeting C*
 (Yes – with Staff Facilitator)(1,200)

This activity can be supported as part of the Meeting C agenda and minimal additional catering will be provided for meeting attendees. Must use staff facilitator for FY17. Lower amount granted for nominal catering only due to facilitator's travel being accounted for in FY17-17.

FY17-47-AFRALO - AFRALO General Assembly + Capacity Building and engagement Program for the ALS representatives

(TBD)(0/165,000 only count once – see FY17-66 At-Large Assemblies)

FY17 resources are only available to support two out of the 3 requested At-Large assemblies this fiscal year. The ALAC has the opportunity to choose between the AFRALO (FY17-47), LACRALO (FY17-53) and NARALO (FY17-54) proposals. Consideration of future assemblies will be taken up again in FY18. (FY17-53, FY17-54, FY17-47). See FY17-66 – At-Large Assemblies.

FY17-48-AFRALO-AFRALO Workshop at the 2016 IGF on " Privacy and users' data management"

Guadalajara IGF Workshop support
(No – to Outreach component)(Yes – to Workshop component)(See details in recommendations)(8,000)

There are two components to this proposal. In regard to the Outreach component, as the proposal notes, it is not anticipated that there will be many African attendees at the Guadalajara IGF meeting. The metrics provided for leadership team outreach do not appear to track for an event that is in Latin America rather than Africa. This concept may be more applicable for a future IGF located in the Africa region.

With respect to the Workshop component of the proposal - pending acceptance by the IGF MAG of the sessions proposed here - support for two (2) AFRALO travelers will be allocated. ICANN staff is not available to support session development, preparation or execution. Approval (and potential future allocations) contingent on: 1) MAG approval of panel; and 2) submission of detailed report from each traveller within 30 days of meeting that addresses: audience turnout/engagement at workshops, number of new ALS applications, number and diversity of contacts and relationships established, number of bilaterals, number of existing ALS members reached at IGF). Report should include analysis of IGF attendance from the RALO's region by stakeholder category - based on public registration data. Report to be submitted to sbr-outcomes@icann.org. Implementation by IGF and Constituency Travel Support Teams.

FY17-49-ISOC TCHAD (African ALS)-1er Forum sur le DNS au Tchad

(No)(0)

DNS Fora are considered regular engagement activities and should be brought to the attention of the Global Stakeholder Engagement Regional VP for Africa for consideration as an FY17 core engagement activity.

FY17-50-ISOC Bangladesh, APRALO ALS-Showcase local APRALO activities at APNIC42 to be held in Dhaka, Bangladesh

(No – CROPP)(0 – See FY17-60)

A combination of CROPP supported travel and collaboration with the appropriate GSE Regional VP should be an acceptable way to implement this proposal. See FY17-60 CROPP.

16

FY17-51-Internet Society Palestine Chapter -ICANN workshops in support to the 1st Palestinian National IGF

(No/Core)(2,700) (Core)

The GSE Middle East Regional Team will examine this proposal as part of the core budget. Conditioned upon OFAC clearance, the team may be able to support 6 regional travellers for this activity.

FY17-52-ISOC-TRV (jointly with ISOC-Delhi)-Support to the First Indian School on Internet Governance (ISIG 2016)

(No - CROPP)(0 – See FY17-60)

The concept of SSIG in India is a strategic and useful endeavor for ICANN and its community. A combination of CROPP supported travel in combination with support from the appropriate Global Stakeholder Engagement Regional VP should be the appropriate means to address this request. Any implementation will be managed by the appropriate GSE regional team. See FY17-60 below for additional guidance on the CROPP parameters available to the APRALO in FY17.

FY17-53-LACRALO - LACRALO General Assembly

(TBD – See FY17-66 At-Large Assemblies)(0/165,000 only count once)

FY17 resources are only available to support two out of the 3 requested At Large assemblies this fiscal year. The ALAC has the opportunity to choose between the AFRALO (FY17-47), LACRALO (FY17-53) and NARALO (FY17-54) proposals. Consideration of future assemblies will be taken up again in FY18. (FY17-53, FY17-54, FY17-47). See FY17-66 Assemblies.

FY17-54-NARALO-NARALO General Assembly

(TBD – See FY17-66 At-Large Assemblies)(0/165,000 only count once)

FY17 resources are only available to support two out of the 3 requested At-Large assemblies this fiscal year. The ALAC has the opportunity to choose between the AFRALO (FY17-47), LACRALO (FY17-53) and NARALO (FY17-54) proposals. Consideration of future assemblies will be taken up again in FY18. (FY17-53, FY17-54, FY17-47). See FY17-66 - Assemblies.

FY17-55-NARALO/ALAC-Tribal Ambassadors Pilot Project

Expanded outreach to underserved populations of developed countries
(Yes) (8,000)

Travel for two tribal ambassadors for ICANN57 is authorized. Community to identify an At Large Guide to serve as a coach for the ambassadors. The At Large Guide to come from among existing/expected experienced attendees at the meeting. Staff has recommended more transparency on recruitment of ambassadors and adjustment of success metrics to include - progress toward a native community ALS.

Additional conditions of allocation are: (1) At Large Guide to follow the guidelines of the Community Mentor Pilot Program to introduce ambassadors to ICANN and the ICANN Meeting - from approximately 6 weeks prior to Meeting, act as the ambassadors' "one-on-one" guide through the ICANN experience during Meeting week, and follow up beyond the Meeting to further guide continued knowledge and engagement; (2) ambassadors to participate in the ICANN Newcomer Sunday meeting with DPRD team representative who will be facilitating the session to ensure inclusion; (3) ambassadors to participate in the Fellowship Morning sessions Monday through Thursday in order to gain overall ICANN experience and understanding of its Multistakeholder community; and (4) both At Large Guide and ambassadors to submit detailed report within 30 days of the ICANN Meeting that addresses activities at the meeting and assessment of experience. These reports will help in assessment of future pilot efforts. Report to be submitted to: sbr-outcomes@icann.org.

Implementation by Policy and DPRD Staff supporting the At Large Community and Constituency Travel Team.

FY17-56-APRALO-APRALO Leadership Team Outreach at the Eleventh Annual IGF Meeting tentatively scheduled to take place in Guadalajara, Mexico, in September 2016

Outreach and Guadalajara IGF Workshop support
 (No – to Outreach component, Yes – to proposed Workshop: See details in recommendations) (8,000)

This proposal has more than one component. In regard to the Outreach component, as the proposal notes, it is not anticipated that there will be many APAC attendees at Latin America IGF. The metrics provided for leadership team outreach do not appear to track for an event that is in Latin America rather than Asia. This concept may be more applicable for a future IGF located in the APAC region.

With respect to the Workshop component of the proposal - support for two (2) APRALO travelers will be allocated - pending acceptance by the IGF MAG of the sessions proposed here. ICANN staff is not available to support session development, preparation or execution. Approval contingent on: (1) MAG approval of panel; and (2) submission of detailed report from each traveller within 30 days of meeting that addresses: audience turnout/engagement at workshops, number of new ALS applications, number and diversity of contacts and relationships

18

established, number of bilaterals, number of existing ALS members reached at IGF). Report should include analysis of IGF attendance from the RALO's region by stakeholder category - based on public registration data and submitted to sbr-outcomes@icann.org. Implementation by ICANN IGF Team and Constituency Travel Team.

FY17-57-ALAC-ALAC Discretion to use Allocated Travel Slots to Support Active Volunteer Leaders within At-Large to Travel to and attend ICANN Public Meetings

Travel Support Clarification
(Yes – Core - already included in travel guidelines) (0)

The ICANN Constituency Travel Team has interpreted the published FY14 Community Travel Support Guidelines to give the At-Large community the flexibility in assigning their travel slots, except for the two (2) liaison slots and the ALAC Chair slot. Other travel slots can be reassigned as deemed appropriate within each RALO. Please refer to the FY14 Community Travel Support Guidelines (https://community.icann.org/x/lgvxAg) and liaise with ICANN Constituency Travel directly for further clarifications.

FY17-58-EURALO/ALAC-EURALO Members' Program at the 16th ICANN Studienkreis meeting, 6-7 October 2016 in Dubrovnik, Croatia

Travel Support
(No – CROPP) (0 – See FY17-60)

This proposal can be implemented by utilizing the existing Community Regional Pilot Program based on CROPP parameters. The community may also wish to explore options with the appropriate ICANN regional engagement team. No additional special allocation resources are available to be allocated in FY17.

FY17-59-ALAC-ALAC Development Session at ICANN 57 Second Pilot Activity

Friday developmental m*eeting at Meeting C*
(Yes - with staff facilitator only) (2,000)

This activity can be supported as part of the Meeting C agenda (final meeting day) and minimal additional catering will be provided for meeting attendees. Intent to use staff facilitator and resource allocation is dependent on facilitator's travel being accounted for in FY17-17.

FY17-60 - CROPP

Continuation of pilot to reflect community feedback
(Yes)(130,000)

The CROPP program has been in place over 30 months and is showing steady growth in community interest and usage for certain communities. Staff has recommended that the program be piloted for one additional year in its now mature phase to see if the substantial benefits realized by a number of community groups can be solidified, with additional modifications to the program.

For FY17, Staff will continue to administer a more comprehensive Regional Outreach Program that will permit eligible communities that have developed a strategic outreach and engagement plan (and posted that plan on the ICANN Community wiki) to choose to continue to employ the CROPP program or, instead, to pursue a more activity-focused strategy.

All eligible communities are not utilizing the program equally, so more outreach options will be offered for the currently eligible GNSO constituencies. Those communities will be able to choose between 4 individual trips for FY17 OR 2 outreach events with budgets at 7,500 USD each. By potentially exploring other outreach and engagement options, individual communities may be able to maximize their outreach and engagement strategies in a more tailored way. The 5 RALOs will continue to have 5 trip activities each at their disposal throughout FY17.

In recognition of their specific requests for activity-focused support (and as an expanded pilot effort), the BC, IPC, ISPCP, NCUC and NPOC may choose to avail themselves of 2 community outreach events rather than the CROPP program itself. This decision will allow an individual community to elect to use the CROPP program OR to host, co-host or sponsor up to 2 targeted community outreach/engagement event during the fiscal year. To confirm their eligibility, the potentially-eligible communities must produce a clear and comprehensive outreach plan explaining their FY17 outreach goals and planned expectations so that the selected activities can be coordinated with the appropriate ICANN Regional engagement teams. The recommended submission target date for those community plans is to be set at 30 September 2016.

Staff to develop/modify program parameters and calendars to effectively manage the provision of these resources. CROPP to continue in FY17 with modifications for GNSO: Election 4 trips or 2 outreach events at 7500 USD a piece. The At-Large community has demonstrated effective use of the program to date and those trip allocations will remain unchanged for FY17. Request FY17-08, FY17-23, FY17-30, FY17-35, FY17-40, FY17-50, FY17-52 FY17-58.

FY17-61-Publications & Media Support

Continuing existing support
(Yes)(60,000)

Continuation of FY17 support at higher level anticipating broader community use in FY17 - combining requests: FY17-41, FY17-20, FY17-09 and allowing participation by ALL SO-AC communities. As a core function of community content support in FY17, development of community outreach content will be managed by the Communications Team (within standard ICANN guidelines developed by that team). Content support will be made available on request when resources permit. Appropriate funds will be allocated to support community requests from all SO/AC communities. Independent/unilateral community efforts will not be able to be resourced.

ICANN Communications team will manage this resource and implement community media & publications requests as possible within allocated 60,000 USD budget and within ICANN communications guidelines. In addition to individual project implementation processes, staff will establish general implementation guidelines to apply to all resourced FY17 special budget requests in this area.

Requests for funding for community-driven content projects in this area will be restricted to payments for graphic designers, videographers, stock photos or artwork, writers, printing and social media campaigns. The content resource support will not available for travel, accommodations or hospitality.

ICANN staff aims to procure optimal services at the best price, consistently through an ethical and fair selection process. ICANN staff will provide a list of approved ICANN vendors for all content projects from which community groups can choose. This resource cannot be used to reimburse a community group for work they perform themselves.

FY17-62 - Document Production Pilot Program (DDPPP)

(No)(0)(Core)

Pilot Program introduced in last quarter of FY16 based on senior executive discussions with community leaders. This resource was approved as a pilot program in FY16 for use by interested communities. Staff and pilot contractors will continue to collaborate with community leaders in the first several months of FY17 to determine if this is a resource that can be effective for the community and effectively managed by staff. Budgeted for in Policy Team FY17 520 budget. Resource also to also be used to test elements of requests FY17-10 and FY17-37.

FY17-63 Consolidated GNSO Secretariat Support Requests (GNSO Secretariat Pilot Program)

(No)(0) (Core)

Staff will continue the FY15 pilot effort for a new 12-month period. ICANN staff will provide and manage part-time in-kind support on a pilot basis for administrative staff support resources to non-contracted GNSO communities (equivalent of approximately 12 hours a week of support per community) in FY17. Funds will not be provided directly to the community. Support will be offered on a "functional" basis and managed by the ICANN staff (i.e., specific staff assigned to specific functions like elections, telephone support, etc.). Staff will coordinate specific points of contact for the community to ensure that requests for service are provided in a timely manner (see e.g., FY17-11, FY17-22, FY17-42). The Secretariat pilot program is budgeted in the core Policy Team budget.

FY17-64- NCPH Intersessional Meeting

(No/Core)(0) (Core)

Previous pilot programs have demonstrated the success and efficacy of this activity. ICANN staff to use community feedback and the models from the 2014, 2015 and 2016 NCPH Intersessional Meetings to plan and conduct this activity at a time mutually agreed to by staff and community - likely late January 2017. In Policy Team core budget - 520.

FY17-65- Translation/Language Services Requests

(No/Core)(0) (Core)

ICANN Language Services is available to resource a number of FY17 community proposals as part of overall Language Services core budget - based on ICANN language services guidelines. In FY17, these resources will necessarily be limited to community governance documents and other reports translated into the six UN languages. The Language Services Team should be contacted directly to assist in these areas, and will establish guidelines and timelines for addressing any of these requests. These experiences will thus inform translation resourcing requirements in future years. Live interpretation requests for ICANN meetings need to be addressed individually with the Language Services and Meetings teams to see what resources can be made available to expand interpretation community needs over time. While resources are not available in FY17 to offer substantially expanded interpretation services, opportunities may be studied or developed in FY17 (at the discretion of the Language Services Team) to identify areas for service improvements in FY18, as more information is required to establish and assess interpretation needs and resources. Implementation through Language Services team. To also be used to address elements of requests FY17-04, FY17-26 and FY17-31 above.

FY17-66 - At-Large (RALO) Assemblies

22

(Yes – 2 out of 3)(165,000 – to be counted once only)

Resources are only available to support 2 out of the 3 requested At-Large assemblies in FY17. The ALAC has the opportunity to choose between the AFRALO (FY17-47), LACRALO (FY17-53) and NARALO (FY17-54) proposals. Consideration of future community assemblies will be taken up again in FY18. It is hoped that this arrangement will give the At Large community flexibility in arranging its activities in FY17. Implementation to be managed by Policy Staff supporting the At Large community.

# # #

REFERENCE MATERIALS TO BOARD SUBMISSION No. 2016.05.15.2d

TITLE: November 2016 ICANN Meeting Venue Contracting

DETAILED ANALYSIS:

1. Background:
The ICANN Public Meeting to be held in San Juan, Puerto Rico, 29 October - 4 November 2016 must be relocated due to the outbreak of the Zika Virus. Staff has examined worldwide options, including a hosting proposal submitted by the government of India, and has identified a suitable venue for ICANN 57 on the alternate dates of 3-9 November 2016 which results in a Thursday through Wednesday pattern.

2. Discussion of Issues:
-   Board Approval: Staff is seeking board approval of the expenditures necessary to contract with an alternate venue since the October 2016 ICANN Meeting in San Juan must be relocated.

Confidential Negotiation Information

3. Potential Venues:
Confidential Negotiation Information

-   Hyderabad, India: Representatives of the government of India proposed that ICANN identify a suitable and available meeting venue in Mumbai, Delhi or Hyderabad. A site visit was conducted in April 2016. There are no suitable venues in Mumbai or Delhi. However, Hyderabad has a suitable meeting venue, the Hyderabad International Convention Centre (HICC), and available dates of 3-9 November 2016.
    - Meeting Rooms: The HICC has excellent conference facilities for an ICANN Meeting.
    - Host Hotel: The Novotel, adjacent to the HICC, will serve as host hotel for the Meeting. However, there are only 150 guest rooms available in this hotel. Everyone else will need to stay in area hotels.
    - Area Hotels: A sufficient number of hotels and serviced apartments are within 15-40 minutes of the HICC. Shuttle buses will be required.

- Food & Beverage Outlets: The HICC has a number of existing food outlets and will be creating new ones to ensure the availability of food for all delegates. There are a number of restaurants in the area that will require a short taxi ride.
- Air Travel: Air access to Hyderabad is good, however, almost all international itineraries will require a stop.
- Ground Transportation: Rajiv Gandhi International Airport is 35 km / 40 minutes from the city center and the HICC. Taxi fare is approximately US$12. A shuttle service to downtown hotels is also available for approximately US$4.
- Gala: The provision of a Gala by the Indian government is unclear at this time.
- Safety & Security: A preliminary risk assessment by ICANN security has not identified any areas of concern for Hyderabad that would require other than standard security measures provided for an ICANN Meeting.

4. Hyderabad International Convention Centre – Board Approval Required

Confidential Negotiation Information

5. Cost – Hyderabad vs. San Juan:

Confidential Negotiation Information

6. Funding of potential additional costs

Confidential Negotiation Information

Staff recommends that the board approve the expenditure (including contracting and disbursements) for the contract with the Hyderabad International Convention Centre in India.

Submitted by: Nick Tomasso
Position: VP, Meetings
Date Noted: 28 April 2016
Email: nick.tomasso@icann.org

TOTAL ENVELOPE APPROVED BY BOARD TO-DATE :   **US$12.9m**

TOTAL FY16 FORECASTED EXPENSES: **US$18.3m**

(includes 9 months actuals + 3 months forecast)

FINAL ADDITIONAL ENVELOPE TO BE APPROVED: **US$5.4M**

See details on next slide.

Reminder:

- PCST launched in Marrakech: produced Historical costs analysis and Total FY16 forecasted expenses.

FY16 USG Transition Forecast

US$ millions	FY16 March YTD	Q4 2016 Apr - June Forecast	FY 16 Forecast
Personnel	$2.7	$0.8	$3.5
T&M	$0.9	$0.1	$1.0
Other Professional Services	$0.3	$0.5	$0.9
Legal Expense	$7.1	$3.4	$10.5
Admin	$2.3	$0.1	$2.4
Total	$13.3	$5.0	$18.3

In millions, USD- unaudited - Arithmetic inconsistencies are due to rounding to the nearest million.

ICANN

FY16 USG Transition Funding

USG Stewardship Transition	Funding Approvals	YTD Approvals	Year to Date by Date	US$ Amounts	YTD Actuals by Date	Var
FY 2016 Budget	$6.9	$6.9	Jul 1 - Nov 30 Actuals	$7.5	$7.5	-$0.6
Expense Approval Singapore	$4.5	$11.4	Dec 1 - Feb 29 Actuals	$3.8	$11.3	$0.1
Expense Approval Marrakesh	$1.5	$12.9	Mar 1 - Mar 30 Actuals	$2.0	$13.3	-$0.4
Approval Needed			Apr 1 - Jun 30 Forecast	$5.0	$18.3	-$5.4

Request for Board Approval of additional envelope of US$5.4 million

In millions, USD- unaudited - Arithmetic inconsistencies are due to rounding to the nearest million.

ICANN