

January 27, 2014

Dr. Stephen D. Crocker  
Board Chair  
Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers

Mr. Fadi Chehadé  
President & CEO  
Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers

Dear Steve and Fadi:

As you are aware, many of our members have closely followed and participated in the evolving Internet governance discussions that were recently energized by the Montevideo I\* meeting and statement, the Global Multistakeholder Meeting on the Future of Internet Governance in Brazil (Brazil Meeting), and the formation of the /1net framework at the Bali IGF meeting. While we understand the difficulty in trying to determine “representation” when leading into a meeting as important and as hastily planned as the Brazil Meeting, we are very concerned with the current representation model being presented through the /1net listserv.

Specifically, we are dismayed that, at this stage of /1net formation and planning for the Brazil Meeting, there is a lack of domain name industry representation -- an industry with a critical role in the Internet infrastructure and with significant interest in the myriad issues represented by the umbrella term “Internet Governance.”

While ICANN is a key founder of the Brazil Meeting, and will be one of its co-sponsors, it has not ensured adequate representation from the constituencies that its charter regulates and whose customers fund ICANN’s operations and its ability to initiate and support such meetings.

We note that the /1net construct of representation for “civil society,” “academia,” “technical,” and “business” makes it difficult for those stakeholders who directly operate and maintain key parts of the Internet to have a voice as we fall into several categories. While we understand that this model is one frequently used by the United Nations, we strongly believe that a technology as multifaceted as the Internet deserves a more flexible and inclusive representation model when determining who should have a voice in critical global policy decisions.

Unfortunately, it appears that the two possible avenues for participation, the “technical community” or the “business community,” have already been foreclosed. We understand that each group needed to determine its own way of nominating its representatives; however, this process was almost entirely closed for Internet businesses responsible for the provisioning of domain names and the DNS. ICC-

BASIS was allocated or assumed sole responsibility for nominating business representatives for the Brazil Steering Committees, a group which we do not feel is sufficiently representative of Internet business. ICC-Basis is a membership-driven organization whose members were the only ones considered to serve on various planning committees. To our knowledge, ICC-BASIS did not advertise or solicit input beyond its own members.

We understand there may be one available slot among the business representatives, and we think it is important that a domain name industry representative fill that slot regardless of its role within ICC-BASIS.

We know that ICANN has created a cross—constituency working group to deal with some of our concerns mentioned above; however, we also know that nothing can replace being able to directly influence processes at their source. We also understand that ICANN is not solely responsible for the organization of the Brazil Summit, but we know that ICANN has been a key player in shepherding this process and clearly has input into its direction. In doing so, please do not forget the Multistakeholder model that ICANN represents and endeavor to ensure that full representation at the Brazil meeting is met.

TLD registries and registrars operate key Internet infrastructure that supports the provision of websites and information globally. Every name query is resolved through TLD hardware. Governance discussions must take into account the effects different models might have on infrastructure operations, costs and markets. Developing governance models without real-time access to those that can foretell the technical and market effects of those models has the possible consequence of making the discussion ineffectual. There must be at least one high-level member with fast access to the types of expertise needed to inform discussions, test hypotheses and provide rapid, competent input. If we want to have an effective and meaningful Internet Governance discussion, the discussion must be truly representative.

The Registries Stakeholder Group and the Registrars Stakeholder Group jointly request the opportunity to identify a representative from ICANN's GNSO Contracted Party House to participate among the key organizers of the Brazil Meeting.

We will continue to work within the framework provided, but the framework (that includes "multi-stakeholder" as its defining quality) should be adjusted in order to ensure participation from an integral part of the community.

Sincerely,

Keith Drazek  
Chair  
Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG)

Michele Neylon  
Chair  
Registrars Stakeholder Group (RrSG)