

ICANN BOARD PAPER NO. 2018.06.23.1b

TITLE: **Appointment of Timothy April to the Security and Stability Advisory Committee**

PROPOSED ACTION: **For Board Consideration and Approval**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Chair of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) respectfully requests the appointment of Timothy April as new Committee members.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

The Committee desires the appointment of Timothy April to the SSAC.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION:

Whereas, the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) reviews its membership and makes adjustments from time-to-time.

Whereas, the SSAC Membership Committee, on behalf of the SSAC, requests that the Board appoint Timothy April to the SSAC for a term beginning immediately upon approval of the Board and ending on 31 December 2020.

Resolved (20XX.06.23.xx), the Board appoints Timothy April to the SSAC for a term beginning immediately upon approval of the Board and ending on 31 December 2020.

PROPOSED RATIONALE:

The SSAC is a diverse group of individuals whose expertise in specific subject matters enables the SSAC to fulfil its charter and execute its mission. Since its inception, the SSAC has invited individuals with deep knowledge and experience in technical and security areas that are critical to the security and stability of the Internet's naming and address allocation systems.

The SSAC's continued operation as a competent body is dependent on the accumulation of talented subject matter experts who have consented to volunteer their time and energies to the execution of the SSAC mission.

Tim has been the Senior Architect, Information Security at Akamai Technologies Inc since August 2011 and has some prior experience in teaching and research. The expertise and skills that he would bring to the SSAC include Content Delivery Networks design, development and operation as well as DDoS and Malware analysis, detection and mitigation. Timothy also has experience with large scale nameserver (both authoritative and recursive) design, development and operations; protocol design and implementation; and general security review experience to add to the existing pool within SSAC. The SSAC believes Timothy April would be a significant contributing member of the SSAC.

This resolution is an organizational administrative function for which no public comment is required. The appointment of SSAC members is in the public interest and in furtherance of ICANN's mission as it contributes to the commitment of the ICANN to strengthen the security, stability, and resiliency of the DNS.

Submitted by: Ram Mohan

Position: Liaison to the ICANN Board from the Security & Stability
Advisory Committee

Date Noted: 1 June 2018

Email: mohan@afilias.info

ICANN BOARD PAPER NO. 2018.06.23.1c

TITLE: Transfer of the .LS (Lesotho) top-level domain to Lesotho Network Information Centre Proprietary (LSNIC)

PROPOSED ACTION: For Board Consideration on Consent Agenda

IANA REFERENCE: 1111090

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

As part of PTI's responsibilities under the IANA Naming Function contract with ICANN, PTI has prepared a recommendation to authorize the transfer of the country-code top-level domain .LS (Lesotho) to Lesotho Network Information Centre Proprietary (LSNIC).

Sensitive Delegation Information

PROPOSED RESOLUTION:

Resolved (2018.06.23.xx), as part of the exercise of its responsibilities under the IANA Naming Function Contract with ICANN, PTI has reviewed and evaluated the request to transfer the .LS country-code top-level domain to Lesotho Network Information Centre Proprietary (LSNIC). The documentation demonstrates that the proper procedures were followed in evaluating the request.

PROPOSED RATIONALE:

Why the Board is addressing the issue now?

In accordance with the IANA Naming Function Contract, PTI has evaluated a request for ccTLD transfer and is presenting its report to the Board for review. This review by the Board is intended to ensure that the proper procedures were followed.

What is the proposal being considered?

The proposal is to approve a request to transfer the country-code top-level domain .LS and assign the role of manager to Lesotho Network Information Centre Proprietary (LSNIC).

Which stakeholders or others were consulted?

In the course of evaluating this transfer application, PTI consulted with the applicant and other significantly interested parties. As part of the application process, the applicant needs to describe consultations that were performed within the country concerning the ccTLD, and their applicability to their local Internet community.

What concerns or issues were raised by the community?

PTI is not aware of any significant issues or concerns raised by the community in relation to this request.

What significant materials did the Board review?

The Board reviewed the following evaluations:

- The domain is eligible for transfer, as the string under consideration represents Lesotho in the ISO 3166-1 standard;
- The relevant government has been consulted and does not object;
- The proposed manager and its contacts agree to their responsibilities for managing this domain;
- The proposal has demonstrated appropriate significantly interested parties' consultation and support;
- The proposal does not contravene any known laws or regulations;
- The proposal ensures the domain is managed locally in the country, and are bound under local law;

- The proposed manager has confirmed they will manage the domain in a fair and equitable manner;
- The proposed manager has demonstrated appropriate operational and technical skills and plans to operate the domain;
- The proposed technical configuration meets the technical conformance requirements;
- No specific risks or concerns relating to Internet stability have been identified; and
- Staff have provided a recommendation that this request be implemented based on the factors considered.

These evaluations are responsive to the appropriate criteria and policy frameworks, such as "Domain Name System Structure and Delegation" (RFC 1591) and "GAC Principles and Guidelines for the Delegation and Administration of Country Code Top Level Domains".

As part of the process, Delegation and Transfer reports are posted at <http://www.iana.org/reports>.

What factors the Board found to be significant?

The Board did not identify any specific factors of concern with this request.

Are there positive or negative community impacts?

The timely approval of country-code domain name managers that meet the various public interest criteria is positive toward ICANN's overall mission, the local communities to which country-code top-level domains are designated to serve, and responsive to obligations under the IANA Naming Function Contract.

Are there financial impacts or ramifications on ICANN (strategic plan, operating plan, budget); the community; and/or the public?

The administration of country-code delegations in the DNS root zone is part of the IANA functions, and the delegation action should not cause any significant variance on pre-planned expenditure. It is not the role of ICANN to assess the financial impact of the internal operations of country-code top-level domains within a country.

Are there any security, stability or resiliency issues relating to the DNS?

ICANN does not believe this request poses any notable risks to security, stability or resiliency. This is an Organizational Administrative Function not requiring public comment.

SIGNATURE BLOCK:

Submitted by: Naela Sarras
Position: Sr. Manager, IANA Services
Date Noted: 5 June 2018
Email: naela.sarras@icann.org

ICANN BOARD SUBMISSION No. 2018.06.23.1d

TITLE: **March 2020 ICANN Meeting Venue Contracting**

PROPOSED ACTION: **For Board Consideration and Action**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Board is being asked to authorize ICANN organization to take all steps necessary to complete contracting for the host venue in Cancun, Mexico for the March 2020 ICANN Public Meeting, which requires Board approval as it will exceed US\$500,000. The Reference Materials for this paper summarizes the steps taken to locate a site for the March 2020 Public Meeting and outlines the facility costs.

As adopted in the November 2016 modifications to ICANN's Delegation of Authority Guidelines, it is the responsibility of the ICANN President and CEO and Senior Management to identify and select sites for ICANN's Public Meetings within the budget and meetings strategy approved by the Board.

ICANN ORGANIZATION RECOMMENDATION:

ICANN organization recommends that the Board delegate to the President and CEO, or his designee(s), the authority to take all actions necessary to enter into a contract, and make expense disbursements pursuant to that contract, for the host venue in Cancun, Mexico, where ICANN will hold the March 2020 Public Meeting.

BOARD FINANCE COMMITTEE (BFC) RECOMMENDATION

The BFC recommends that the Board delegate to the President and CEO, or his designee(s), the authority to take all actions necessary to enter into a contract, and make expense disbursements pursuant to that contract, for the host venue in Cancun, Mexico, where ICANN will hold its March 2020 Public Meeting.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION:

Whereas, ICANN intends to hold its first Public Meeting of 2020 in the Latin American/Caribbean region.

Whereas, ICANN org has completed a thorough review of the proposed venues in Latin American/Caribbean region and finds the one in Cancun, Mexico to be the most suitable.

Resolved (2018.06.23.xx), the Board authorizes the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to engage in and facilitate all necessary contracting and disbursements for the host venue for the March 2020 ICANN Public Meeting in Cancun, Mexico, in an amount not to exceed ^{Confidential Negotiation Information}

Resolved (2018.06.23.xx), specific items within this resolution shall remain confidential for negotiation purposes pursuant to Article III, section 5.2 of the ICANN Bylaws until the President and CEO determines that the confidential information may be released.

PROPOSED RATIONALE:

As part of ICANN's Public Meeting schedule, presently three times a year, ICANN hosts a meeting in a different geographic region (as defined in the ICANN Bylaws). ICANN67, scheduled for 7-12 March 2020, is to occur in the Latin American/Caribbean geographic region. A call for recommendations for the location of the meeting in Latin American/Caribbean was posted on 15 July 2016. Various parties sent proposals to ICANN.

The ICANN org performed a thorough analysis of the proposals, as well as other venues, and prepared a paper to identify those that met the Meeting Location Selection Criteria (see <http://meetings.icann.org/location-selection-criteria>). Based on the proposals and analysis, ICANN has identified Cancun, Mexico as the location for ICANN67.

The Board reviewed ICANN org's briefing for hosting the meeting in Cancun, Mexico and the determination that the proposal met the significant factors of the Meeting Location Selection Criteria, as well as the related costs for the facilities selected, for the March 2020 ICANN Public Meeting. The Board agrees.

Taking this step towards contracting is in the fulfilment of ICANN's mission and in the public interest to ensure that ICANN org is utilizing the right third party providers, and to ensure that it is maximizing available resources in a cost-efficient and effective manner. This action will benefit ICANN's mission to ensure the security, stability and resiliency of the domain name system.

There will be a financial impact on ICANN in hosting the meeting and providing travel support as necessary, as well as on the community in incurring costs to travel to the meeting. But such impact would be faced regardless of the location and venue of the meeting and will be accounted for in the appropriate budget. This action will have no impact on the security or the stability of the DNS.

The Board thanks all who recommended sites for ICANN67.

This is an Organizational Administrative function that does not require public comment.

Submitted by: Nick Tomasso
Position: VP, Global Meeting Operations
Date Noted: 25 May 2018
Email: nick.tomasso@icann.org

ICANN BOARD SUBMISSION No. 2018.06.23.1e

TITLE: **June 2020 ICANN Meeting Venue Contracting**

PROPOSED ACTION: **For Board Consideration and Action**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Board is being asked to authorize ICANN organization to take all steps necessary to complete contracting for the host venue and hotels in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia for the June 2020 ICANN Public Meeting, which requires Board approval as it will exceed US\$500,000. The Reference Materials for this paper summarizes the steps taken to locate a site for the June 2020 Public Meeting and outlines the facility costs.

As adopted in the November 2016 modifications to ICANN's Delegation of Authority Guidelines, it is the responsibility of the ICANN CEO and Senior Management to identify and select sites for ICANN's Public Meetings within the budget and meetings strategy approved by the Board.

ICANN ORGANIZATION'S RECOMMENDATION:

ICANN organization recommends that the Board delegate to the President and CEO, or his designee(s), the authority to take all actions necessary to enter into the contracts, and make expense disbursements pursuant to those contracts, for the host venue and hotels in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, where ICANN will hold the June 2020 Public Meeting.

BOARD FINANCE COMMITTEE (BFC) RECOMMENDATION:

The BFC recommends that the Board delegate to the President and CEO, or his designee(s), the authority to take all actions necessary to enter into the contracts, and make expense disbursements pursuant to those contracts, for the host venue and hotels in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, where ICANN will hold its June 2020 Public Meeting.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION:

Whereas, ICANN intends to hold its second Public Meeting of 2020 in the Asia Pacific region.

Whereas, ICANN org has completed a thorough review of the proposed venues in Asia Pacific region and finds the one in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia to be the most suitable.

Resolved (2018.06.23.xx), the Board authorizes the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to engage in and facilitate all necessary contracting and disbursements for the host venue and hotels for the June 2020 ICANN Public Meeting in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, in an amount not to exceed
Confidential Negotiation Information

Resolved (2018.06.23.xx), specific items within this resolution shall remain confidential for negotiation purposes pursuant to Article III, section 5.2 of the ICANN Bylaws until the President and CEO determines that the confidential information may be released.

PROPOSED RATIONALE:

As part of ICANN's Public Meeting schedule, presently three times a year, ICANN hosts a meeting in a different geographic region (as defined in the ICANN Bylaws). ICANN68, scheduled for 22-25 June 2020, is to occur in the Asia Pacific geographic region. A call for recommendations for the location of the meeting in the Asia Pacific region was posted on 15 July 2016. Various parties sent proposals to ICANN.

The ICANN org performed a thorough analysis of the proposals, as well as other venues, and prepared a paper to identify those that met the Meeting Location Selection Criteria (see <http://meetings.icann.org/location-selection-criteria>). Based on the proposals and analysis, ICANN has identified Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia as the location for ICANN68.

The Board reviewed ICANN org's briefing for hosting the meeting in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia and the determination that the proposal met the significant factors of the Meeting Location Selection Criteria, as well as the related costs for the facilities selected, for the June 2020 ICANN Public Meeting. The Board agrees.

Taking this step towards contracting is in the fulfilment of ICANN's mission and in the public interest to ensure that ICANN org is utilizing the right third party providers, and to ensure that it is maximizing available resources in a cost-efficient and effective

manner. This action will benefit ICANN's mission to ensure the security, stability and resiliency of the domain name system.

There will be a financial impact on ICANN in hosting the meeting and providing travel support as necessary, as well as on the community in incurring costs to travel to the meeting. But such impact would be faced regardless of the location and venue of the meeting and will be accounted for in the appropriate budget. This action will have no impact on the security or the stability of the DNS.

The Board thanks all who recommended sites for ICANN68.

This is an Organizational Administrative function that does not require public comment.

Submitted by:	Nick Tomasso
Position:	VP, Global Meeting Operations
Date Noted:	25 May 2018
Email:	nick.tomasso@icann.org

ICANN BOARD SUBMISSION No. 2018.06.23.1f

TITLE: **October 2020 ICANN Meeting Venue Contracting**

PROPOSED ACTION: **For Board Consideration and Action**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Board is being asked to authorize ICANN organization to take all steps necessary to complete contracting for the host venue and hotel in Hamburg, Germany for the October 2020 ICANN Public Meeting, which requires Board approval as it will exceed US\$500,000. The Reference Materials for this paper summarizes the steps taken to locate a site for the October 2020 Public Meeting and outlines the facility costs.

As adopted in the November 2016 modifications to ICANN's Delegation of Authority Guidelines, it is the responsibility of the ICANN President and CEO and Senior Management to identify and select sites for ICANN's Public Meetings within the budget and meetings strategy approved by the Board.

ICANN ORGANIZATION RECOMMENDATION:

ICANN organization recommends that the Board delegate to the President and CEO, or his designee(s), the authority to take all actions necessary to enter into the contracts, and make expense disbursements pursuant to those contracts, for the host venue and hotel in Hamburg, Germany, where ICANN will hold the October 2020 Public Meeting.

BOARD FINANCE COMMITTEE (BFC) RECOMMENDATION:

The BFC recommends that the Board delegate to the President and CEO, or his designee(s), the authority to take all actions necessary to enter into the contracts, and make expense disbursements pursuant to those contracts, for the host venue and hotel in Hamburg, Germany, where ICANN will hold its October 2020 Public Meeting.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION:

Whereas, ICANN intends to hold its third Public Meeting of 2020 in the European region.

Whereas, ICANN organization has completed a thorough review of the proposed venues in the European region and finds the one in Hamburg, Germany to be the most suitable.

Resolved (2018.06.23.xx), the Board authorizes the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to engage in and facilitate all necessary contracting and disbursements for the host venue and hotel for the October 2020 ICANN Public Meeting in Hamburg, Germany, in an amount not to exceed Confidential Negotiation Information

Resolved (2018.06.23.xx), specific items within this resolution shall remain confidential for negotiation purposes pursuant to Article III, section 5.2 of the ICANN Bylaws until the President and CEO determines that the confidential information may be released.

PROPOSED RATIONALE:

As part of ICANN’s Public Meeting schedule, presently three times a year, ICANN hosts a meeting in a different geographic region (as defined in the ICANN Bylaws). ICANN69, scheduled for 17-23 October 2020, is to occur in the European geographic region. A call for recommendations for the location of the meeting in Europe was posted on 15 July 2016. Various parties sent proposals to ICANN.

ICANN organization performed a thorough analysis of the proposals, as well as other venues, and prepared a paper to identify those that met the Meeting Location Selection Criteria (see <http://meetings.icann.org/location-selection-criteria>). Based on the proposals and analysis, ICANN has identified Hamburg, Germany as the location for ICANN69.

The Board reviewed ICANN organization’s briefing for hosting the meeting in Hamburg, Germany and its determination that the proposal met the significant factors of the Meeting Location Selection Criteria, as well as the related costs for the facilities selected, for the October 2020 ICANN Public Meeting. The Board agrees.

Taking this step towards contracting is in the fulfilment of ICANN's mission and in the public interest to ensure that ICANN org is utilizing the right third party providers, and to ensure that it is maximizing available resources in a cost-efficient and effective

manner. This action will benefit ICANN's mission to ensure the security, stability and resiliency of the domain name system.

There will be a financial impact on ICANN in hosting the meeting and providing travel support as necessary, as well as on the community in incurring costs to travel to the meeting. But such impact would be faced regardless of the location and venue of the meeting and will be accounted for in the appropriate budget. This action will have no impact on the security or the stability of the DNS.

The Board thanks all who recommended sites for ICANN69.

This is an Organizational Administrative function that does not require public comment.

Submitted by:	Nick Tomasso
Position:	VP, Global Meeting Operations
Date Noted:	25 May 2018
Email:	nick.tomasso@icann.org

ICANN BOARD PAPER NO. 2018.06.23.1g

TITLE: **Board Consideration of SSAC Recommendations from SAC047, SAC058, SAC061, SAC090, and SAC097**

PROPOSED ACTION: **For Board Consideration and Approval**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) publishes advisories with recommendations to the ICANN Board relating to matters of security and stability. The ICANN organization has evaluated the following SSAC reports for implementation feasibility and recommends that the Board accepts these advice:

- SAC047 Recommendation 2: SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model
- SAC058 Recommendation 3: SSAC Report on Domain Name Registration Data Validation
- SAC061 Recommendation 2: SSAC Comment on ICANN's Initial Report from the Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services
- SAC090 Recommendations 1, 2, 3, and 4: SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Namespace
- SAC097 Recommendations 1, 2, 3 and 4: SSAC Advisory Regarding the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) and Registry Operator Monthly Activity Reports

SAC047, SAC058, and SAC061 pre-date the Action Request Register (ARR) while SAC090 and SAC097 were issued by the SSAC since the establishment of the ARR in mid 2016.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

ICANN org recommends that the Board adopt the scorecard “ICANN Board Action for SSAC Advice Documents SAC047, SAC058, SAC061, SAC090, and SAC097 (08 June 2018)” to address the SSAC’s advice.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION:

Whereas, the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) submitted recommendations in SAC Documents: SAC047, SAC058, SAC061, SAC090, and SAC097.

Whereas, the ICANN org has evaluated the feasibility of the SSAC’s advice and developed implementation recommendations for each, or noted the completed implementation where relevant.

Whereas, the Board has considered the SSAC Advice and the ICANN org’s implementation recommendations relating to these advice.

Resolved (2018.06.23.xx), the Board adopts the scorecard titled “ICANN Board Action for SSAC Advice Documents SAC047, SAC058, SAC061, SAC090, and SAC097 (08 June 2018).” **[INSERT LINK TO FINAL SSAC ADVICE SCORECARD ADOPTED BY BOARD]**, and directs the CEO or his designee to implement the advice as described in the scorecard.

PROPOSED RATIONALE:

The Action Request Register is a framework intended to improve the process for the Board’s consideration of recommendations to the ICANN Board, including advice from ICANN Advisory Committees. This framework has been under development since 2015, and as part of the initial effort, the ICANN org reviewed SSAC Advice issued between 2010 and 2015 to identify items that had not yet received Board consideration. The results of this initial review were communicated to the SSAC Chair in a letter from the Chair of the ICANN Board on 19 October 2016 (see <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-faltstrom-19oct16->

[en.pdf](#)). This resolution is intended to address several of items that were identified as open at that time, as well as two items that have been submitted to ICANN Board and processed by the ICANN org since the inception of the ARR.

As part of the Action Request Register process, for each advice item presented with this resolution, the ICANN org has reviewed the request, confirmed its understanding of the SSAC's request with the SSAC, and evaluated the implementation feasibility of the request.

Background information on each advice document is provided below:

[SAC047](#), recommendation 2, recommends that ICANN preserve operational data about ex-registries and define a framework to share such data with the community.

[SAC058](#), recommendation 3, recommends that the ICANN community seek to identify validation techniques that can be automated.

[SAC061](#), recommendation 2, recommends that the ICANN Board ensure that a formal security risk assessment of the registration data policy be conducted as an input into the Policy Development Process.

[SAC090](#), recommendation 1, recommends that the ICANN Board take appropriate steps to establish definitive and unambiguous criteria for determining whether or not a syntactically valid domain name label could be a top-level domain name in the global DNS.

[SAC090](#), recommendation 2, recommends that the scope of work presented in recommendation 1 include at least the following issues and questions:

- 1) Should ICANN formalize in policy the status of the names listed on the reserved names listed in Section 2.2.1.2.1 and ineligible strings listed in Section 2.2.1.2.3 of the Applicant Guidebook, the two-character ISO 3166 codes proscribed by reference in Section 2.2.1.3.2 Part III of the Applicant Guidebook, the geographic names proscribed by reference in Section 2.2.1.4 of the Applicant Guidebook, the names listed in RFC 6761? If so: i) How should ICANN respond

to changes that other parties may make to lists that are recognized by ICANN but are outside the scope of ICANN's direct influence? ii) How should ICANN respond to a change in a recognized list that occurs during a round of new gTLD applications?

2) The IETF is an example of a group outside of ICANN that maintains a list of "special use" names. What should ICANN's response be to groups outside of ICANN that assert standing for their list of special names?

3) Should ICANN formalize in policy the status of private use names? If so: i) How should ICANN deal with private use names such as .corp, .home, and .mail that already are known to collide on a large scale with formal applications for the same names as new ICANN-recognized gTLDs ii) How should ICANN discover and respond to future collisions between private use names and proposed new ICANN-recognized gTLDs?

[SAC090](#), recommendation 3, recommends that the ICANN Board establish effective means of collaboration on these issues with relevant groups outside of ICANN, including the IETF.

[SAC090](#), recommendation 4, recommends that ICANN complete recommendations 1 through 3 before making any decision to add new TLD names to the global DNS.

[SAC097](#), recommendation 1, recommends that the ICANN Board suggest to ICANN org to consider revising the CZDS system to address the problem of subscriptions terminating automatically by default.

[SAC097](#), recommendation 2, recommends that the ICANN Board suggest to ICANN org to ensure that in subsequent rounds of new gTLDs, the CZDS subscription agreement conform to the changes executed as a result of implementing recommendation 1.

[SAC097](#), recommendation 3, recommends that the ICANN Board suggest to ICANN org to seek ways to reduce the number of zone file access complaints, and resolve complaints in a timely manner.

[SAC097](#), recommendation 4, recommends that the ICANN Board suggest to ICANN org to ensure that zone file access and Web-based WHOIS query statistics are accurately and publicly reported, according to the standards that are uniform across all gTLD registry operators. The Zone File Access metric should be clarified.

The Board's acceptance of these advice serves the public interest and is in furtherance of ICANN's mission as it improves the security and stability of the DNS. Implementation of these advice can be accomplished within ICANN org's existing operating plan and budget.

In considering these advice, the Board reviewed the following materials:

- SSAC047 <<<https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-047-en.pdf>>>
- SSAC058 <<<https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-058-en.pdf>>>
- SSAC061 <<<https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-061-en.pdf>>>
- SSAC090 <<<https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-090-en.pdf>>>
- SSAC097 <<<https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-097-en.pdf>>>
- 2012 Applicant Guidebook
<<<https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/guidebook-full-04jun12-en.pdf>>>
- GNSO Subsequent Procedures for gTLDs PDP Working Group Charter
<<<https://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/new-gtlds/subsequent-procedures-charter-21jan16-en.pdf>>>
- RFC 6761 <<<https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc6761>>>
- Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework
<<<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-framework-30jul14-en.pdf>>>
- 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement
<<<https://www.icann.org/en/resources/registrars/raa/approved-with-specs-27jun13-en.htm>>>
- GNSO gTLD Registration Data Services PDP Working Group Charter
<<<https://gnso.icann.org/en/drafts/whois-ng-gtld-rds-charter-07oct15-en.pdf>>>

- Expert Working Group (EWG) on Next Generation Directory Services Final Report <<<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/final-report-06jun14-en.pdf>>>
- Zone File Access Advisory Group Archive: <https://archive.icann.org/en/topics/new-gtlds/zone-file-access-en.htm>
- Zone File Access Concept Paper: <https://archive.icann.org/en/topics/new-gtlds/zfa-concept-paper-18feb10-en.pdf>

Signature Block:

Submitted by: Akram Atallah

Position: President, Global Domains Division

Date Noted: 8 June 2018

Email: Akram.Atallah@icann.org

In addition, ITEMS held [15 calls](#), three face-to-face meetings with the At-Large Review Working Party and two community-wide webinars. According to its [Charter](#), the At-Large Review Working Party (RWP) was formed to function as a liaison between the ALAC/At-Large, the Independent Examiner and the Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the Board, to provide input on review criteria, coordinate interviews and objectively supply clarification and responses to the preliminary findings and recommendations. Once a final report is issued, the RWP is expected to coordinate with the At-Large to prepare an Implementation Plan and champion the implementation of improvement activities.

A [Draft Report](#) prepared by ITEMS was published for public comment, following the standard ICANN process. 15 comments were submitted, five authored by individual contributors, and ten by organizations (including five organizations affiliated with the At-Large community). See [Staff Report of Public Comment Proceeding](#). In May 2017, ITEMS, submitted its [Final Report](#) containing a detailed assessment of the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC), the Regional At-Large Organizations (RALOs) and the At-Large Structures (ALSs) and 16 recommendations to improve their structure, function, and operations.

In response, the RWP issued the [At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment & Implementation Plan](#). Noting wide disparity in views, the Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the ICANN Board ([OEC](#)) asked ICANN organization to map the underlying issues noted in the Final Report and the At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment & Implementation Plan ([mapping document](#)) and, once approved by the OEC, it was submitted to the RWP. In response to the mapping document, the RWP drafted the [At-Large Review Implementation Overview Proposal](#). The document provided ALAC comments on ITEMS' assessments, as well as alternative ALAC implementation proposals.

Following the publication of the [At-Large Review Implementation Overview Proposal](#), the [CPH](#), the [NCSG](#), and a group called Atlarge.watch,² which submitted its letter anonymously, wrote to

² ICANN policy is not to publish anonymized material.

the ICANN Board. Both the NCSG and the CPH called for an updated implementation overview to address all questions from the mapping document and the outcome to “be presented to the whole ICANN community, so that any further input from, or discussion with, the community can be arranged, to see the Review through to an appropriate end.”

The OEC noted these concerns and has considered them together with all other community input received throughout this review process. The OEC believes that conducting an additional round of public comments is not in line with the organizational review process, and would unnecessarily prolong the second At-Large Review and the implementation of improvements. Regarding the letters sent by the [CPH](#) and [NCSG](#), the OEC’s recommendation, and the resulting Board action was compelled by the fact that the ALAC took on this fruitful discussion and [responded](#) in a substantive and detailed way.

Having considered all relevant documents, including all feedback received from the ICANN community, the OEC recommended to the Board that it is appropriate to move the At-Large Review forward, based on the discussion and assurances provided by the ALAC, and that there is no further need for the RWP to provide answers to the questions raised in the [mapping document](#).

Organizational Effectiveness Committee’s Recommendation to the ICANN Board

The OEC recommends to the Board to accept the [Final Report](#); to accept the [At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment & Implementation Plan](#); to accept the [At-Large Review Implementation Overview Proposal](#) and to use it as a guide for the At-Large review implementation process.

The OEC also recommends to the Board to direct the ALAC to draft a detailed implementation plan. The implementation plan shall contain a detailed overview of ALAC-developed metrics for each of the implementation steps, including a concise overview of the current state for each of the ALAC’s proposals contained in the [At-Large Review Implementation Overview Proposal](#), a

clearly defined goal of the implementation objectives and, where possible, a methodology of how to measure implementation progress on an ongoing basis. The OEC notes to the Board that this is in line with the ALAC Implementation Overview Proposal that states in footnote 1 “the ALAC will consider how metrics will be used to track implementation.” The OEC recommends to the Board to direct the ALAC to include expected budgetary implications into its detailed implementation plan for each of the implementation steps. For all budgetary and other resource implications, the OEC recommends that the Board direct ICANN organization in support of the At-Large, to provide confirmation of the feasibility of that plan in terms of time, resources, and finances.

The OEC recommends that the implementation plan incorporates a phased approach that allows for easy-to-implement and least costly recommendations to be implemented first, with more significant budget implications addressed via the FY20 budget cycle, subject to the aforementioned confirmation by ICANN organization concerning the feasibility of implied time, resources, and finances.

The OEC recommends that the detailed implementation plan shall be submitted to the Board as soon as possible, but no later than six (6) months after the adoption of this resolution.

The OEC recommends that the Board directs ALAC to provide semiannual written implementation reports updating the OEC on progress, including the metrics detailed in the implementation plan.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION

Whereas, the second organizational review of the At-Large commenced in May 2016, in accordance with the ICANN Bylaws, [Article 4, Section 4.4](#), which requires the ICANN Board to “cause a periodic review of ... each Advisory Committee ... to determine (i) whether that organization, council or committee has a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure, (ii) if so, whether any change in structure or operations is desirable to improve its effectiveness and (iii) whether that organization, council or committee is accountable to its constituencies, stakeholder groups, organizations and other stakeholders;”

Whereas, the independent examiner that conducted the second At-Large Review produced a Draft Report that was published for Public Comment in February 2017 and a Final Report, published in May 2017;

Whereas, the ICANN community provided input via public comment on the Draft Report;

Whereas, the At-Large Review Working Party drafted the At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment & Implementation Plan, approved by the At-Large Advisory Committee;

Whereas, the Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the ICANN Board received a briefing from the independent examiner on the Final Report and the At-Large Review Working Party on the At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment & Implementation Plan during its meeting on 21 September 2017;

Whereas, the Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the ICANN Board approved a document mapping the underlying issues noted in the Final Report and the At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment & Implementation Plan, during its meeting on 6 December 2017;

Whereas, the mapping document highlighted differences between the Final Report and the At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment & Implementation Plan and the OEC included a set of questions to the RWP, because the OEC agreed that “further discussion with the Review Working Party is required on this topic, prior to making a recommendation to the Board on the Final Report or the Feasibility Study;”

Whereas, in response to the mapping document, the At-Large Review Working Party drafted the At-Large Review Implementation Overview Proposal, approved by the ALAC and submitted the same for the OEC's consideration;

Whereas, after submission of the At-Large Review Implementation Overview Proposal, the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group and Contracted Parties House of the GNSO Council submitted additional correspondence to the ICANN Board on the review, and the ALAC provided additional information to the OEC in response to those letters. The OEC believes that the ALAC has adequately taken the concerns raised into account;

Whereas, the OEC considered all relevant documents, and public comment input at a 29 May 2018 meeting in order to reach a recommendation to the Board on how to proceed with the organizational review of the At-Large;

Resolved (2018.06.23.xx), the Board receives the At-Large Review Final Report from the independent examiner.

Resolved (2018.06.23.xx), the Board accepts the At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment & Implementation Plan, approved by the ALAC on 22 August 2017, and the Review Working Party's At-Large Review Implementation Overview Proposal, approved by the ALAC on 20 April 2018.

Resolved (2018.06.23.xx), the Board directs the ALAC to convene an At-Large review implementation working group that oversees the implementation process of the implementation proposals contained in the At-Large Review Implementation Overview Proposal, including through the development of a detailed implementation plan. The Board expects that the implementation plan will expand on the implementation steps detailed in the At-Large Review Implementation Overview Proposal, including through identification of metrics for each

implementation, a concise overview of the current state for each of the ALAC's proposals, a clearly defined goal of the implementation objectives, and a methodology of how to measure implementation progress on an ongoing basis.

Resolved (2018.06.23.xx), the Board directs the ALAC to work with ICANN organization to include expected budgetary implication for each of the implementation steps into its detailed implementation plan. The implementation plan shall incorporate a phased approach that allows for easy-to-implement and least costly improvements to be implemented first, with those items with more significant budget implications addressed via subsequent budget cycles. Any budgetary requests should be made in line with ICANN organization's budgeting processes. The detailed implementation plan shall be submitted to the Board as soon as possible, but no later than six (6) months after the adoption of this resolution.

Resolved (2018.06.23.xx), the Board directs the At-Large review implementation working group to provide to the OEC semiannual written implementation reports on progress against the implementation plan, including, but not limited to, progress toward metrics detailed in the implementation plan and use of allocated budget.

PROPOSED RATIONALE

To ensure ICANN's multistakeholder model remains transparent and accountable, and to improve its performance, ICANN conducts ICANN Bylaws-mandated organizational reviews of its Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees as prescribed in Article 4, Section 4.4 of its Bylaws. The second At-Large Review started in May 2016.

Independent Examination

ITEMS International was [appointed](#) as the independent examiner for the At-Large Review in May 2016, in accordance with ICANN's procurement process that involved ICANN organization personnel and the Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the Board, who is responsible for overseeing the organizational review process. During its work, ITEMS reviewed relevant

documentation, conducted over 100 face-to-face interviews with members of the At-Large community, the ICANN community, the ICANN Board, and the ICANN organization. ITEMS' survey gathered 242 individual responses. In addition, ITEMS held [15 calls](#), three face-to-face meetings with the RWP, and two community-wide webinars. A [Draft Report](#) was published for public comment, following the standard ICANN process.

The RWP also provided direct feedback to the independent examiner on initial drafts of the [Draft Report](#) and the [Final Report](#). ITEMS considered this feedback, incorporating those elements that it deemed appropriate based on its independent role and professional judgement.

On 1 May 2017, ITEMS submitted its [Final Report](#) to ICANN. The Final Report included a narrative of underlying issues identified by the independent examiner, and 16 recommendations designed by the independent examiner as proposals to address those issues. At the core of the recommendations was the proposal to reorganize the At-Large based on a so-called 'Empowered Membership Model'.

At-Large Review Working Party/ALAC Input

The RWP agreed with some of the issues raised in the [Final Report](#). The Board notes that the RWP raised concerns that many recommendations, including the Empowered Membership Model, were either not implementable or, if implemented without modification, would be harmful to the At-Large community as the recommendations would lead to a deviation from the organization's mission and function as stated in the [ICANN Bylaws Article 12.2\(d\)](#). The RWP provided detailed rationale of its concerns in the [At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment & Implementation Plan](#), approved by the ALAC on 22 August 2017.

The RWP drafted the [At-Large Review Implementation Overview Proposal](#), approved by the ALAC on 20 April 2018, in which it provided additional comments on the review findings and stipulated alternative proposals to address those underlying issues identified by the independent examiner with which the At-Large community agreed.

Input from ICANN community

In addition to the responses collected by the independent examiner through interviews and online surveys, during the [public comment](#) on the independent examiner's [Draft Report](#), 15 comments were submitted, five authored by individual contributors, and ten by organizations (including five organizations affiliated with the At-Large community). See [Staff Report of Public Comment Proceeding](#). Overall, the comments from the At-Large community, including the ALAC, RALOs, and some ALSs, were critical of ITEMS' Draft Report. Notably, the ALAC stated that its "strong belief of the ALAC and the Review Working Party that with no Working Groups (WGs); overloaded ALAC Members serving the dual role of RALO leaders; Rapporteurs with minimal knowledge and experience interfacing with their AC/SO WGs and authoring statements; effectively getting 'old-timers' out of the way and minimally visible; and Liaisons unable to do their jobs (or being rejected by their target organization), we would have succeeded in ensuring that At-Large would no longer be of service to ICANN or able to defend the interests of end-users."

Other contributors were less critical of ITEMS' report, supporting at least some aspects of the Empowered Membership Model proposal and agreeing with many of ITEMS' assessments and recommendations. For example, the Registry Stakeholder Group (RySG) noted that "we support the conclusion that At-Large's mission is important to ICANN but that the delivery of that mission has been limited by At-Large's current form." The Commercial and Business User Constituency (CBUC) "endorses some aspects of the Empowered Membership Model (EMM)." Similarly, the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG) believes that "many of the problems identified by the ITEMS report do exist. In particular, that: It is too focused on internal committees and procedures, and that it is too focused on enlarging the power and resources received by ALAC in the ICANN ecosystem."

OEC and Board Considerations and Actions

The OEC, as the ICANN Board committee overseeing organizational reviews, reviewed all

relevant documents pertaining to the At-Large review in detail. Specifically, it considered the [Final Report](#) and the [At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment & Implementation Plan](#) and received presentations and input from the independent examiner and the RWP, respectively. Following those presentations, the OEC then ordered ICANN organization to produce a [mapping document](#) that was issued by the OEC to the RWP and included a number of questions. The mapping document in turn led the RWP to draft the [At-Large Review Implementation Overview Proposal](#). That document, although not responding to the questions contained in the mapping document, provided detailed comments oriented to address the issues raised by the independent examiner; it also produced a set of ALAC-approved implementation proposals.

Following the publication of the [At-Large Review Implementation Overview Proposal](#), the [CPH](#), the [NCSG](#), and a group called Atlarge.watch,³ which submitted its letter anonymously, wrote to the ICANN Board. The CPH and NCSG both followed up on their public comments and raised concerns that the At-Large Review Implementation Overview Proposal does not, in their view, address the questions in the [mapping document](#), nor does it respond to specific criticisms raised in the At-Large Review report. The NCSG stated that the Implementation Proposal “will not address some of the most important and fundamental problems that were identified by the reviewers and the broader community.” Both groups called for an updated implementation overview to address all questions from the mapping document and the outcome to “be presented to the whole ICANN community, so that any further input from, or discussion with, the community can be arranged, to see the Review through to an appropriate end.”

The Board notes these concerns and has considered them together with all other community input received throughout this review process. The Board believes that conducting an additional round of public comments is not in line with the organizational review process, and would unnecessarily prolong the second At-Large Review and the implementation of improvements. Regarding the letters sent by the [CPH](#) and [NCSG](#), the OEC’s recommendation, and the resulting

³ ICANN policy is not to publish anonymized material.

Board action was compelled by the fact that the ALAC took on this fruitful discussion and [responded](#) in a substantive and detailed way. In consideration of the responses provided, the OEC recommended, and the Board agrees, that it is appropriate to move the At-Large Review forward, based on the discussion and assurances provided by the ALAC, and that there is no further need for the RWP to provide answers to the questions raised in the [mapping document](#).

Having considered the ALAC position, including its response to community concerns, the Board believes that the ALAC has demonstrated accountability and transparency in this organizational review process. Furthermore, the Board believes that the [At-Large Implementation Overview Proposal](#) provides an appropriate response to the concerns raised by the review, and is hopeful that the proposal will lead to a much-improved At-Large and further improve end user participation within ICANN's multistakeholder model. While the recommendation path that is being pursued veers significantly from the recommendations of the independent examiner, the Board considers, based on all that it has seen, that the implementation recommendations are appropriate to address the well-stated issues from the independent examiner's report. Implementing the ALAC-proposed improvements is a significant step in assuring that the post-review At-Large is able and capable to fulfil its Bylaws-mandated role and responsibilities.

In order to confirm that the ALAC proceeds appropriately, the Board is directing the ALAC to provide it with an expanded implementation plan, including a concise overview of the current state for each of the ALAC's implementation proposals, a clearly defined goal of the implementation objectives, prioritization and resource implications, and a methodology of how to measure implementation progress on an ongoing basis. The Board believes that these metrics will help ensure an accountable and transparent implementation process, leading to meaningful improvements to further enhance the At-Large's crucial role of representing end user interests within ICANN, as defined in the Bylaws.

Generally, the Board notes the importance of the organizational review process, as defined in Bylaws Section 4.4. Since the start of the At-Large review process, the OEC and the ICANN

organization have already implemented changes to the broader organizational review process to address the procedural issues observed within this At-Large review, and particularly to keep from other reviews suffering from the same inability of the RWP and the independent examiner to agree on how to address the underlying issues and appropriate recommendations. Notably, the organizational review process (for all reviews convened after this second At-Large review) now consists of two phases, with the first phase focusing solely on an assessment of the organization under review. The second phase, which begins once substantial agreement is reached on the assessment between the independent examiner and the organization under review, then focuses on developing recommendations for improvements. This two-phased approach will mitigate against a similar outcome as occurred during the At-Large review, and it will help bolster the organizational review process and the accountability of the organizations under review.

The organizational review process is an iterative process, and the Board hopes that all parts of the ICANN community will continue to work productively to understand the unique roles and viewpoints that each SO/AC brings to ICANN, to its policy development work and cross-community efforts, and we look forward to the next iteration of reviews to continue refinement and process improvement.

What is the proposal being considered?

The Board considers the proposal to accept the [Final Report](#), the [At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment & Implementation Plan](#), and the [At-Large Review Implementation Overview Proposal](#), both approved by the ALAC. In addition, the Board considers instructing the ALAC to form an implementation team. The implementation team shall draft an implementation plan and provide the OEC with semiannual written reports detailing the implementation progress. Due to the fact that some of the independent examiner's recommendations were either not implementable or, if implemented without modification, would lead to a deviation from the At-Large's mission and function, the Board is considering whether to instruct the ALAC to use the At-Large Review Implementation Overview Proposal in lieu of the Final Report to reasonably address the underlying issues identified by the independent reviewer to guide the implementation process.

What significant materials did the Board review?

The Board reviewed: the independent examiner’s [Review of the ICANN At-Large Community Final Report](#) containing 16 recommendations; the [At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment & Implementation Plan](#) approved by the ALAC; the [mapping document](#) requested by the OEC and prepared by the ICANN organization; and the [At-Large Review Implementation Overview Proposal](#) approved by the ALAC. The Board also reviewed all [public comments](#), and the [staff summary of public comments](#), including the letters sent by the [CPH](#) and the [NCSG](#). Based on this, and the recommendations made by the OEC, the Board agrees that the At-Large Review Implementation Overview Proposal should serve as the guide for the implementation work.

Are there fiscal impacts or ramifications on ICANN (strategic plan, operating plan, or budget)?

The work to improve the effectiveness of the ALAC and the At-Large, as detailed in the [At-Large Review Implementation Overview Proposal](#), may require additional resources beyond those included in the Board-approved FY19 Operating Plan and Budget. With this action, the ALAC is directed to form a team, who will plan, execute, and report on implementation efforts. A detailed implementation plan shall be drafted, including budget/resources impact (where applicable), and the plan should incorporate a phased approach that allows for easy-to-implement and least costly recommendations to be implemented first, with more significant budget implications addressed via the FY20 budget cycle.

Are there any security, stability or resiliency issues relating to the DNS?

This action is not expected to have a direct impact on the security, stability, or resiliency of the DNS.

Is public comment required prior to Board action?

A [Public Comment](#) was opened following the publication of the [Draft Report](#) in February 2017. No further public comments are required.

Consistency with ICANN’s Mission and Serving the Global Public Interest

This action is consistent with ICANN’s mission and serves the global public interest by supporting the effectiveness and ongoing improvement of the accountability of all parts of ICANN.

Signature Block:

Submitted by: Larisa Gurnick
Position: VP, Multistakeholder Strategy and Strategic Initiatives
Date Noted: 8 June 2018
Email: larisa.gurnick@icann.org

AGENDA – 23 JUNE 2018 REGULAR BOARD Meeting – 60 minutes

Last Updated 13 June 2018

Time, etc.	Agenda Item	Shepherd
Assembly, Roll Call & Consent Agenda Vote	1. Consent Agenda	
15 min	1.a. Board Meeting Minutes from 3 May, 13 May, 17 May and 30 May 2018	John Jeffrey
	1.b. Appointment of new member to the SSAC	Ram Mohan
	1.c. Transfer of the .LS (Lesotho) top-level domain to Lesotho Network Information Centre Proprietary (LSNIC)	Mike Silber
	1.d. March 2020 ICANN Meeting Venue Contracting	Ron da Silva
	1.e. June 2020 ICANN Meeting Venue Contracting	Ron da Silva
	1.f. October 2020 ICANN Meeting Venue Contracting	Ron da Silva

AGENDA – 23 JUNE 2018 REGULAR BOARD Meeting – 60 minutes

Last Updated 13 June 2018

Time, etc.	Agenda Item	Shepherd
	1.g. Board Consideration of SSAC Recommendations from SAC047, SAC058, SAC061, SAC090, and SAC097	Ram Mohan
	1.h. Organizational Review of the At-Large - Final Report and Recommendations	Khaled Koubaa
	1.i. Consideration of Reconsideration Request 18-3: Astutium Ltd.	Chris Disspain
	1.j. Thank you to Local Host of ICANN 62 Meeting	Cherine Chalaby
	1.k. Thank you to Sponsors of ICANN 62 Meeting	Cherine Chalaby
	1.l. Thank you to Interpreters, Staff, Event and Hotel Teams of ICANN 62 Meeting	Cherine Chalaby
	2. Main Agenda	
Discussion & Decision 45 min	2.a. Consideration of Reconsideration Request 18-1: DotMusic Limited	Chris Disspain

AGENDA – 23 JUNE 2018 REGULAR BOARD Meeting – 60 minutes

Last Updated 13 June 2018

Time, etc.	Agenda Item	Shepherd
	2.b. Consideration of Reconsideration Request 18-2: dotgay LLC	Chris Disspain
	2.c. AOB	

Directors and Liaisons,

Attached below please find Notice of date and time for a Regular Meeting of the ICANN Board.

23 June 2018 – Regular Meeting of the ICANN Board of Directors - at 14:00 UTC (9:00am – 10:00am in Panama).

<https://www.timeanddate.com/worldclock/fixedtime.html?msg=Regular+Meeting+of+the+ICANN+Board&iso=20180623T09&p1=192&ah=1>

Some other time zones:

23 June 2018 – 7:00am PDT Los Angeles

23 June 2018 – 10:00am EDT Washington, D.C.

23 June 2018 – 4:00pm CEST Brussels

REGULAR MEETING OF THE ICANN BOARD (OPEN SESSION)

Consent Agenda:

- Approval of Board Meeting Minutes
- Appointment of new member to the SSAC
- Transfer of the .LS (Lesotho) top-level domain to Lesotho Network Information Centre Proprietary (LSNIC)
- March 2020 ICANN Meeting Venue Contracting
- June 2020 ICANN Meeting Venue Contracting
- October 2020 ICANN Meeting Venue Contracting
- Board Consideration of SSAC Recommendations from SAC047, SAC058, SAC061, SAC90, and SAC097
- Organizational Review of the At-Large - Final Report and Recommendations
- Consideration of Reconsideration Request 18-3: Astutium Ltd.
- Thank you to Local Host of ICANN 62 Meeting
- Thank you to Sponsors of ICANN 62 Meeting
- Thank you to Interpreters, Staff, Event and Hotel Teams of ICANN 62 Meeting

Main Agenda

- Consideration of Reconsideration Request 18-1: DotMusic Limited
- Consideration of Reconsideration Request 18-2: dotgay LLC
- AOB

MATERIALS – You can access the Board Meeting materials in Google Drive here:

Contact Information Redacted

If you have trouble with access, please let us know and we will work with you to assure that you get access to the documents.

If call information is required, it will be distributed separately.

If you have any questions, or we can be of assistance to you, please let us know.

John Jeffrey

General Counsel & Secretary, ICANN

John.Jeffrey@icann.org <John.Jeffrey@icann.org>

<<mailto:John.Jeffrey@icann.org> <<mailto:John.Jeffrey@icann.org>> >

Contact Information Redacted