

Proxy Voting

At the GNSO Council meeting in March, 2012 a proxy was requested but not in the correct way.

Do rules need to be adapted to accommodate situations where no formal proxy can be given?

GNSO Operating Rules and Procedures, para 4.6:

An **abstaining or absent Council member** (the Proxy Giver) may transfer his or her vote to any other Council member (the Proxy Holder).

A proxy notification (form) must be sent to the GNSO Secretariat. The notification should, **where applicable**, be sent by the Proxy Giver's appointing organization. **Ordinarily** a proxy notification must be received by the GNSO Secretariat before the start of the relevant meeting.

Exceptionally, a proxy notification may be given during a meeting by a Council member who is present but needs to leave before a vote.

Interpretation of the Rules

The rules describe the procedure for who could ask for a proxy and how this is to be done.

- a proxy notification should be sent to the GNSO Secretariat by the Proxy Giver's appointing organization. "Where applicable" is referring to NomCom appointees since in this case it is obviously not applicable.

Question 1: should the ability of "sending the notification" been offered to others (e.g. council members)?

- a proxy notification must be received by the GNSO Secretariat before the start of the relevant meeting. "Ordinarily" implies that there may be unusual cases which don't allow to meet this requirement. One is described in the following para.

Question 2: should "(non) ordinarily" be defined and how?

Proposal

Question 1 should definitely be answered by the council and be reflected in the rules accordingly.

In case of an "unusual" proxy notification a solution could be that the council – as it was done – "on the spot" hears the rationale and decides with simple majority.