

User Involvement in the GNSO

Alan Greenberg

alan.greenberg@mcgill.ca

ICANN – Mexico City

04 March 2009

Board Request

⌘ 11 December 2008

Whereas, the Board has received varying recommendations on registrant and user involvement in the GNSO, and the issue of how to incorporate the legitimate interests of individual Internet users in constructive yet non-duplicative ways remains an open issue that affects GNSO restructuring.

*Resolved, the Board requests that members of the **GNSO community** work with members of the **ALAC/At-Large community** and representatives of **potential new "non-commercial" constituencies** to jointly develop a recommendation for the composition and organizational structure of a Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group that does not duplicate the ALAC and its supporting structures, yet ensures that the gTLD interests of individual Internet users (along with the broader non-commercial community) are effectively represented within the GNSO. This recommendation should be submitted no later than 24 January 2009 for consideration by the Board.*

Staff clarification

⌘ NCSG charter NOT the topic

⌘ Working Group agreed. Focus would be on the resolution premise:

Whereas, the Board has received varying recommendations on registrant and user involvement in the GNSO, and the issue of how to incorporate the legitimate interests of individual Internet users in constructive yet non-duplicative ways remains an open issue that affects GNSO restructuring.

Working Group Composition & Result

- ⌘ Requested and received 1 month delay

- ⌘ ALAC & At-Large

- ⌘ GNSO (NCUC, BC, RaR)

- ⌘ NC Constituency(ies) in formation

- ⌘ General consensus on final report

- ⌘ One disagreement and minority report

- ⌘ One minor discomfort with one section

User vs Registrant

⌘ Reaffirmed recommendation of July GNSO Restructuring WG to keep the current usage of *USER* instead of the BGC-recommended *REGISTRANT*.

☑ Registrants a subset of Users

☑ Constituency/Stakeholder Group members could be individuals in addition to “entity users” as in the current Bylaws.

ALAC vs Users in GNSO

- ⌘ ALAC focus much wider than gTLDs
- ⌘ GNSO involvement requires significant gTLD interest and resource commitment
- ⌘ Difference is not one of who you are, but what your interests are.

Involvement

- ⌘ GNSO requires major involvement
- ⌘ Not easy to attract such committed players who do not have a financial stake in gTLDs
- ⌘ To be successful:
 - ☑ Minimize overhead of participation
 - ☑ Potential new players must believe they have a chance of influencing policy outcomes

Recommendations

1. Be receptive to users and those speaking on their behalf (both Comm and non-Comm).
2. Make sure new constituencies can (and believe they can) be effective.
3. To attract new players, streamline the processes and do active outreach and publicity (implies investment).

Report

⌘ <http://tinyurl.com/cefe74>