

Generic Names Supporting
Organisation
Public Forum

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
- <http://www.gnsso.icann.org>

GNSO Public Forum

- WHOIS recommendation
- ICANN process for responding to changes from registry operators
- Contention for deleted names
- GNSO Council review

WHOIS Recommendation

- Registrars must ensure that registrants understand and acknowledge the current WHOIS requirements separately from the registration agreement

Process for ICANN to approve changes to proposed by registry operators

Criteria – will the change make a detrimental and material impact on the security and stability of the Internet's unique identifier systems, while fostering competition where appropriate?

Quick Look

- Changes that substantially affect the operation of the third parties will go through a public comment period before final approval
- Process to complete within a few weeks

Detailed review

- If ICANN believes that the change does have a detrimental and material impact, a thorough review will be conducted
- ICANN would appoint expert evaluator/s, collect further facts, and seek public comments
- Process to complete within a few months

Contention for deleted names

- Previously registered names often have a market value well above the standard retail price for a domain name
- A list of domain names is published by a registry along with information on the time when a name will become available
- The first-come-first-served (FCFS) model means that the first add command that reaches the registry within microseconds of the name becoming available gets the name

Add-storms – game of chance

- Registrars send as many add commands as possible to the registry to increase the probability that one of their commands will be successful for a high value domain name
- Each registrar gets the same capacity to send add commands
- Some organisations are applying for additional registrar accreditations (100s) to increase the number of add commands that can be sent
- Inefficient use of the resources of registrars, registries and ICANN – doesn't scale

Workshop – solutions discussed

- Wait List Service (will reduce the number of high value names that are made available)
- Ratio Model (no. of add commands allowed proportional to successful adds)
- Pay per command model (allows registry to scale resources to number of adds)
- Auction model (allows name to be obtained at the registry at market price)
- Combination of above

GNSO review

- External reviewer producing a report for ICANN Board
- GNSO Council conducting a self-review
- Review will be subject to public comment before being considered by the ICANN Board

GNSO self review

- Retain 3 representatives per constituency to ensure geographic coverage and sufficient resources
- Allow flexibility in setting timeframes for policy development depending on complexity of the issue

Staff support

- Improve background analysis on issue before commencing policy development
- Ensure legal analysis on recommendations prior to formal public review
- Final policy recommendations need to include policy along with necessary legal changes to contracts to put the change into effect
- Establish monitoring and enforcement mechanisms for compliance

Further improvements

- Encourage members of the ICANN community to contribute to early in the policy development process through the first public comment
- Establish key metrics for measuring success of a policy and ensure appropriate measurement and reporting systems in place