The purpose of the joint ccNSO/GNSO Joint IDN Working Group (JIG) is to deal with issues related to the introduction of IDN ccTLDs under the IDN ccTLD Fast Track implementation process and with IDN gTLDs under the new gTLD implementation process which are of common interest to both the GNSO and ccNSO. The JIG was formed by mutual charters between the ccNSO and GNSO councils and then extended (ccNSO: http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/minutes-council-23aug11-en.pdf | GNSO: http://gnso.icann.org/en/meetings/minutes-council-12dec13-en.htm) to complete its work on the three identified issues of common interest between the ccNSO and GNSO. One of the three issues relates to the Universal Acceptance of IDN TLDs. The JIG has delivered its Final Report on Universal Acceptance of IDN TLDs on 17 November for GNSO Council consideration.

There was a lot of discussion about the importance of ensuring universal acceptance and its key import to the success of the related gTLDs and the new gTLD program in general. The tone of this discussion was that there is a significant level of concern that this will in fact be done well.

The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION – DNS Security and Stability and Analysis (DSSA) Working Group Final Report: In December 2010, the ALAC, ccNSO, GNSO and NRO (acting as ASO in this case) all endorsed the charter of the joint DNS Security and Stability and Analysis working group (DSSA WG) according to each of their own rules and procedures and as a result are the participating SO’s and AC’s in the DSSA. The DSSA delivered its Final Report to the chartering organisations on 11 November 2013.

The implicit recommendation of the report is that due to a conflicting process initiated by the Board, the DSSA is recommending that stage 2 actions considered by the DSSA NOT go ahead at this time. The suggestion was made that this be made explicit in the motion. This was addressed by modifying the motion to refer to the letter from the co-chairs to the Chairs of the chartering organizations, outlining the rationale for the position. The motion was adopted unanimously.

DISCUSSION – Written final input to the ATRT2: The Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT 2), mandated by paragraph 9.1 of the Affirmation of Commitments (AoC), is completing its analysis and holding consultations with Community, staff and Board. To fully inform its work, the ATRT 2 seeks input from the Community on its Draft Report & Recommendations (and the Correction Issued 7 November 2013) compiled for the Community’s consideration. Community participation is essential to the success of the review, and all input will be carefully considered. There was no objection to the details of the statement being refined and the statement being submitted on behalf of the Council (not indicating that it had explicit support of all of the SG/Constituencies).

DISCUSSION – Geographic Regions Review Working Group: The Geographic Regions Review Working Group was formed by the ICANN Board to (1) identify the different purposes for which ICANN’s Geographic Regions are used; (2) determine whether the uses of ICANN’s Geographic Regions (as currently defined, or at all) continue to meet the requirements of the relevant stakeholders; and (3) submit proposals for community and Board consideration relating to the current and future uses and definition of the ICANN Geographic Regions. A full record of the Working Group’s past reports and public workshops and presentations can be found at the Working Group’s Confluence Wiki space.

At various times over the past few years, the ALAC, ASO, ccNSO, GAC and GNSO communities have supplied representatives to serve on the Working Group. These communities have had the opportunity to review and provide formal comments on the Working Group’s recommendations before being submitted to the ICANN Board. The recommendations are provided a Final Report which is posted here.

The Chair of the working group has now written to the GNSO indicating that the charter of the Working Group, as approved by the ICANN Board, requires that the Chair receive written notification (by 31 December if possible) from each of the organisations that contributed members to the Working Group before the Final Report can be submitted formally to the ICANN Board. The form of the notification could support, oppose or take no position on the recommendations of the working group.

A decision was generally agreed to that the Council will send a letter of support.
INPUT & DISCUSSION – Prospective improvements to the Policy Development Process: The Council is committed to on-going enhancements to the methods of working of the Council and the work initiated and managed by the Council. The PDP process is a cornerstone of policy making within the GNSO and, as such, the work of the Council. The PDP outcomes and associated processes are the subject of focus and attention both within the GNSO and the broader ICANN Community. The Council has previously discussed a paper prepared by ICANN staff on potential improvements to the PDP process. The discussion is now encapsulated in a table form and now includes reference to the related recommendations of the ATRT2. Here the Council will discuss the table and aim to agree on concrete next steps.

There was a substantive discussion on many of the issues, and a decision was made to further refine the list and investigate options, likely with a group being formed to work with staff on this between GNSO Council meeting. This would be less formal that a traditional WG though.

GNSO Council Meeting - 31 October 2013


Motions: https://community.icann.org/display/gnso/councilmeetings/Motions+31+October+2013

MP3: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-council-20131031-en.mp3


Items requiring ALAC/At-Large focus: None.

Opening Remarks - Chair: The GNSO Review, which was tentatively postponed, will be going forward next year, as the first of a new series of institutional reviews.

MOTION – Adoption of the Thick Whois Policy Development Process Final Report and Recommendations: The Final Report on Thick Whois has been prepared as required by the GNSO PDP in the ICANN Bylaws. The Final Report is based on the Initial Report of 21 June 2013 and has been updated to reflect the review and analysis of the Public Comments received by the Thick Whois Working Group, in addition to further deliberations. The recommendations are:

1. The provision of thick Whois services, with a consistent labelling and display as per the model outlined in specification 3 of the 2013 RAA1, should become a requirement for all gTLD registries, both existing and future.
2. Following the adoption of this report and recommendations by the GNSO Council, the subsequent public comment forum (prior to Board consideration) and the notification by the ICANN Board to the GAC, specifically request input on any considerations related to the transition from thin to thick Whois that would need to be taken into account as part of the implementation process.
3. As part of the implementation process a legal review of law applicable to the transition of data from a thin to thick model that has not already been considered in the EWG memo2 is undertaken and due consideration is given to potential privacy issues that may arise from the discussions on the transition from thin to thick Whois, including, for example, guidance on how the long-standing contractual requirement that registrars give notice to, and obtain consent, from each registrant for uses of any personally identifiable data submitted by the registrant should apply to registrations involved in the transition. Should any privacy issues emerge from these transition discussions that were not anticipated by the WG and which would require additional policy consideration, the Implementation Review Team is expected to notify the GNSO Council of these so that appropriate action can be taken.

The motion carried unanimously among those present, but there were two Councillors absent who will have an opportunity for absentee voting, but the current threshold is sufficiently high to ensure its passing with a super-majority and thus go to the Board for their ratification.

MOTION – A charter for the Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation PDP WG: ICANN staff prepared a paper to summarise the outcomes of the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) negotiations in order to set the scene for subsequent associated policy development work to be managed by the Council. This is an ICANN Board initiated PDP. The staff paper contained a draft charter for the PDP WG and the Council has discussed this. Refinements to the charter have been proposed as has a title for the PDP WG.

This item originally came out of the joint GNSO/ALAC group that was convened after the 2009 RAA was approved. The motion originally read that this was the last of the items out of that process that were illegible for the PDP process. In fact, it was the last of the items from that group that were deemed to be high priority, with other issues still potentially to be acted on. I requested that the motion be suitably changed to reflect this, and the change was accepted as a friendly.

The motion passed unanimously (among those present), despite some reservations on the part of two NCSG Councillors.

MOTION – To approve a charter for the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group: On 13 June 2013 the GNSO Council initiated a Policy Development Process (PDP) on the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information and decided to create a PDP Working Group for the purposes of fulfilling the requirements of the PDP. Following a call for volunteers, a Drafting Team was formed and its members have developed a charter for consideration by the GNSO Council.

This motion was deferred from the last meeting with the understanding that the concerns were raised and discussed prior to this meeting. That was not done, but the concerns were raised at this meeting. They include the need to widen the charter to look at issues of whether such translation and transliteration is needed, who should pay for it, and several other issues.

I pointed out that in the absence of rules, registries and registrars have no basis on which to present IDN registration data in a 7-bit ASCII WHOIS system. The motion was voluntarily withdrawn to allow the charter to be reworked and resubmitted for the Buenos Aires meeting.

GNSO Council Meeting - 10 October 2013

Policy issues surrounding string confusion:

The Council previously discussed issues associated with the string confusion decisions that input on a draft survey and the implementation of the Lime Survey software within the ICANN IT infrastructure, the survey was made available to the community in September 2012. ICANN staff compiled and consolidated the survey results and the WSWG completed the WSWG Final Report for delivery to the GNSO Council.

There was a concern raised that the number of respondents was small and could not be considered statistically representative. The report's recommendations were unanimously approved (which was just to pass the results on to other bodies).

Motion to approve the further development of a framework for cross community working groups: This motion seeks further to develop a framework for cross community working groups by picking up the work of the drafting team which proposed a set of Draft Principles for Cross Community Working Groups (CCWGs) that were approved by the GNSO Council in March 2012. This work has had the benefit of subsequent review, comments and suggestions provided by the ccNSO. The motion here proposes that, in full cooperation with other SO/ACs, the GNSO Council jointly develops an updated set of principles for CCWGs taking into consideration the feedback provided by the ccNSO and in consultation with other interested SO/ACs. The aim being to create a framework applicable across all SO/ACs for the effective future functioning of CCWGs.

The motion was unanimously approved. It will be co-chaired by John Berard and an as yet unnamed ccNSO person. I indicated that the ALAC would be participating.

Motion to approve a charter for the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group: On 13 June 2013 the GNSO Council initiated a Policy Development Process (PDP) on the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information and decided to create a PDP Working Group for the purposes of fulfilling the requirements of the PDP. Following a call for volunteers, a Drafting Team was formed and its members have developed a charter for consideration by the GNSO Council. The drafting team has submitted the charter and so the GNSO Council, having reviewed the charter, will vote on whether to approve it as submitted by the Drafting Team.

This motion was deferred until the next meeting due to concerns raised by the Registrar SG. It is unclear exactly what those concerns were or why they were not raised earlier in the process.

Discussion – Policy issues surrounding string confusion: The Council previously discussed issues associated with the string confusion decisions that have been made recently e.g. relating to plural and singular versions of the same term and the contradictory decisions on identical strings. The Council agreed to write to the ICANN board and new gTLD programme committee and to consider appropriate additional action.

Christine Willet, VP, gTLD Operations spoke to the Council. The discussion starts at 45 minutes into the MP3 and continues for about 33 minutes.

UPDATE & DISCUSSION – A PDP for relevant policies on issues not dealt with during the course of developing the 2013 RAA: ICANN staff has prepared a paper to summarise the outcomes of the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) negotiations in order to set the scene for subsequent, relevant policy development work to be managed by the Council. This will be an ICANN Board initiated PDP.

Staff believes that the only substantive item left from the original GNSO/ALAC list (~2009) of needed RAA changes are those related to privacy and proxy services and this PDP is to address that subject. If the ALAC believes that there are other still pending issues, they should be raised.

GNSO Council Meeting - 13 June 2013


Motions: https://community.icann.org/display/gnso/councilmeetings/Motions+13+June+2013

MP3: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-council-20130613-en.mp3


Items requiring ALAC/At-Large focus or action are in red.

Motion - to Adopt Proposed Modification of the GNSO Operating Procedures Concerning the Deadline for the Submission of Reports and Motions: The change requires that reports and motions submitted for inclusion in a GNSO Council meeting agenda as soon as possible, but no later than 23h59 Coordinated Universal Time (UTC) on the day, 10 calendar days before the GNSO Council meeting. This tightens up the previous rule of “8 business days”. The motion passed unanimously.
MOTION - Initiation of a Policy Development Process (PDP) on the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information: A Final Issue Report on the translation and transliteration of contact information was submitted to the GNSO Council on 21 March 2013 (see http://gnso.icann.org/en/library). Contrary to its initial recommendation, Staff now recommends that a PDP be initiated as it is expected that the work of this PDP will helpfully inform the deliberations of other efforts that are looking into gTLD registration data services such as the Expert Working Group (EWG) and the subsequent PDP. Also, as recommended by the WHOIS Policy Review Team, the Final Issue Report recommends that ICANN should commission a study on the commercial feasibility of translation or transliteration systems for internationalized contact data, which is expected to help inform the PDP Working Group in its deliberations. ICANN’s General Counsel has confirmed that the topic is properly within the scope of the ICANN policy process and within the scope of the GNSO. The motion carried unanimously.

DISCUSSION – Reconsideration request from the Non-Commercial Stakeholder group relating to decision on the Trademark Clearinghouse:

On the 19th April 2013, the Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group submitted a Reconsideration Request to the ICANN Board Governance Committee (BGC). On the 16 May 2013, the BGC Recommendation on the Reconsideration Request was published. Concerns have been raised within the Council about:

1. The nature of the response to this particular request. Specifically in terms of the arguments presented within the response and the perceived or actual implications of these arguments on the workings of the multi-stakeholder model.
2. More generally about the effectiveness of the reconsideration process.

I cannot do justice by summarizing the introduction to this discussion, but strongly suggest that everyone either listed to it or read it. The same is true for following discussion that follows. The discussion starts at minute 25 of the MP3 and goes until 1:26, and the transcript covers pages 17-57.

DISCUSSION – Forthcoming reviews of the GNSO and GNSO Council: It now appears that the Board Structural Improvements Committee may be delaying the review process, so a GNSO review may not take place as soon as expected. The GNSO will continue discussing what action, if any they will take at this time.

UPDATE & DISCUSSION – Report on User Experience Implications of Active Variant TLDs & IDN Letter to the Board: During its meeting in Beijing, the ICANN Board requested that, by 1 July 2013, interested Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees provide staff with any input and guidance they may have to be factored into implementation of the Recommendations from the Report on User Experience Implications of Active Variant TLDs’ (see http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/prelim-report-11apr13-en.htm#2.a). The Report on User Experience Implications of Active Variant TLDs examines potential challenges from a user experience perspective when variants of IDN TLDs are activated and offers recommendations to users to minimize risks and optimize the implementation. The GNSO itself will not provide any input but is suggesting that SG/Constituencies might wish to.

GNSO Council Meeting - 16 May 2013


Motions: https://community.icann.org/display/gnscouncilmeetings/Motion+16+May+2013

MP3: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnscouncil-20130516-en.mp3


Items requiring ALAC/At-Large action are in red.

MOTION - To address the Final Issue Report on the Uniformity of Reporting: At its October meeting last year the GNSO Council requested an Issue Report on the current state of uniformity in the mechanisms to initiate, track, and analyse policy-violation reports. ICANN Staff was also explicitly requested to provide its recommendation(s) on how this issue can be further addressed outside of a PDP if recommendations in relation to this issue do not require consensus policies to implement. The Final Issue Report was presented to the GNSO Council in Beijing. The Council considered a motion to form a non-PDP Working Group to consider additional methods for collecting necessary metrics and reporting from Contracted Parties and other external resources to aid the policy development process as outlined in the Final Issue Report. The GNSO did not initiate a Policy Development Process at this stage but will review at the completion of the ICANN Contractual Compliance three-year plan expected for 31 December 2013. The GNSO Council did create of a drafting team to develop a charter for a non-PDP Working Group to consider additional methods for collecting necessary metrics and reporting from Contracted Parties and other external resources to aid the investigation. (Adopted unanimously)

A call for DT members will be issued.

MOTION - To adopt a revised Policy Development Process (PDP) Manual incorporating modifications to include the suspension of a PDP: Adopted unanimously.

MOTION - Initiation of a Policy Development Process (PDP) on the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information: A Final Issue Report translation and transliteration of contact information was submitted to the GNSO Council on 21 March 2013 (see http://gnso.icann.org/en/library). The Final Issue Report recommends that the GNSO Council should initiate a Policy Development Process (PDP) limited to the issues discussed in this report but delay the next steps in the PDP until the Expert Working Group (EWG) on gTLD Directory Services completes its recommendations. In May 2013 with a possible extension, in order to ensure that the resulting policy recommendations would be consistent with any new model or approaches to contact data that may result from the Expert Working Group’s deliberations. As recommended by the WHOIS Policy Review Team the Final Issue Report also recommends that ICANN should commission a study on the commercial feasibility of translation or transliteration systems for internationalized contact data, which is expected to help inform the PDP Working Group in its deliberations.
The EWG indicated while in Beijing that their work would take considerably longer than expected, that there was no reason to delay this work, and in fact the work would help them.

One NCSG Council member felt the PDP should wait for the EWG, a position supported by an IPC Councillor who asked for a deferral until the next meeting, and this deferral was (automatically) granted.

**UPDATE & DISCUSSION – Report on User Experience Implications of Active Variant TLDs & IDN Letter to the Board:** During its meeting in Beijing, the ICANN Board requested that, by 1 July 2013, interested Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees provide staff with any input and guidance they may have to be factored into implementation of the Recommendations from the Report on User Experience Implications of Active Variant TLDs (see http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/prelim-report-11apr13-en.htm#2.a). The Report on User Experience Implications of Active Variant TLDs examines potential challenges from a user experience perspective when variants of IDN TLDs are activated and offers recommendations to users to minimize risks and optimize the implementation.


Input is requested on:

a) Which recommendations if any, are pre-requisites to the delegation of any IDN variant TLDs (i.e., delegation of IDN Variant TLDs should not proceed until these recommendations are implemented),

b) Which recommendations, if any, can be deferred until a later time, and

c) Which recommendations, if any, require additional policy work by the ICANN community and should be referred to the relevant stakeholder group for further policy work.

**Buenos Aires:** Intent is to use the Friday following the ICANN week to "induct" new Councillors into the Council. Not obvious if open to old Councillors as well.

**GNSO Council Meeting - 14 February 2013**

**Agenda:** http://gnso.icann.org/en/meetings/agenda-council-14feb13-en.htm

**Motions:** None

**MP3:** http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-council-20130214-en.mp3


**Minutes:** http://gnso.icann.org/en/meetings/minutes-council-14feb13-en.htm

**Overview:** Substantive issues of interest to At-Large included theseveral recent meetings, TMCH, IGO/INGO, Closed generic TLDs, Whois privacy/proxy study and ERRP.

**INFORMATION & DISCUSSION – Recent meetings in Amsterdam & LA:** Prior to a Ry/Rr briefing in Amsterdam, Council Chair and Vice Chairs met with ICANN staff, and found the process very useful. The discussions focused on Council management as well as the status of various issues and projects. The NCSG met in Los Angeles in the first ever inter-sessional House meeting along with ICANN staff. The long period between Toronto and Beijing was one of the driving rationales. The two SGs also met individually with Fadi. With the CSG, the subjects included the series of Roundtables and the IP rights strawman process.

**UPDATE & DISCUSSION - Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH) Strawman Proposal and Defensive Registrations:** ICANN's CEO has requested GNSO Council input on the Strawman Proposal developed through the TMCH related implementation discussions. The discussion focused on the draft letter to be sent staff on the GNSO position, with a focus on trying to get it to accurately reflect Council (or SG) positions. I did intervene saying that it was good to get that letter out, but Council should start to discuss how to develop policy at least for the issue that even ICANN says is policy.

**UPDATE & DISCUSSION – Board requested advice on second level protections for certain IGO names and acronyms:** Council got an extensive update on the PDP. A letter will be drafted in reply. I suspect the ultimate answer will be that there is no consensus from the GNSO on a rationale to stop the Board action, but there are some people who feel that taking interim action while a PDP is running is not in the Public Interest.

**UPDATE & DISCUSSION – The issue of "closed generic" TLDs:** The New gTLD Program Committee recently directed the ICANN CEO to request the GNSO to provide guidance on the issue of "closed generic" TLDs, concurrent with the opening of the public comment forum and if the GNSO wishes, to provide such guidance. Guidance on this issue is requested to be provided by the close of the public comment forum. (7 March). It was pointed out that the issue had been discussed and was was closed with the current outcome. Many of the decisions were ultimately made by staff (ie response to question: what if Kraft applies for .food - answer was it was ok).

**UPDATE & DISCUSSION – Whois Privacy and Proxy Relay and Reveal Study:** At the ICANN Meeting in Toronto, Lyman Chapin presented the results of the survey that evaluated the feasibility of conducting a future in-depth study into communication Relay and identity Reveal requests sent for gTLD domain names registered using Proxy and Privacy services. The Council must consider whether to go ahead with the study. One question is whether the study should be done, but delayed until the Directory Services Expert Working Group does its work. I voiced the opinion that the Expert Panel would lead to a PDP, and the accreditation of privacy/proxy services as well, so might as well start the study - they always take longer than planned. There was some concern expressed about staff making decisions prior to the study being completed wasting the money on the study. Clarification would be sought and the issue discussed in Beijing.

**Any Other Business:** I raised the issue of the long delays in implementing PEDNR, as asked for a report (almost 4 years since GNSO initiated the PDP, 10 months since GNSO approval, 14 months since Board approval, 2 months since comment period closed). Staff said that an announcement will likely be made in about 2 weeks.

**GNSO Council Meeting - 21 January 2013**
This was a one-topic meeting to formally endorse the GNSO STRT-2 candidates. The rules call for each SG to endorse one candidate and up to two additional candidates endorsed by the GNSO as a whole. The candidates are supposed to have no more than half of the nominees from one region and not all of the nominees should be of the same gender. To endorse the additional candidates requires the support of 60% of both houses.

The Registries SG have supported all three applicants but since they can only formally endorse one, they have endorsed Brian Cute. The Registrar SG has endorsed the only candidate that applied to them, Thomas Barrett. The CSG and NCSG has not yet formally endorsed anyone, although some parts of the CSG have selected Michael Roberts. Nominations were due by the 24th, but given that there is a Ry/RR meeting in Amsterdam this week, and a CSG meeting in Los Angeles next week, the GNSO call was scheduled for today.

The CSG and NCSG have been given until midnight of January 24 to make their endorsements. There will then be an e-mail ballot to potentially endorse any additional candidates. It appears that given the candidate list, the GNSO self-imposed geographic diversity rule will not be met, and it is possible the gender rule will not be met as well.

The overall applicant pool is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Geogr. Region</th>
<th>SG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Barrett</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>North America</td>
<td>RrSG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Cute</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>North America</td>
<td>RySG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avri Doria</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>North America</td>
<td>NCSG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Falvey</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>North America</td>
<td>RySG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Blake Harris</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>North America</td>
<td>RySG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie-Laure Lemineur</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>NCSG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivier Muron</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>CSG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Roberts</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>North America</td>
<td>CSG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full application details can be found at [http://www.icann.org/en/about/aoc-review/atrt/2/applications](http://www.icann.org/en/about/aoc-review/atrt/2/applications)

---

GNSO Council Meeting - 17 January 2013


**Motions:** [https://community.icann.org/display/gnscouncilmeetings/Motions+-+17+January+2013](https://community.icann.org/display/gnscouncilmeetings/Motions+-+17+January+2013)

**MP3:** [http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-council-20130117-en.mp3](http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-council-20130117-en.mp3)


**Overview:** Substantive issues of interest to At-Large included IRTP-D PDP Initiation and Charter, TMCH Strawman, Response to GAC letter on IGO/INGO protections, discussion of ATRT-2 selections and a discussion on Policy vs Implementation. Items requiring ALAC/At-Large action are in red.

**Initiation of a Policy Development Process (PDP) on the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) Part D:** IRTP, Part D includes six issues:

- Whether reporting requirements for registries and dispute providers should be developed, in order to make precedent and trend information available to the community and allow reference to past cases in dispute submissions;
- Whether additional provisions should be included in the TDRP (Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy) on how to handle disputes when multiple transfers have occurred;
- Whether dispute options for registrants should be developed and implemented as part of the policy (registrants currently depend on registrars to initiate a dispute on their behalf);
- Whether requirements or best practices should be put into place for registrars to make information on transfer dispute resolution options available to registrants;
- Whether existing penalties for policy violations are sufficient or if additional provisions/penalties for specific violations should be added into the policy;
- Whether the universal adoption and implementation of EPP AuthInfo codes has eliminated the need of FOAs. (Forms of Authorization - standardized forms for registrars to request and confirm transfers)

The Council unanimously approved the PDP.
Approval of a Charter for the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) Part D Working Group: Normally, when a PDP is initiated, the Council convenes a DT to draft a charter for the work to be carried out. In this instance, in the interest of efficiency and because the issues laid out in the IRTP-D Final Issues Report were very precise, Council adopted the charter as proposed and request that this work be started by a WG asap. A call for WG participants will be made shortly.

GNSO Council Review and SIC Update: In Toronto, the Chair of the SIC provided an overview of a new framework for future independent review efforts at ICANN. The GNSO was used as a case study to describe the effort because it is the first Supporting Organization lined-up in the next review cycle. Rob Hogarth presented the overall concept

- Presentation
- GNSO Review Plan framework

UPDATE & DISCUSSION - Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH) Strawman Proposal and Defensive Registrations Discussion: The discussion started of discussion the draft letter which essentially focused on the concept that the GNSO is the policy formulation body and thus the strawman is to a large extent not relevant, since it was created by an ad hoc group. By the end of the discussion, there was a strong acceptance that for the issues that either staff or large parts of the GNSO deem to be policy, the GNSO does have an obligation to start expedited policy work on those areas. The discussions will continue.

UPDATE & DISCUSSION - Response to the GAC Letter: The GAC has sent a letter to the GNSO Council with regard to the initiation of a PDP on the IGO/INGO issue, and specifically requesting a rationale for undertaking a PDP i.e. an explanation as to why GNSO believes this issue should be evaluated through a PDP rather than simply executed as an implementation process. The Council has sent an initial response and now needs to move ahead with developing a full response. A letter was drafted by Neustar which people generally thinks is a good start (as do I), particularly if some history and background is attached. Work will continue.

UPDATE & DISCUSSION - ATRT2 Developments: There are 8 applications. The GNSO has told the selectors that they would like to see at least 4 selected, giving representation to each SG. The GNSO rules call for them to endorse one candidate per SG, plus up to 2 more if they can get a 60% vote from BOTH houses), no more than half (of the 4 I think) from any one region, and not all of the same gender. A meeting is scheduled for January 21 to finalize selections.

INFORMATION & DISCUSSION – Policy vs. Implementation: The recent letter from the GAC as well as activities relating to work on the Trademark Clearinghouse, highlights a broader issue regarding the boundary between policy development and implementation work as well as the effective integration of policy development and integration work from the outset. Recent discussions on the Council mailing list indicate that there is an interest to undertake further work on this issue. At the same time, ICANN Staff has published a paper that is intended to facilitate further community discussions on this topic.