

Report of Public Comments

Title:	Potential Postponement of the GNSO Review		
Publication Date:	XX September 2013		
Prepared By:	Larisa Gurnick		
Comment Period:		Important Information Links	
Comment Open Date:	15 July 2013		Announcement
Comment Close Date:	15 August 2013		Public Comment Box
Reply Close Date:	6 September 2013		View Comments Submitted
Time (UTC):	23:59 UTC		Report of Public Comments
Staff Contact:	Alice Jansen	Email:	Alice.Jansen@icann.org
Section I: General Overview and Next Steps			
<p>The Board Structural Improvements Committee (SIC) is considering recommending to the ICANN Board of Directors that the review of the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO), which is mandated by ICANN Bylaws Article IV, Section 4, be postponed and that a new schedule for the review be established within the next 6 months. The SIC seeks comments from the ICANN Community to better form its recommendation or to reconsider its recommendation. The SIC is considering this recommendation because there are two substantial, relevant activities that have commenced. They are the second Affirmation of Commitments (AoC) Accountability and Transparency Review (ATRT2) and ICANN's Strategic Planning Process.</p> <p>The SIC seeks comments from the ICANN Community to better form its recommendation or to reconsider its recommendation. The SIC is particularly interested in comments that are in response to the following question: <i>Are there other factors that the SIC should consider with regard to this recommendation?</i></p> <p>The SIC will consider the feedback received from the community and will make a recommendation to the ICANN Board of Directors regarding the timing of the next GNSO review.</p>			
Section II: Contributors			
<p><i>At the time this report was prepared, a total of [number] (n) community submissions had been posted to the Forum. The contributors, both individuals and organizations/groups, are listed below in chronological order by posting date with initials noted. To the extent that quotations are used in the foregoing narrative (Section III), such citations will reference the contributor's initials.</i></p>			
<u>Organizations and Groups:</u>			
Name	Submitted by	Initials	

Brand Registry Group	Philip Sheppard	BRG
Google	Aparna Sridhar	GOOGLE
Internet Service Provider and Connectivity Providers	Tony Holmes	ISPCP
Not-for-Profit Operational Constituency	Mlemineur	NPOC
Non Commercial Stakeholder Group	Avri Doria	NCSG
Intellectual Property Constituency	Claudio Di Gangi	IPC
Business Constituency	Steve DelBianco	BC
ARI Registry Services	Donna Austin	ARI

Individuals:

Name	Affiliation (if provided)	Initials

Section III: Summary of Comments

General Disclaimer: This section is intended to broadly and comprehensively summarize the comments submitted to this Forum, but not to address every specific position stated by each contributor. Staff 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).

Seven out of the eight responders indicated that the GNSO Review should not be postponed. The reasons cited included:

- Much has changed since the last review was launched in 2006. The expansion of the TLD space has increased the number and variety of stakeholders participating in GNSO policy making and a review needs to take place on schedule to examine whether the current model meets the needs of a new generation of stakeholders and allows productive discussion and resolution of emerging issues.
- GNSO Structure is unlikely to accommodate the anticipated new stream of stakeholders resulting from the expansion of the TLD space. The GNSO Review will be an important vehicle for considering and addressing this issue.
- As a result of the new gTLD program many more players within the existing structure will qualify for membership of other Constituencies than was previously the case. In addition players from other Support Organisations will also wish to participate in GNSO activities. The unbalance that is already occurring needs to be addressed by the GNSO review.
- The prior review took many years to implement. Responders stressed the need to minimize the length of the GNSO Review process in general, to provide a more efficient, responsive and effective review of the GNSO for the entire ICANN community.
- The work being undertaken by the ATRT 2 in assessing the policy development process or the Strategic Planning process will not address the stated issues in any substantive way.

One responder, the Brand Registry Group did not offer an opinion on whether the Review should be postponed. It requested reassurance from the ICANN Board that there is no linkage between the timing for the BRG to be involved in ICANN policy development in a voting and representative capacity, and any decision

on the postponement of the GNSO review.

Section IV: Analysis of Comments

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

The analysis of comments indicates that community is not in favor of the GNSO review postponement and believes that the review should take place as mandated by the Bylaws, in the most efficient and expeditious way, in order to address the changing needs of stakeholders and evaluate whether the current GNSO structure can meet these changing needs in the future.