



Joint SO/AC Working Group (WG) Charter

WG Name:	Consumer Choice, Competition and Innovation Working Group (CCI)
-----------------	--

Section I: Working Group Identification

Chartering Organization(s):	GNSO Council, ALAC, CCNSO and GAC (as applicable)
Charter Approval Date:	
Name of WG Chair:	[Interim Chair- Rosemary Sinclair]
Name(s) of Appointed Liaison(s):	Rosemary Sinclair
WG Workspace URL:	
WG Mailing List:	
Important Document Links:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • {Doc1} • {Doc2} • {Doc3} • {Doc4}

Section II: Mission, Purpose, and Deliverables

Mission & Scope:

The WG aims to develop a report for consideration by SOs/ACs in developing their response to the request arising from the following Board resolution (2010.12.10.30):

Whereas, the area of consumer choice, competition and innovation is one of the strategic areas for ICANN in the 2010 to 2013 strategy plan <<http://www.icann.org/en/strategic-plan/strategic-plan-2010-2013-19feb10-en.pdf>>.

-

Whereas, ICANN has committed to promoting competition, consumer trust and consumer choice in the Affirmation of Commitments <<http://www.icann.org/en/documents/affirmation-of-commitments-30sep09-en.htm>>.

Whereas, if and when new gTLDs (whether in ASCII or other language character sets) have been in operation for one year, ICANN has committed to organize a review that will examine the extent to which the introduction or expansion of gTLDs has promoted competition, consumer trust and consumer choice.

Resolved (2010.12.10.30), the ICANN Board requests advice from the ALAC, GAC, GNSO and

ccNSO on establishing the definition, measures, and three year targets for those measures, for competition, consumer trust and consumer choice in the context of the domain name system, such advice to be provided for discussion at the ICANN International Public meeting in San Francisco from 13-18 March 2011.

Objectives & Goals:

To produce a report to be given to each of the AC/SOs for their consideration. The Working Group Report could be considered by GNSO, ccNSO, GAC and ALAC in forwarding advice to the ICANN in response to the Board Resolution (2010.12.10.30). Each AC/SO may act independently on the Working Group Report, and may endorse all, part, or none of the report findings. .

Deliverables & Timeframes:

The CCI WG is expected to carry out the activities identified in this Charter in order to produce an Update Report to the GNSO Council by the ICANN Dakar Meeting.

Section III: Formation, Staffing, and Organization

Membership Criteria:

The CCI WG will be open to all interested in participating from the GNSO, CCNSO, At-Large, and GAC.

Group Formation, Dependencies, & Dissolution:

It is desired that this WG be formed as a Joint Working Group, with members of the GNSO, CCNSO, At-Large, and GAC participate, assuming that each such group approves of the terms of this Charter as specified in Section II above. If this Charter is not approved by such SO/ACs, the CCI WG should continue to proceed as a GNSO chartered Working Group to produce the Report.

Working Group Roles, Functions, & Duties:

The CCI WG shall not communicate directly with the ICANN Board regarding its work product developed under this Charter.

The ICANN Staff assigned to the CCI WG will fully support the work of the committee as directed by the Chair including meeting support, document drafting, editing and distribution and other substantive contributions when deemed appropriate.

Staff assignments to the CCI WG :

- GNSO Secretariat
- 1 ICANN policy staff member- (Margie Milam)

The standard WG roles, functions & duties shall be applicable as specified in Section 2.2 of the Working Group Guidelines. The CCI-WG shall follow the GNSO Working Group Guidelines.

Statements of Interest (SOI) Guidelines:

Each member of the CCI-WG from the GNSO is required to submit an SOI in accordance with Section 5 of the GNSO Operating Procedures.

Section IV: Rules of Engagement

Decision-Making Methodologies:

{Note: The following material was extracted from the Working Group Guidelines, Section 3.6. If a Chartering Organization wishes to deviate from the standard methodology for making decisions or empower the WG to decide its own decision-making methodology, this section should be amended as appropriate}.

The Chair will be responsible for designating each position as having one of the following designations:

- **Full consensus** - when no one in the group speaks against the recommendation in its last readings. This is also sometimes referred to as **Unanimous Consensus**.
- **Consensus** - a position where only a small minority disagrees, but most agree. *[Note: For those that are unfamiliar with ICANN usage, you may associate the definition of 'Consensus' with other definitions and terms of art such as rough consensus or near consensus. It should be noted, however, that in the case of a GNSO PDP originated Working Group, all reports, especially Final Reports, must restrict themselves to the term 'Consensus' as this may have legal implications.]*
- **Strong support but significant opposition** - a position where, while most of the group supports a recommendation, there are a significant number of those who do not support it.
- **Divergence** (also referred to as **No Consensus**) - a position where there isn't strong support for any particular position, but many different points of view. Sometimes this is due to irreconcilable differences of opinion and sometimes it is due to the fact that no one has a particularly strong or convincing viewpoint, but the members of the group agree that it is worth listing the issue in the report nonetheless.
- **Minority View** - refers to a proposal where a small number of people support the recommendation. This can happen in response to a **Consensus**, **Strong support but significant opposition**, and **No Consensus**; or, it can happen in cases where there is neither support nor opposition to a suggestion made by a small number of individuals.

In cases of **Consensus**, **Strong support but significant opposition**, and **No Consensus**, an effort should be made to document that variance in viewpoint and to present any **Minority View** recommendations that may have been made. Documentation of **Minority View** recommendations normally depends on text offered by the proponent(s). In all cases of **Divergence**, the WG Chair should encourage the submission of minority viewpoint(s).

The recommended method for discovering the consensus level designation on recommendations should work as follows:

- i. After the group has discussed an issue long enough for all issues to have been raised, understood and discussed, the Chair, or Co-Chairs, make an evaluation of the designation and publish it for the group to review.
- ii. After the group has discussed the Chair's estimation of designation, the Chair, or Co-Chairs, should reevaluate and publish an updated evaluation.
- iii. Steps (i) and (ii) should continue until the Chair/Co-Chairs make an evaluation that is accepted by the group.
- iv. In rare case, a Chair may decide that the use of polls is reasonable. Some of the reasons for this might be:
 - o A decision needs to be made within a time frame that does not allow for the natural process of iteration and settling on a designation to occur.
 - o It becomes obvious after several iterations that it is impossible to arrive at a designation. This will happen most often when trying to discriminate between **Consensus** and **Strong support but Significant Opposition** or between **Strong support but Significant Opposition** and **Divergence**.

Care should be taken in using polls that they do not become votes. A liability with the use of polls is that, in situations where there is **Divergence** or **Strong Opposition**, there are often disagreements about the meanings of the poll questions or of the poll results.

Based upon the WG's needs, the Chair may direct that WG participants do not have to have their name explicitly associated with any Full Consensus or Consensus view/position. However, in all other cases and in those cases where a group member represents the minority viewpoint, their name must be explicitly linked, especially in those cases where polls were taken.

Consensus calls should always involve the entire Working Group and, for this reason, should take place on the designated mailing list to ensure that all Working Group members have the opportunity to fully participate in the consensus process. It is the role of the Chair to designate which level of consensus is reached and announce this designation to the Working Group. Member(s) of the Working Group should be able to challenge the designation of the Chair as part of the Working Group discussion. However, if disagreement persists, members of the WG may use the process set forth below to challenge the designation.

If several participants (see Note 1 below) in a WG disagree with the designation given to a position by the Chair or any other consensus call, they may follow these steps sequentially:

1. Send email to the Chair, copying the WG explaining why the decision is believed to be in error.
2. If the Chair still disagrees with the complainants, the Chair will forward the appeal to the CO liaison(s). The Chair must explain his or her reasoning in the response to the complainants and in the submission to the liaison. If the liaison(s) supports the Chair's position, the liaison(s) will provide their response to the complainants. The liaison(s) must explain their reasoning in the response. If the CO liaison disagrees with the Chair, the liaison will forward the appeal to the CO. Should the complainants disagree with

the liaison support of the Chair’s determination, the complainants may appeal to the Chair of the CO or their designated representative. If the CO agrees with the complainants’ position, the CO should recommend remedial action to the Chair.

3. In the event of any appeal, the CO will attach a statement of the appeal to the WG and/or Board report. This statement should include all of the documentation from all steps in the appeals process and should include a statement from the CO (see Note 2 below).

Note 1: Any Working Group member may raise an issue for reconsideration; however, a formal appeal will require that a single member demonstrates a sufficient amount of support before a formal appeal process can be invoked. In those cases where a single Working Group member is seeking reconsideration, the member will advise the Chair and/or Liaison of their issue and the Chair and/or Liaison will work with the dissenting member to investigate the issue and to determine if there is sufficient support for the reconsideration to initial a formal appeal process.

Note 2: It should be noted that ICANN also has other conflict resolution mechanisms available that could be considered in case any of the parties are dissatisfied with the outcome of this process.

Status Reporting:

As requested by the GNSO Council Chair/Vice Chairs.

Problem/Issue Escalation & Resolution Processes:

{Note: the following material was extracted from Sections 3.4, 3.5, and 3.7 of the Working Group Guidelines and may be modified by the Chartering Organization at its discretion}

The WG will adhere to [ICANN’s Expected Standards of Behavior](#) as documented in Section F of the ICANN Accountability and Transparency Frameworks and Principles, January 2008.

If a WG member feels that these standards are being abused, the affected party should appeal first to the Chair and Liaison and, if unsatisfactorily resolved, to the Chair of the Chartering Organization or their designated representative. It is important to emphasize that expressed disagreement is not, by itself, grounds for abusive behavior. It should also be taken into account that as a result of cultural differences and language barriers, statements may appear disrespectful or inappropriate to some but are not necessarily intended as such. However, it is expected that WG members make every effort to respect the principles outlined in ICANN’s Expected Standards of Behavior as referenced above.

The Chair, in consultation with the Chartering Organization liaison(s), is empowered to restrict the participation of someone who seriously disrupts the Working Group. Any such restriction will be reviewed by the Chartering Organization. Generally, the participant should first be warned privately, and then warned publicly before such a restriction is put into place. In extreme circumstances, this requirement may be bypassed.

Any WG member that believes that his/her contributions are being systematically ignored or discounted or wants to appeal a decision of the WG or CO should first discuss the circumstances with the WG Chair. In the event that the matter cannot be resolved satisfactorily, the WG member should request an opportunity to discuss the situation with the Chair of the Chartering Organization or their

designated representative.

In addition, if any member of the WG is of the opinion that someone is not performing their role according to the criteria outlined in this Charter, the same appeals process may be invoked.

Closure & Working Group Self-Assessment:

--

Section V: Charter Document History

Version	Date	Description
1.0	13 July 2011	First Draft (Margie Milam)
2.0		Steve Del Bianco Revisions
3.0	5 Sept 2011	Rosemary Sinclair Revisions
4.0	7 Sept 2011	Rosemary Sinclair revisions

Staff Contact:	Margie Milam	Email:	margie.milam@icann.org
-----------------------	--------------	---------------	------------------------

Translations: If translations will be provided please indicate the languages below:

n/a												
-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--