

Generic Names Supporting Organisation

Dr Bruce Tonkin
Chair, GNSO Council

GNSO Purpose

- Responsible for developing and recommending to the ICANN Board substantive policies relating to generic top-level domains
- com, net, org, biz, info, aero, coop, museum, pro, name

Theme of this report

- Better decision making
- Think about why there is so much litigation
- Litigation = use another decision making process
- Think about why the Roman empire fell – watch some movies – Gladiator, Star Wars, The Matrix

Process

- Public input
- Policy development and analysis
- Council/Board/staff decision
- Appeal
- Implementation
- Compliance
- Review outcomes

Public input

- Less public speaking
- More data collection
- WHOIS attempting to move to data collection – but little support so far
- Structured questions are a good start
- Process needs Manager of Public Participation = forensic scientist
- PLEASE HELP

Policy development and analysis

- Less public speaking
- More analysis
- Currently working on approval process for changes in gtld services
- Need staff support with strong analytical and writing skills
- Either spend the money now or later in court
- Seek the Return of the Jedi to ICANN

Decision

- Need clear criteria
- Need to be able to measure if decision was right – need measurable objective
- Clearly document basis for decision
- Set up mechanism to measure success later

Wait List Service decision

- Sept 2001 – issues of recycling domain names first raised
- April 2002 – General Counsel analysis of WLS
- April 2002 – Transfers Task force commences analysis
- June 2002 – Board requests Names Council input
- July 2002 – Names Council approves report recommending (with dissenting views) (a) that VeriSign's request be rejected and (b) that if it is approved various conditions be incorporated
- August 2002 – Board authorised staff to complete negotiations with Verisign to offer WLS
- March 2004 – “WLS Negotiations” on Board agenda

Appeal

- Less public speaking
- Focus on whether the correct process was followed

Implementation

- Less public speaking
- Not an extended appeal process
- Little experience of this in ICANN
- WHOIS, Transfers, Deletes – mostly not implemented
- New gtlds and Redemption Grace Period was implemented
- Need more implementers and less policy developers involved in this stage
- Build measurement, reporting, compliance monitoring
- Need staff resources – otherwise ICANN pointless

Compliance

- Might be worth trying
- An important part of civilisation is there are consequences for not complying
- Consider at policy development stage
- Need to be able to clearly measure whether a party is complying
- **BUILD INDUSTRY REPUTATION**

Review outcomes

- Less public speaking
- Plan review during policy development
- Define measures of success
- Establish measurement systems
- Review data

Conclusion

- Improve decision making
- Resource entire process up front instead of spending on litigation later
- Reconsider funding models
- Establish overall measures for ICANN's success
- One more important slide

Thanks

- Elisabeth Porteneuve
- CcTld liaison to GNSO Council
- One of those with analytical skills who has made a significant contribution to policy development
- The GNSO thanks her for her contributions to the GNSO over a long period of time