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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
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