

1	Community Forum on Proposed Fundamental Bylaws Amendments
SO/AC/SG/C	ASO, ccNSO, GNSO, ALAC, GAC (collectively, the Empowered Community) through their representatives on the Empowered Community Administration
SESSION LEADER(S)	Empowered Community Administration
BACKGROUND / IMPORTANCE	The ICANN Board Governance Committee (BGC) has proposed moving its responsibilities for ICANN's Reconsideration Request process to a new Board committee that can also be dedicated to the oversight of ICANN's other accountability mechanisms as deemed appropriate by the Board. The Reconsideration Request process is a key ICANN accountability mechanism, and the BGC's oversight of it is part of ICANN's Fundamental Bylaws which can only be amended if the ICANN Board and ICANN's Empowered Community (EC) approve. The proposed Fundamental Bylaw change has been posted for public comment, following which the Board is expected to review and act on the proposal. If the Board approves the change, the next step (as mandated by the Bylaws) will be for the EC to consider whether it supports the change. The Bylaws specify the process by which the EC may approve Fundamental Bylaw changes. This includes the convening of a Community Forum by ICANN if so directed by the EC Administration. The Bylaws further specify that such a Forum must be held within a particular period from the time that the ICANN Secretary notifies the EC of the Board's action. This session request represents the formal request to ICANN from the EC Administration, that a Community Forum be held during the upcoming ICANN58 meeting in Johannesburg, in accordance with Section 1.3 of Annex D of the revised ICANN Bylaws. This will be the first time that the EC will be coming together to exercise one of the EC's new powers under the revised ICANN Bylaws. It will also be the first time that the EC Administration - comprising a representative from each of the EC's five Decisional Participants - will be conducting a Community Forum in accordance with the new procedures spelled out in the Bylaws.
GOALS / EXPECTED OUTCOMES	Following the Community Forum, the Bylaws specify additional steps that are to be taken by the EC Administration and the EC's Decisional Participants, including timelines for notification of approval of the proposed Fundamental Bylaw change. This Community Forum is therefore a mandatory step in the approval process required by the revised ICANN Bylaws. The EC Administration expects that this first Community Forum will provide the EC and the EC Administration with the opportunity to prepare and execute on one of its new Bylaws powers. In addition, this first Community Forum experience will allow the EC and the EC Administration to identify any practical difficulties, technical or other challenges that may occur. As there are a number of approval and rejection processes related to the various new EC powers under the revised ICANN Bylaws, this first Community Forum will be an important and significant experience for the ICANN community.
RELEVANT DOCUMENTATION	ICANN Bylaws, Article 6 describing the EC: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en/#article6 ICANN Bylaws, Annex D laying out the EC and EC Administration approval process, steps and timelines: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en/#annexD Information about the proposed Fundamental Bylaw change to be discussed at the proposed Community Forum: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/bylaws-bgc-2017-03-31-en
SESSION FORMAT	The EC Administration is requesting the following: (a) The Community Forum needs to be scheduled as earliest into the meeting proper as possible, so that the fruits of the community discussion can be carried back to the various SO/AC's for further discussion during their sessions during the meeting; (b) This needs to be a high level interest topic -- nothing else scheduled around it; (c) It needs the same level of live transcription and translation services afforded ICANN Board meetings; and (d) It can be a 60- rather than a 90-minute session if need be. The EC Administration will run the Community Forum, and anticipates allowing for ample audience participation (e.g. possibly similar to an ICANN Public Forum following a brief presentation on the proposed Fundamental Bylaw change and the EC approval process). The usual remote participation facilities as provided to ICANN sessions in the Main Room of an ICANN Public Meeting are also requested.
OTHER COMMENTS	Annex D of the Bylaws require that "ICANN will provide support services for the Approval Action Community Forum and shall promptly post on the Website a public record of the Approval Action Community Forum as well as all written submissions of ICANN and any Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee (including Decisional Participants) related to the Approval Action Community Forum.
SUBMITTED BY	Mary Wong
2	Cross-Community Discussion on Next-Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services (RDS) Policy Requirements
SO/AC/SG/C	GNSO
SESSION LEADER(S)	Chuck Gomes, Susan Kawaguchi, David Cake, Michele Neylon
BACKGROUND / IMPORTANCE	On 26 May, 2015, the ICANN Board reaffirmed its 2012 request for a Board-initiated PDP to define the purpose of collecting, maintaining and providing access to gTLD registration data, and to consider safeguards for protecting data, using the recommendations in the EWG's Final Report as an input to, and, if appropriate, as the foundation for a new gTLD policy. Accordingly, the GNSO Next-Generation gTLD RDS PDP Working Group is currently working through phase 1 of the Board-requested PDP, using the Framework's 3-phase process to (1) establish gTLD registration data requirements to determine if and why a next-generation RDS is needed, (2) design policies that detail functions that must be provided by a next-generation RDS to support those requirements, and (3) provide guidance for how a next-generation RDS should implement those policies, coexisting with and eventually replacing WHOIS.
GOALS / EXPECTED OUTCOMES	The leadership of the GNSO Policy Development Process Working Group on next-generation gTLD Registration Directory Service (RDS) to replace WHOIS (Next-Gen RDS) is requesting a 3-hour cross-community session to obtain community feedback on key concepts related to the purposes of gTLD registration data and directory services, data elements required by those purposes, and related data protection and privacy requirements. The WG is currently deliberating on these concepts and hopes to solicit community feedback on these rough consensus agreements in advance of publishing its first initial report.
RELEVANT DOCUMENTATION	The Next-Generation gTLD RDS PDP Working Group is developing key concepts, including a statement of purpose, to facilitate answering fundamental questions on gTLD registration data requirements to determine if and why a next-generation RDS is needed. This is the primary objective of the first phase of the PDP, and a crucial prerequisite to progressing to the next phase in which policies will be developed to fulfill these requirements. A working document detailing the Working Group's on-going deliberation and points of rough agreement is posted on its wiki: http://tinyurl.com/ng-rds . A presentation to set the stage for this Cross-Community session by enumerating points of agreement and soliciting community feedback on them will also be posted on that page in advance of ICANN59.
SESSION FORMAT	The session will include a brief overview of the questions now being addressed by this Working Group, and the progress of the PDP Working Group in answering those questions. However, most of the agenda would include an interactive dialogue between the Working Group members and the broader community on the WG's initial key concepts/purposes, data elements, and privacy of gTLD registration data and directory services, including the draft statement of purpose for RDS now being developed, as well as purposes identified for each of the gTLD registration data elements.
OTHER COMMENTS	From previous experience at ICANN56 and ICANN58, the PDP Working Group leadership has observed that a 90-minute session will not be sufficient to cover all the work for which cross-community input is being solicited. In particular, it is important to note that at ICANN58, the 90-minute cross community session on data protection barely started the planned agenda. Considering that the WG will have been working for over 15 months at the time of ICANN 59, it should not be surprising that a short session will be very limiting. Having two consecutive 90-minute blocks (total of 180 minutes) will be necessary to cover all the complex and inter-related key concepts that the WG has been discussed and which the community may find important to provide input on at ICANN59.
SUBMITTED BY	Amr Elsadr

3 **GDPR: the most important change in data privacy regulation in over 20 years**

SO/AC/SG/C	ccNSO & gNSO
SESSION LEADER(S)	Peter Vergote (.be), additional session leader from RySG to be confirmed
BACKGROUND / IMPORTANCE	The full implementation of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) is around the corner and organizations have until 25 May 2018 to become compliant. The goal of the GDPR is to harmonize data privacy laws across Europe, to protect and empower all EU citizens data privacy and to reshape the way organizations across the region approach data privacy. The regulation will apply to any person or entity that processes the personal data of EU residents related to the offering of goods or services or to monitor their behaviour, in other words: it applies to every organization that engages with businesses in the EU, including companies which do not have a registered place of business in the EU but which offer goods or services on the European market. Because these new regulations drastically change the way organizations approach data privacy, it is important businesses of all size understand the regulatory requirements and what they need to do to prepare for the new set of regulations. These regulations are far reaching and require domain name industry players to take a fresh look at how to manage data and information.
GOALS / EXPECTED OUTCOMES	This session aims to explore the impact of the European General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), possibly leading into ICANN undertaking a legal review of the impact of the GDPR on the domain name industry (on whois, escrow, ...)
RELEVANT DOCUMENTATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final version of the Regulation, released 6 April 2016: http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-5419-2016-INIT/en/pdf European Commission - Press release: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-15-6321_en.htm
SESSION FORMAT	moderated discussion, possibly with panel
SUBMITTED BY	Alejandra Reynoso

4 **Geographic Names**

SO/AC/SG/C	GNSO
SESSION LEADER(S)	Skilled Neutral Moderator (To be identified); Facilitated by Avri Doria and Jeff Neuman, Co-Chairs of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG
BACKGROUND / IMPORTANCE	The topic of geographic names at the top-level of the DNS is an area where there are divergent views amongst the community organizations, and even amongst those within their respective community organizations. During the 2012 round of the New gTLD Program, country or territory names as defined in the Applicant Guidebook, were not permitted. Certain other Geographic names, as defined in the Applicant Guidebook, were permitted when accompanied with supporting documentation. However, during that 2012 round, there were a number of other applied for gTLDs that members of the community, including the Governmental Advisory Committee, considered to be of geographic significance and either submitted early warnings, public comments, and/or official government objections through GAC Advice. Some of these strings were ones which other community members considered to be generic or were applied for by a particular brand. As a result of that advice, a number of the generic applications either went through as originally proposed, others were modified through a private negotiation process, and some were not allowed to proceed. Irrespective of whether the community agrees with those outcomes, it is acknowledged by many that the process was not as predictable as it could have been. For subsequent procedures for new TLDs, they urge for more predictability and certainty as to which TLDs constitute geographical TLDs, whether such TLDs are permitted or not, the application and evaluation processes for them, and the forms of objections and resolutions involving any disputes over geographic names. There are currently several efforts underway that are separately looking at how geographic names should be handled in the future, with some focusing on different aspects of the topic. The New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG is seeking to facilitate a dialogue that allows for the community to collaborate, understand the various needs, and to consider and debate proposals to address geographic names in future new gTLD procedures. A webinar will have been held on 25 April 2017 which set forth some of the various positions held by different members of the multi-stakeholder community. The sessions at ICANN 59 are intended to expand on the outcomes of the April 25th webinar and to work with all relevant stakeholders to find an acceptable path forward.
GOALS / EXPECTED OUTCOMES	The goal is to work collaboratively with the community to develop a compromise solution, which has consensus, to address geographic names in future new gTLD procedures. At a minimum, the expectation is that a framework, or a set of principles, will be agreed upon by which the PDP WG and interested parties within the community can reach a consensus resolution on this topic.
RELEVANT DOCUMENTATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- In Progress: Background document that discusses the current treatment of geographic names in the Applicant Guidebook, as well as the development process that led to those outcomes. -- Cross Community Working Group on the Use of Country and Territory Names as top-level domains - https://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/cwg-uctn and https://conso.icann.org/workinggroups/ccwg-unct.htm -- GAC Working Group to Examine the Protection of Geographic Names in any Future Expansion of gTLDs - https://gacweb.icann.org/display/gacweb/GAC+Working+Group+to+Examine+the+Protection+of+Geographic+Names+in+any+Future+Expansion+of+gTLDs -- New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG project page: https://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/new-gtld-subsequent-procedures -- Geographic Names Webinar: https://gns0.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-27mar17-en.htm
SESSION FORMAT	The desire is to have three 90 minute, non-conflicted sessions, one at the beginning of the meeting and two back-to-back at the end of the meeting. -- The first of these meetings would be to review the outcomes of the Geographic Names Webinar mentioned above as well as in the Relevant Documentation section and to review one or more proposals derived from those discussions (which would be distributed prior to ICANN59 within the documentation deadline). The session would be led/moderated by a skilled neutral third party facilitator and supported by Avri Doria and Jeff Neuman. -- After the first session, interested parties (comprised of representatives from the various communities) would collaborate to take into account discussions from the first session and develop an updated proposal. The second of the sessions (i.e., the back-to-back sessions) would be used to gain agreement on this updated compromise solution proposal.
SUBMITTED BY	Steve Chan

5 **Operational side of ICANN's OPS Plan and Budget**

SO/AC/SG/C	ccNSO
SESSION LEADER(S)	Giovanni Seppia (.eu)
BACKGROUND / IMPORTANCE	In Helsinki, a successful dialogue kicked off on the Operational side of ICANN's OPS Plan and Budget, during a session held under the auspices of the ccNSO. Following the public comment period on the ICANN FY 2018 Budget and/or Operational Plan, suggested is to continue the dialogue on, potentially: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PTI budget and long term planning - ICANN international engagement follow up, including regional offices and hubs strategy - New gTLD programme estimates
GOALS / EXPECTED OUTCOMES	This type of dialogue is intended as part of ICANN's regular planning processes. The session is organized to provide a basis for the community dialogue and start the focus on ICANN's operational goals and related metrics.

RELEVANT DOCUMENTATION	- ICANN FY 2018 Budget and/or Operational Plan https://www.icann.org/public-comments/fy18-budget-2017-03-08-en - ccNSO SOP Working Group https://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/sopiwg.htm
SESSION FORMAT	Moderated discussion, with a panel (panel consisting of relevant ICANN staff, registries and registrars as main financial contributors)
SUBMITTED BY	Alejandra Reynoso

6

Rejection Action Petitions: is the Empowered Community able to exercise its rights under the ICANN bylaws?

SO/AC/SG/C	ccNSO
SESSION LEADER(S)	Stephen Deerhake (.as)
BACKGROUND / IMPORTANCE	The Empowered Community (EC) is a non-profit association consisting of the ICANN ALAC, ASO, ccNSO, GAC, and GNSO— each a Decisional Participant. The five Decisional Participants together comprise the EC. The EC's sole purpose is to exercise its rights and perform its obligations under the ICANN Bylaws. Rejection Petitions may only be filed in response to the following specific Board actions, as per Annex D (2.1) of the ICANN bylaws. The ICANN Board is expected to approve the FY18 Budget at ICANN59, and will thus be submitting a Rejection Action Board Notice to the Community, triggering the start of a Rejection Action Petition Period.
GOALS / EXPECTED OUTCOMES	This session is intended to inform the broader community about the rejection action petition process – how to file a rejection action petition, what the requirements are for a rejection action petition, and the timelines involved with the process, with emphasis on the various time constraints, and the cost of failure to adhere to the time constraints. The main segments that will be covered in this session, are: 1. Broad stroke Introduction/Overview 2. Requirements for a Petition 3. Soliciting support from other SO/ACs and the Rejection Action Community Forum 4. Decision period and voting thresholds
RELEVANT DOCUMENTATION	- Annex D, ICANN Bylaws https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en/#annexD - GRC wiki https://community.icann.org/display/ccnso/kspc/Guidelines+Review+Committee - Slide deck ICANN58 https://ccnso.icann.org/meetings/copenhagen58/presentation-ec-overview-15mar17-en.pdf
SESSION FORMAT	moderated panel discussion and simulation
SUBMITTED BY	Alejandra Reynoso

7

Tech Day

SO/AC/SG/C	ccNSO & gNSO
SESSION LEADER(S)	Eberhard Lisse (.na)
BACKGROUND / IMPORTANCE	Tech Day has grown from the idea that ccTLDs of all sizes may have technical issues and develop solutions which they share here. gTLDs may have similar issues and hence similar solutions, the sharing of which is helpful, in particular for small TLDs.
GOALS / EXPECTED OUTCOMES	Sharing of ideas, avoiding duplication of solutions
RELEVANT DOCUMENTATION	https://ccnso.icann.org/meetings
SESSION FORMAT	3 presentations, each max 20 min with time for discussion after each presentation
OTHER COMMENTS	Part of the Tech Day sessions are suitable for a cross-community approach (potentially on "DNS Security", the final agenda will be available closer to the meeting). Staff contact: Kimberly Carlson (ccNSO)
SUBMITTED BY	Alejandra Reynoso

8

Who sets ICANN's priorities?

SO/AC/SG/C	ccNSO
SESSION LEADER(S)	Jordan Carter (.nz) , others potentially to be confirmed
BACKGROUND / IMPORTANCE	When organisations have clear priorities, they get more work done - and everyone knows where to focus their energy and enthusiasm. At ICANN 58, a number of discussions with ICANN Board members, senior staff and community members showed a wide variety of different understandings about: a) what ICANN's priorities are b) who is responsible for establishing the priorities Some sense of priorities are available from discussions with the Board, from discussions with Staff, from the Strategic and Operating Planning framework. But they are all asserting different priorities, and as a result different audiences get different messages about what is important. The whole ICANN system (Board, staff, community) would benefit from clear priorities, rather than trying to work on too many things at once. There would be less risk of volunteer burnout, less confusion about what needs to be done, and less pressure on the ICANN organisation / ICANN staff to meet many and ever-growing needs, if there was an agreed understanding for how priorities are set. If the discussion can identify an existing group to take or confirm responsibility for this task, that would be helpful.
GOALS / EXPECTED OUTCOMES	Goal: to secure agreement from across the ICANN system about how to establish priorities for the organisation in future. Expected outcomes: - participants hear the different perspectives from Board, staff, community leaders about what happens today and what should happen - community dialogue converges around an agreed approach, or exposes differences of opinion about how priorities should be set - the community, staff and Board can then take account of this dialogue and continue it, or implement the consensus, whichever is applicable. - (hoped-for outcome): agreement to a single set of priorities that can be documented, including where the priority came from and when it was agreed.
SESSION FORMAT	1. intro to the topic. 2. A panel discussion of the topic where people propose some thoughts about who should set priorities and how they should do so. (To be invited: ICANN CEO, additional senior staff member, a couple of board members, a couple of SO/AC leaders.) 3. Discussion with the audience about the question of 'who' sets priorities 4. Discussion with the audience about the question of 'how' priorities are set 5. Wrap up
SUBMITTED BY	Alejandra Reynoso