|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposed Revisions (appear in Redline) | Notes, Explanation, Questions |
| Mission, Commitments, and Core Values | No change |
| The Mission of The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers ("ICANN") is to [support] [coordinate], at the overall level, the global Internet's [core registries][systems of unique identifiers], and in particular to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique identifier systems. In particular, ICANN: | Comment 104 (DP-DK/New America)Comment 111 (IAB) ALT Language: “The mission of The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers ("ICANN") is to support, at the overall level, core Internet registries, and in particular to ensure the stable and secure operation of those registries. In particular, |
| [Supports] [Coordinates] the allocation and assignment of the three [categories of registries] [sets of unique identifiers] for the Internet, which are Domain names (forming a system referred to as "DNS"); Internet protocol ("IP") addresses and autonomous system ("AS") numbers; and Protocol port and parameter numbers. | Comment 111/IAB (also Comment 104/DP-DK)  |
| [Supports] Coordinates the operation and evolution of the DNS root name server system. | Comment 111/IAB and Comment 104/DP-DK |
| [Supports] Coordinates policy development reasonably and appropriately related to these technical functions. | Comment 111/IAB and Comment 104/DP-DK |
| In this role, with respect to domain names, ICANN’s Mission is to [support] coordinate the development and implementation of policies:- for which uniform or coordinated resolution is reasonably necessary to facilitate the openness, interoperability, resilience, security and/or stability of the DNS ;- that are developed through a bottom-up, consensus-based multistakeholder process and designed to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet’s unique names systems, and. | Comment 111/IAB and Comment 104/DP-DK 130/ALAC proposes adding “and to foster trust in the DNS”131/LAB simplify language |
| In this role, with respect to IP addresses and AS numbers, ICANN’s Mission is described in the ASO MoU between ICANN and RIRs. |  |
| In this role, with respect to protocol port and parameter numbers, ICANN’s Mission is to [to be provided by the IETF]. | Comment 111/IAB DELETE |
| In this role, with respect to the DNS root server system, ICANN’s Mission is to [to be provided by root server operators]. | RRSAC to provide language |
| ICANN shall have no power to act other than in accordance with, and as reasonably necessary to achieve its mission. Without in any way limiting the foregoing absolute prohibition, ICANN shall not engage in or use its powers to attempt the regulation of services that use the Internet's unique identifiers, or the content that they carry or provide. | Comment 104 (DP-DK/New America); [Note: For Discussion] BC and others comment (109): *“ICANN shall not engage in or use its powers to attempt to establish contractual obligations on companies with which it is not in privity of contract and shall not attempt to establish contractual obligations on contracted parties that are not agreed by such parties.” See also Comment 112/USCIB; 115 IPC; 117/MPAA; 119/USCC; 134/DotMusic* |
| Commitments and Core Values |  |
| In carrying out its Mission, ICANN will act in a manner that complies with and reflects ICANN’s Commitments and respects ICANN’s Core Values, both described below.  |  |
| These Commitments and Core Values are intended to apply in the broadest possible range of circumstances. The Commitments reflect ICANN’s fundamental compact with the global Internet community and are intended to apply consistently and comprehensively to ICANN’s activities. The specific way in which Core Values apply, individually and collectively, to each new situation may depend on many factors that cannot be fully anticipated or enumerated. Situations may arise in which perfect fidelity to all Core Values simultaneously is not possible.  | These changes are designed to address the many concerns raised about balancing: 96/IA; 106/BC; 119 USCC; 125/GG; 127/CENTR (“complimentary” not “competing” core values); 128/i2Coalition; |
| reconciliation must be:  |  |
|  |  |
| In any situation where one Core Value must be reconciled with another, potentially competing Core Value, the balancing must further an important public interest goal identified through the bottom-up, multistakeholder process that is within ICANN's Mission. [ | 123/NCSG suggests new language re mission131/LAB suggests deleting language in [ ] 124/MM suggests clarification re mission |
| Commitments.  | 100/WC2 proposes to add accountability to democratic standards (including expression)130/ALAC proposes adding “and to foster trust in the DNS” |
| In performing its Mission, ICANN must operate in a manner consistent with its Bylaws for the benefit of the Internet community as a whole, carrying out its activities in conformity with relevant principles of international law, international conventions, and applicable local law and through open and transparent processes that enable competition and open entry in Internet-related markets.  Specifically, ICANN’s action must: | Change made to address comment 106/Govt-ES (local law);Comment 108/CCG suggests including indicative list of applicable treatiesComment 131/LAB would change to “international and domestic law” (note, not acceptable to Govt-ES) |
| Preserve and enhance the operational stability, reliability, security, global interoperability, resilience, and openness of the DNS and the Internet;  |  |
| Maintain the capacity and ability to coordinate the DNS at the overall level and to work for the maintenance of a single, interoperable Internet; | 131/LAB[NOTE: For discussion] |
| Respect the creativity, innovation, and flow of information made possible by the Internet by limiting ICANN's activities to matters that are within ICANN’s Mission and require or significantly benefit from global coordination; |  |
| Employ an open, transparent and bottom-up, private sector led multistakeholder policy development processes that (i) seeks input from the public, for whose benefit ICANN shall in all events act, (ii) promote well-informed decisions based on [unbiased] expert advice, and (iii) ensure that those entities most affected can assist in the policy development process; | Largely supportive comments; one suggests clarifying that “private sector” is expansive (i.e., not just business but civil society, users, etc.); others wish to clarify that this language is consistent with government participation.Govt-ES would remove101/DCA-T (clarify that experts should not have conflict of interest) |
| Make decisions by applying documented policies consistently, neutrally, objectively, and fairly, without singling out any particular party for discriminatory treatment; |  |
| Remain accountable to the Internet Community through mechanisms defined in the Bylaws that enhance ICANN’s effectiveness. |  |
| Core Values:   |  |
| In performing its Mission, the following core values should also guide the decisions and actions of ICANN: |  |
| Seeking and supporting broad, informed participation reflecting the functional, geographic, and cultural diversity of the Internet at all levels of policy development and decision-making to ensure that the bottom-up, multistakeholder policy development process is used to ascertain the global public interest and that those processes are accountable and transparent; | 113/Linx (delete “global public interest)123/NCSG (revised language) |
| To the extent feasible and appropriate, delegating coordination functions to or recognizing the policy role of other responsible entities that reflect the interests of affected parties and the roles of both ICANN’s internal bodies and external expert bodies; | 110/UK suggests deleting this language, or at least having a rigorous debate and community support for any deviation from this requirement. 112/USCIB suggests deleting “and appropriate” |
| Where feasible and appropriate, depending on market mechanisms to promote and sustain a healthy competitive environment in the DNS market. | 110/UK suggests deleting “where feasible and appropriate,” or at least having a rigorous debate and community support for any deviation from this requirement.124/MM suggests deletion of new language “that enhances consumer trust and choice”  |
| *“Ensuring that any expansion of the top-level domain space will adequately address issues of competition, consumer protection, security, stability and resiliency, malicious abuse issues, sovereignty concerns, and rights protection.”*  | Comments 109/BC; *Comment 112/USCIB; 117/MPAA* |
| Introducing and promoting competition in the registration of domain names where practicable and beneficial in the public interest as identified through the bottom-up, multistakeholder policy development process. |  |
| Operate with efficiency and excellence, in a fiscally responsible and accountable manner and at a speed that is responsive to the needs of the global Internet community. |  |
| While remaining rooted in the private sector, recognizing that governments and public authorities are responsible for public policy [within their jurisdiction] and duly taking into account the public policy advice of [governments and public authorities][the GAC] in accordance with the Bylaws and to the extent consistent with the Mission, and these Commitments and Core Values. | Concern re “consistent with the Mission” language: 106/Govt-ES; 116 Govt-BR98/JS1 (is this in tension with ICANN’s obligation to comply with applicable law where it operates124/MM: alternative language in [ ] |
| Striving to ensure that the interests of one or more groups are not advanced at the undue expense of others. | 131/LAB proposed alternative language |
|  |  |