

# GNSO Liaison Reports 2014

- ☐ GNSO Council Teleconference held 11 December 2014 at 15:00 UTC.

11 December	GNSO Council Teleconference	15:00 UTC	<a href="#">Agenda</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <a href="#">Transcript</a></li><li>• <a href="#">Chat Transcript</a></li></ul>	<a href="#">Mp3</a>
-------------	-----------------------------	-----------	------------------------	--	---------------------

MP3 recording of the GNSO Council teleconference held on Thursday, 11 December 2014 at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnsoc/gnsoc-council-20141211-en.mp3>; the Adobe chat transcript at :<http://gnsoc.icann.org/en/meetings/transcript-chat-council-11dec14-en.pdf>; Also see page <http://gnsoc.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#dec>

Agenda for the GNSO Council Teleconference held 11 December 2014 at 15:00 UTC.

<https://community.icann.org/display/gnsocouncilmeetings/Agenda+11+December+2014>  
<http://gnsoc.icann.org/en/meetings/agenda-council-11dec14-en.htm>

*Meeting Time 15:00 UTC:*  
<http://tinyurl.com/mwphzsc>

GNSO Council meeting was audio cast <http://stream.icann.org:8000/gnsoc.m3u>

## **Item 1: Administrative matters (5 mins)**

- 1.1 Roll Call
- 1.2 Statement of interest updates
- 1.3 Review/amend agenda
- 1.4. Note the status of minutes for the previous Council meeting per the GNSO Operating Procedures:

Minutes of the [GNSO Council Public meeting](#) and the [Administrative meeting of the new Council](#) on 15 October 2014 and the GNSO Council meeting **13 November 2014** will be posted as approved on 7 December 2014.

## **Item 2: Opening Remarks / Review of Projects & Action List (10 mins)**

Review focus areas and provide updates on specific key themes / topics

Include review of [Projects List](#) and [Action List](#).

Comments or questions arising.

## **Item 3: Consent agenda (5 mins)**

## **Item 4: DISCUSSION - Board Working Group Report on the Nominating Committee (10 mins)**

ICANN posted for public comment the report prepared by the Board Working Group on Nominating Committee (BWG-NomCom). The Board stated that it welcomes input from the community on the BWG-NomCom report as the recommendations in the BWG-NomCom report have potential effects on the NomCom structure.

If implemented, the recommendations would result in an increase in the number of appointees from ccNSO and ASO and a reduction in the GNSO appointees. Also, GAC representation could increase at GAC discretion. Overall, the size of the NomCom would increase from 21 to 25-27 individuals.

The deadline for comments was 21 October, followed by a reply period, [extended to 9 January](#). Here, the Council will consider whether to submit input on behalf of the Council to the public comment forum and, if so, the content of such input.

### **4.1 Update (Tony Holmes)**

### **4.2 Discussion**

### **4.3 Next steps**

## **Item 5: UPDATE - Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability (15 mins)**

The National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) has requested that ICANN "convene a multistakeholder process to develop a plan to transition the U.S. government stewardship role" with regard to the IANA Functions and related root zone management.

During discussions around the transition process, the community raised the broader topic of the impact of the change on ICANN's accountability given its historical contractual relationship with the United States and NTIA. The concerns raised during these discussions around the transition process indicate that the level of trust into the existing ICANN accountability mechanisms does not yet meet some stakeholder's expectations. Considering that the NTIA has stressed that it was expecting community consensus regarding the transition, this gap between the current situation and stakeholder expectations may prevent the transition to proceed.

As a result, a DT was formed with participants, amongst others, from the ccNSO, GNSO, ASO and ALAC to develop a charter for a Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability. The DT delivered the proposed charter for consideration to all the ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees on 3 November 2014 and the charter was adopted by the GNSO Council during its meeting on 13 November. .

The Council received an update on status and activities of the CCWG to date.

5.1 Update (Thomas Rickert)

5.2 Discussion

5.3 Next steps

**Item 6: DISCUSSION – Prospective policy work on “name collision” (15 mins)**

On the 30 July 2014, the New gTLD Program Committee of the ICANN Board directed staff to "provide information to, and work with the GNSO to consider whether policy work on developing a long-term plan to manage gTLD name collision issues should be undertaken."

ICANN Staff submitted this paper to the GNSO Council on 7 October 2014 (see <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-gnso-policy-07oct14-en.pdf>) and it was presented to the Council during the ICANN meeting in Los Angeles. Council members agreed in Los Angeles to discuss with their respective group what further action, if any, should be taken on this topic and report back accordingly during this meeting.

Furthermore, a [letter](#) was received from Cyrus Namazi offering any additional information or assistance that ICANN Staff can provide to further assist the Council in its deliberations.

The GNSO Council discussed the topic during its last meeting following which all Councilors were encouraged to discuss with their respective groups what, if any, policy development is deemed necessary and to provide that feedback during this meeting.

6.1 Discussion

6.2 Next steps

**Item 7: DISCUSSION - Board resolution concerning future gTLD Application Rounds (15 mins)**

On 17 November 2014 the ICANN Board adopted a resolution the planning for future gTLD application rounds. As part of its action, the Board acknowledged the effort and progress within the GNSO to identify areas where the GNSO believes that policy advice can be clarified or where it wishes to provide additional policy advice applicable to future application rounds. Furthermore, as requested in the GNSO Council's June 2014 resolution, the Board provided input into the GNSO Council's discussion to identify areas that the Board believes may be appropriate for discussion in an evaluation of the current gTLD application round and for possible adjustments for subsequent application procedures.

The GNSO Council reviewed and discussed the input received.

7.1 - Update

7.2 - Discussion

**Item 8: UPDATE – GNSO / GAC Consultation Group and related work (15 mins)**

Here the Council will have an opportunity to hear about the work of the GNSO / GAC Consultation Group and from the GNSO Liaison to the GAC including any initial input and feedback derived following the ICANN meeting in Los Angeles.

In addition, there will be an opportunity to further discuss ideas put forward during the GNSO Council Development Session in relation to potential GNSO work in response to the GAC Communiqué from ICANN meetings.

8.1 – Update (Mason Cole / Volker Greimann)

8.2 – Discussion

**Item 9: UPDATE – Cross Community Working Group to develop a transition proposal for IANA stewardship on naming related functions (15 mins)**

Following adoption of the [charter](#), this is an opportunity for the Council to receive a brief update on the current status as well as next steps of this CWG. The CWG has been tasked to develop an IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal on Naming Related Functions and has been meeting for 2 hours every week since its creation in view of delivering a final proposal by the end of January 2015. A number of sub-groups have been formed to progress work on the different elements of the ICG Request for Proposals and a face-to-face meeting is being planned for mid-November. A draft proposal will be published for community comment on 1 December. For further information, see <https://community.icann.org/x/37fhAg>.

9.1 – Update (Jonathan Robinson)  
9.2 – Next steps

**Item 10 Any Other Business (10 mins)**

10.1 Correspondence with NGPC on IGO & RCRC. Any update?

10.2 Skill sets for Nominating Committee. Complete?

10.3 [Letter](#) to the GAC sub-working group on geographic names from Cross-Constituency Working Group on Country and Territory Names (CWG) - Confirmation of no objection?

☑ **REPORT to the November 2014 ALAC Meeting:-**  
Recently the GNSO has published its **Activity Report** from the **ICANN LA Meeting**, where they:

- - held over 60 sessions.
  - Proxy and Privacy Services Accreditation Issues (PPSAI) Working Groups held a face-to-face facilitated meeting on the Friday before.
  - held its usual weekend of preparatory sessions, where policy issues and activity and work progress updates were presented.
  - met with SSAC, the GNSO Review Consultants, various senior ICANN staff, the Board and the GAC.
  - the GNSO Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies met, and each met with the Board.
  - held a GNSO Council Public Meeting, passing motions;
    - 1. to adopt the IRTF Part D Final Report and all 18 of its consensus recommendations, which is now open for Public Comment until December 1st;
    - 2. adoption of the Charter for a Cross Community Working Group to discuss Internet Governance (CWG-IG) issues affecting ICANN.
  - welcomed 7 new GNSO Councillors and myself as the new ALAC Liaison to the GNSO Council.
  - held a 1 day in service training and team building session for the new GNSO Council on the Friday following the close of the meeting.

Following the 'Adoption of a Charter for a Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability' at the November GNSO Council Meeting (see below) a call has been sent out so that "Each GNSO Stakeholder Group should identify one member for the CWG by 20 November 2014 taking into account the charter requirement"(s).

Documents and outcomes from the 13th November 2014 GNSO Council Teleconference see <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#nov>

<a href="#">Agenda</a>	<a href="#">Recording - MP3</a>	<a href="#">AC Room Chat Transcript</a>	<a href="#">Minutes</a>	<a href="#">Transcript</a>
------------------------	---------------------------------	---	-------------------------	----------------------------

Matters of particular significance to ALAC / At-Large from this meeting.

**Item 4: MOTION – Adoption of a Charter for a Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability**

RESOLVED: copy of notice from GNSO Secretary follows regarding the outcome at the meeting=>

*"Ahead of the official Council minutes, the following resolution was passed at the GNSO Council meeting on 13 November 2014.*

***Adoption of a Charter for a Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability***

*Whereas,*

- 1. The National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) has requested that ICANN "convene a multistakeholder process to develop a plan to transition the U.S. government stewardship role" with regard to the IANA Functions and related root zone management.*
- 2. During discussions around the transition process, the community raised the broader topic of the impact of the change on ICANN's accountability given its historical contractual relationship with the United States and NTIA. Accountability in this context is defined, according to the Netmundial multis stakeholder statement[1], as the existence of mechanisms for independent checks and balances as well as for review and redress.*

3. The concerns raised during these discussions around the transition process indicate that the level of trust into the existing ICANN accountability mechanisms does not yet meet some stakeholder's expectations. Considering that the NTIA has stressed that it was expecting community consensus regarding the transition, this gap between the current situation and stakeholder expectations may prevent the transition to proceed.

4. A DT was formed with participants, amongst others, from the ccNSO, GNSO, ASO and ALAC to develop a charter for a Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability.

5. The DT delivered the proposed charter for consideration to all the ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees for consideration (see: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/enhancing-accountability-charter-03nov14-en.pdf>)

Resolved,

1. The GNSO Council approves the Charter (<http://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/enhancing-accountability-charter-03nov14-en.pdf>) and appoints Thomas Rickert as the GNSO Council liaison and GNSO co-chair to the CWG.

2. Each GNSO Stakeholder Group will identify one member for the CWG by 20 November taking into account the charter requirement that best efforts should be made to ensure that members:

- Have sufficient expertise to participate in the applicable subject matter (see for example <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/enhancing-accountability-faqs-2014-08-22-en#12> for areas identified for expertise);
- Commit to actively participate in the activities of the CWG on an ongoing and long-term basis; and
- Where appropriate, solicit and communicate the views and concerns of individuals in the organization that appoints them.

3. The GNSO will collaborate with the other SOs and ACs to issue a call for participants to join the CWG, each in accordance with its own rules.

[1] <http://netmundial.br/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/NETmundial-Multistakeholder-Document.pdf>

---

## GNSO Council Development Session- 17 October 2014

GNSO Council Development Session – Held onsite at ICANN Offices in LA, FULL REPORT WILL BE LINKED HERE when released from Draft status and approved by GNSO Council

In general though the purpose was a combination of 'team / leadership training' as well as to discuss the role and purpose of the GNSO Council, and for the GNSO leadership / councillors to provide their views and expectations as to what they would like to see from the Council in the coming year.

Primary Objectives of the meeting was to

- Build trust between each other and understanding of each others groups
- Orient the Council in the GNSO

---

16 October	GNSO Wrap Up	12:00 PDT	<a href="#">Transcript</a>	
------------	--------------	-----------	----------------------------	--

## GNSO Council Meeting - 15 October 2014

Agenda: <https://community.icann.org/display/gnsocouncilmeetings/Agenda+15+October+2014>

Motions: <https://community.icann.org/display/gnsocouncilmeetings/Motions+15+October+2014>

Transcript: <http://la51.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-gns0-council-admin/transcript-gns0-council-admin-15oct14-en.pdf>

Minutes:

Recording: <http://audio.icann.org/meetings/losangeles2014/gnso-council-admin-15oct14-en.mp3>

Items meriting ALAC/At-Large focus:

Discussion:

**MOTION - On the adoption of the IRTP Part D Final Report and Recommendations:** The [final report](#) of the policy work on the inter-registrar transfer process has been published. The Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) provides the policy framework for domain name transfers between registrars. The IRTP also provides standardized requirements for inter-registrar transfer disputes - through the Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy (TDRP). The policy is an existing community consensus policy that was implemented in late 2004 and has been revised numerous times since then.

The IRTP Part D Policy Development Process (PDP) is the forth and final PDP of this series of revisions. The Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Council resolved at its meeting on 17 October 2012 to launch an Issue Report on IRTP Part D, "which should include all the remaining issues identified by the original transfers Working Groups as well as the additional issue identified by the IRTP Part C WG."

The report was adopted unanimously.

**MOTION – To adopt the Charter for a Cross Community Working Group to discuss Internet governance (CWG-IG) issues affecting ICANN and to make recommendations to the chartering organisation on these issues:**

The Internet Governance Cross Community Working Group CWG has been established by the participating SO's and AC's to coordinate, facilitate, and increase the participation of the ICANN community in discussions and processes pertaining to Internet Governance.

All issues, processes and discussions regarding the Transition of NTIA's Stewardship of the IANA Functions, and/or current and future accountability and accountability mechanisms related to the aforementioned Transition, are deemed to be out of scope of the objective of the WG.

The CWG has a [charter](#) which has previously been adopted by ICANN's ALAC, ccNSO and SSAC. In this item the GNSO Council will vote on whether or not to adopt the charter of the CWG.

An amendment was proposed to explicitly say that the three Constituencies within the CSG would appoint their own member ([link to amendment here](#)). The amendment was not considered friendly. Various issues were raised, including that the CSG was effectively a merger of three independent organizations and they never operated as a group. This struck me as an inappropriate time to effectively attempt to re-structure the GNSO (that is a personal opinion). It was re-worded and accepted as friendly. The identification of the GNSO co-chair was also deleted.

The motions passed with two Nos and one Abstention.

**UPDATE – A GNSO liaison to the GAC:** The council voted to appoint Mason Cole as the GNSO Liaison to the GAC with immediate effect such that he can be well informed and up to speed in order to participate effectively as soon as possible and, in particular, at ICANN 51. Mason summarized his perspective of the position. A main focus will be taking information on ongoing GNSO activities and presenting it to the GAC in a form that is understandable and useful to the GAC and looking for methodologies for the GAC to influence these activities.

**UPDATE – A letter to the ICANN NGPC regarding the proposed modification of GNSO consensus recommendations relating to IGO acronyms and Red Cross identifiers:**

On 10 November 2013 the PDP Working Group (IGO-INGO PDP WG) delivered its [Final Report](#) to the GNSO Council that included twenty-five consensus recommendations. On 20 November 2013 the GNSO Council unanimously [adopted](#) all twenty-five consensus recommendations of the IGO-INGO PDP WG and forwarded them to the ICANN Board in January 2014 with a recommendation for their adoption.

On 30 April 2014 the Board [resolved](#) to adopt those of the GNSO's recommendations that are not inconsistent with GAC advice, and to facilitate dialogue between the affected parties in order to reconcile the remaining differences, as further detailed in [Annex A](#) and [Annex B](#) of the Board's resolution. The GNSO's recommendations and GAC advice are largely consistent except in relation to the duration and mechanism of protection for IGO acronyms and the full names and acronyms of 189 Red Cross national societies and the international Red Cross and Red Crescent movement, for which the GNSO had [recommended](#) a 90-day period of protection by way of a claim notification service utilising the Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH).

On 16 June 2014 the NGPC [sent](#) a letter to the GNSO Council requesting that the GNSO consider modifying its recommendations relating to the duration and mechanism of protection for IGO acronyms and national society names of the Red Cross. This modification to be in accordance with and as envisaged by Section 16 of the GNSO's [PDP Manual](#).

On 24 July 2014, the Chair of the NGPC followed up with a note to the Chair of the GNSO Council and offered to provide a written or oral briefing to provide greater clarity on the GAC's advice and expectations with respect to protections of IGO-INGO Identifiers. As a result of the briefing it was agreed to send a follow-up [letter](#) to the NGPC which has now been done (see <http://gnso.icann.org/en/correspondence/robinson-to-chalaby-disspain-07oct14-en.pdf>)

**UPDATE - Name Collision:** On the 30 July 2014, the New gTLD Program Committee of the ICANN Board directed staff to "provide information to, and work with the GNSO to consider whether policy work on developing a long-term plan to manage gTLD name collision issues should be undertaken." ICANN Staff submitted this paper to the GNSO Council on 7 October 2014 (see <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-gnso-policy-07oct14-en.pdf>).

There was a discussion on whether "drop catching" should be a part of this work, but no decision was taken.

**UPDATE – A cross community working group to develop a transition proposal for IANA stewardship on naming related functions:** A drafting team (DT) was formed with participants from the ccNSO, GNSO, SSAC and ALAC to develop a charter for a Cross Community Working Group to Develop an IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal on Naming Related Functions.

Wrong wording - Accountability and Governance Charter

#### **Item 10: Thanks to outgoing councillors and ALAC Liaison (5 mins)**

- Jennifer Wolfe (NCA)
- Ching Chiao (RySG)
- John Berard (CSG / BC)
- Magaly Pazello (NCSG)
- Klaus Stoll (NCSG)
- Alan Greenberg (ALAC Liaison)
- Maria Farrell (NCSG)
- Petter Rindforth (IPC)

#### **Item 11: Any Other Business (5 mins)**

11.1 GNSO Review update (Jennifer Wolfe)

### **GNSO Council Meeting - 24 September 2014**

**Agenda:** <https://community.icann.org/display/gnsocouncilmeetings/Agenda+25+September+2014>

**Motions:** None

**Transcript:** Not yet available

**Minutes:** Not yet available

#### **Items meriting ALAC/At-Large focus:**

**Discussion:** Request from the Chair of the Board to the GNSO to contribute people to a Board-GNSO working group to investigate the next steps on the DS-EWG. There was a substantive discussion indicating that there was significant confusion on the next steps, justifying the need. Some Councillors were very confused on the overall EWG issue, going so far as to believe that the EWG was actually a Board initiated PDP, and it now had to be implemented.

#### **ADD POINTER TO REQUEST LETTER**

#### **DISCUSSION – A letter to the ICANN NGPC regarding the proposed modification of GNSO consensus recommendations relating to IGO acronyms and Red Cross identifiers:**

On 10 November 2013 the PDP Working Group (IGO-INGO PDP WG) delivered its [Final Report](#) to the GNSO Council that included twenty-five consensus recommendations. On 20 November 2013 the GNSO Council unanimously [adopted](#) all twenty-five consensus recommendations of the IGO-INGO PDP WG and forwarded them to the ICANN Board in January 2014 with a recommendation for their adoption.

On 30 April 2014 the Board [resolved](#) to adopt those of the GNSO's recommendations that are not inconsistent with GAC advice, and to facilitate dialogue between the affected parties in order to reconcile the remaining differences, as further detailed in [Annex A](#) and [Annex B](#) of the Board's resolution. The GNSO's recommendations and GAC advice are largely consistent except in relation to the duration and mechanism of protection for IGO acronyms and the full names and acronyms of 189 Red Cross national societies and the international Red Cross and Red Crescent movement, for which the GNSO had [recommended](#) a 90-day period of protection by way of a claim notification service utilising the Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH).

On 16 June 2014 the NGPC [sent](#) a letter to the GNSO Council requesting that the GNSO consider modifying its recommendations relating to the duration and mechanism of protection for IGO acronyms and national society names of the Red Cross. This modification to be in accordance with and as envisaged by Section 16 of the GNSO's [PDP Manual](#).

On 24 July 2014, the Chair of the NGPC followed up with a note to the Chair of the GNSO Council and offered to provide a written or oral briefing to provide greater clarity on the GAC's advice and expectations with respect to protections of IGO-INGO Identifiers. As a result of the briefing it was agreed to send a follow-up letter to the NGPC. Here the Council will review the letter with the objective of providing sufficient input and/or support such that the letter can now be sent.

The [letter](#) was generally acceptable to the Council. I took strong exception to the fact that it did not explicitly ask the NGPC for clarity on what they were willing to offer the GAC with respect to the RCRC local names. I was asked to suggest a modification.

**UPDATE – A GNSO liaison to the GAC:** The council voted to appoint Mason Cole as the GNSO Liaison to the GAC with immediate effect such that he can be well informed and up to speed in order to participate effectively as soon as possible and, in particular, at ICANN 51. Mason presented his history and described how he envisioned the role.

<http://gns0.icann.org/en/correspondence/presentation-gac-liaison-overview-25sep14-en.pdf>

**UPDATE - PDP WG on IRTP Part D - Final Recommendations:** The WG anticipates that it will be in a position to submit its Final Report in advance of the ICANN meeting in Los Angeles. As such, James Bladel, the Chair of the WG, has proposed that he presents the Final Report and recommendations to the Council now so that there is ample time for review and discussion prior to and during the LA meeting which with the objective being that the Council is in a well-informed position to vote on the report during the meeting in LA.

James Bladel, the Chair of the WG presented some of the highlights and the overall report will be presented in LA.

James and the entire WG was praised for the diligence and care that was taken in carrying out this PDP (by me and Avri).

<http://gns0.icann.org/en/correspondence/presentation-irtp-d-final-25sep14-en.pdf>

**UPDATE – Subsequent rounds of new gTLDs – status report:** A status report from ICANN staff following on from the GNSO Council's [motion](#) on New gTLD Subsequent Rounds was requested during the ICANN 50 meeting in London.



This status update included status reporting on:

- (a) the new gTLD program in general;
- (b) ICANN's anticipated timeline and work plan for the review specified in Section 9.3 of the Affirmation of Commitments;
- (c) ICANN's work to date on any evaluation of the first round;
- (d) the work to date on the post-launch independent review of the Trademark Clearinghouse; (e) ICANN's current projection for a timetable for subsequent rounds.

An interim update has previously been [provided](http://gns0.icann.org/en/correspondence/presentation-new-gtld-subsequent-22sep14-en.pdf) by Karen Lentz but a more detailed report is also available. - <http://gns0.icann.org/en/correspondence/presentation-new-gtld-subsequent-22sep14-en.pdf>.

**UPDATE – A cross community working group to develop a transition proposal for IANA stewardship on naming related functions:** A drafting team (DT) was formed with participants from the ccNSO, GNSO, SSAC and ALAC to develop a charter for a Cross Community Working Group to Develop an IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal on Naming Related Functions. Following adoption of the [charter](#) at the previous meeting, this is an opportunity for the Council to receive a brief update on the next steps.

The GNSO may name up to 5 members. The group will meet for the first time on October XX.

**DISCUSSION – The report of the ICANN Board Working Group on the Nominating Committee:** The Board Working Group on Nominating Committee (BWGNomCom) is charged with performing the review called for in Recommendation 10 of the Nominating Committee Review Finalization Working Group, addressing issues of the size and composition of the Nominating Committee, as well as the related issues of NomCom's recruitment and selection functions. The Board Working Group on Nominating Committee has recently published its [report](#). The general feeling was that the Council might well want to comment, but would wait for the reply period to allow it first to see any Constituency/SG comments.

## GNSO Council Meeting - 04 September 2014

**Agenda:** <https://community.icann.org/display/gnsocouncilmeetings/Agenda+04+September+2014>

**Motions:** <https://community.icann.org/display/gnsocouncilmeetings/Motions+04+September+2014>

**MP3:** Not yet available

**Transcript:** Not yet available

**Minutes:** - Not yet available

**Items meriting ALAC/At-Large focus:** Mason Cole was unanimously confirmed as GNSO Liaison to the GAC, with the primary purpose being to ensure that the GAC is kept informed of GNSO activities. The GNSO Council approved the IANA transition group charter, with concern being expressed that there was no prior notice given about the proposed ALAC amendment.

**MOTION: A proposed modification of the GNSO's consensus recommendations relating to IGO acronyms and Red Cross identifiers:** On 10 November 2013 the PDP Working Group (IGO-INGO PDP WG) delivered its [Final Report](#) to the GNSO Council that included twenty-five consensus recommendations of the WG. On 20 November 2013 the GNSO Council unanimously [adopted](#) all twenty-five consensus recommendations of the IGO-INGO PDP WG and forwarded them to the ICANN Board in January 2014 with a recommendation for their adoption.

On 30 April 2014 the Board [resolved](#) to adopt those of the GNSO's recommendations that are not inconsistent with GAC advice, and to facilitate dialogue between the affected parties in order to reconcile the remaining differences, as further detailed in [Annex A](#) and [Annex B](#) of the Board's resolution. The GNSO's recommendations and GAC advice are largely consistent except in relation to the duration and mechanism of protection for IGO acronyms and the full names and acronyms of 189 Red Cross national societies and the international Red Cross and Red Crescent movement, for which the GNSO had [recommended](#) a 90-day period of protection by way of a claim notification service utilising the Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH).

On 16 June 2014 the NGPC [sent](#) a letter to the GNSO Council requesting that the GNSO consider modifying its recommendations relating to the duration and mechanism of protection for IGO acronyms and national society names of the Red Cross. This modification to be in accordance with and as envisaged by Section 16 of the GNSO's [PDP Manual](#).

On 24 July 2014, the Chair of the NGPC followed up with a note to the Chair of the GNSO Council and offered to provide a written or oral briefing to provide greater clarity on the GAC's advice and expectations with respect to protections of IGO-INGO Identifiers.

Chris clarified the interpretation of the NGPC on IGO acronyms, and clarified that on the RCRC, no actual detailed proposal was made by the NGPC was suggested in their letter. A NGPC meeting next week may provide further clarification, and if needed, the GNSO should request further clarification.

**MOTION – To appoint a GNSO liaison to the GAC:** The [call for applications](#) for the GNSO Liaison to GAC was circulated and a deadline for applications was set for the 31 July 2014.

The three evaluators (GNSO Council Chair and Vice Chairs) carefully and thoroughly evaluated each application against the specified criteria. Following this process, the application submitted by Mason Cole was selected to be put forward to the GNSO Council for the position of GNSO Liaison to the GAC.

Here the council will consider [motion 5](#) to appoint Mason Cole as the GNSO Liaison to the GAC with immediate effect such that he can be well informed and up to speed in order to participate effectively as soon as possible and, in particular, at ICANN 51.

Unless terminated earlier according to the processes agreed or extended by a new motion of the Council, the term of the Liaison will run for the course of the current financial year, FY 2015 (ending 30 June 2015).

Mason was unanimously confirmed as GNSO Liaison to the GAC, with the primary purpose being to ensure that the GAC is kept informed of GNSO activities.

**MOTION – Adoption of the [charter](#) for a cross community working group to develop a transition proposal for IANA stewardship on naming related functions:** Following the distribution of an [invitation to participate](#), a drafting team (DT) was formed with participants from the ccNSO, GNSO, SSAC and ALAC to develop a charter for a Cross Community Working Group to Develop an IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal on Naming Related Functions.

A drafting team was formed and has worked efficiently to produce a charter. The [charter](#) is now being sent out to the supporting organisations for support.

Here the Council will take the opportunity to review, discuss and vote on the adoption of the Charter.

Concern was expressed with the ALAC adding a new amendment without the rest of the DT or AC/SO Chairs being notified. I did point out that we were adopting the Charter as originally proposed by the DT, and adopting the amendment separately so that we are not delaying the process.

The Charter was unanimously approved.

**DISCUSSION – The report of the ICANN Board Working Group on the Nominating Committee:** The Board Working Group on Nominating Committee (BWGNomCom) is charged with performing the review called for in Recommendation 10 of the Nominating Committee Review Finalization Working Group, addressing issues of the size and composition of the Nominating Committee, as well as the related issues of NomCom's recruitment and selection functions.

The Board Working Group on Nominating Committee has recently published its [report](#).

George Sadowsky presented an overview of the report. Since the report recommends that the GNSO representation on the NomCom be substantially changed (impacting the Commercial SG), there was significant interest. One thing that didn't come through in the report was that the recommended changes in voting were there to ensure that there was no horse-trading ("I'll vote for your candidate if you vote for mine."). This behaviour was an original concern and there is some evidence of it happening at times. The change would help ensure that it was less possible.

**DISCUSSION – The draft charter from for a cross community working group on internet governance:** A drafting team was formed and has worked to produce a charter. The [charter](#) has been previously sent out to organisations for discussion and comment, including the GNSO Council.

There was little discussion and given that the meeting was uncharacteristically running late, the issue was referred back to the mailing list.

**Procedure to elect the GNSO Council Chair:** Council had previously used an election procedure. The [current version](#) was very briefly discussed and Council approved its use for the upcoming selection.

Jonathan did mention in passing that he intended to put his name forward again.

## GNSO Council Meeting - 24 July 2014

**Agenda:** <https://community.icann.org/display/gnsocouncilmeetings/Agenda+24+July+2014>

**Motions:** <https://community.icann.org/display/gnsocouncilmeetings/Motions+24+July+2014>

**MP3:** <http://audio.icann.org/gnsocouncil-20140724-en.mp3>

**Transcript:** <http://gnsocouncil.icann.org/meetings/transcript-council-24jul14-en.pdf>

**Minutes:** - Not yet available

**Items meriting ALAC/At-Large focus: The Business Constituency of the CSG has made a proposal for a standing CWG on accountability of the ICANN Board - see last item of this report.**

**MOTION – A proposed modification of the GNSO's consensus recommendations relating to IGO acronyms and Red Cross identifiers:** On 10 November 2013 the PDP Working Group (IGO-INGO PDP WG) delivered its [Final Report](#) to the GNSO Council that included twenty-five consensus recommendations of the WG. On 20 November 2013 the GNSO Council unanimously [adopted](#) all twenty-five consensus recommendations of the IGO-INGO PDP WG and forwarded them to the ICANN Board in January 2014 with a recommendation for their adoption.

On 30 April 2014 the Board [resolved](#) to adopt those of the GNSO's recommendations that are not inconsistent with GAC advice, and to facilitate dialogue between the affected parties in order to reconcile the remaining differences, as further detailed in [Annex A](#) and [Annex B](#) of the Board's resolution. The GNSO's recommendations and GAC advice are largely consistent except in relation to the duration and mechanism of protection for IGO acronyms and the full names and acronyms of 189 Red Cross national societies and the international Red Cross and Red Crescent movement, for which the GNSO had [recommended](#) a 90-day period of protection by way of a claim notification service utilising the Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH).

On 16 June 2014 the NGPC [sent](#) a letter to the GNSO Council requesting that the GNSO consider modifying its recommendations relating to the duration and mechanism of protection for IGO acronyms and national society names of the Red Cross. This modification to be in accordance with and as envisaged by Section 16 of the GNSO's [PDP Manual](#).

A NGPC member was scheduled to be present but due to a schedule conflict that did not happen. It will for the next meeting. There was a substantive (but not conclusive) discussion on the process, much of it hinging on whether Councillors, in sending recommendations back to a reconvened WG, are actually endorsing their content, or simply passing them on for due consideration.

The motion was withdrawn to be resubmitted in modified format for the next meeting.

**Update – On the Uniformity of Reporting Final Issue Report Resolution:** Here the Council will receive an update, regarding an approved [resolution](#) as a result of the [Final Issue Report](#) on Uniformity of Reporting (a recommendation from RAPWG).

The resolution states, "The GNSO Council does 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 whether additional action is required."



ICANN's Contractual Compliance team provided a presentation to the Council in London and here will present and be in a position to discuss the past activities and results of the Contractual Compliance three-year plan and future efforts to evolve the contractual compliance function with regard to metrics collection and reporting.

Council received an [update on Contractual Compliance activities](#) from Maguy Serad.

**UPDATE – A cross-community working group to develop a transfer process for the IANA stewardship role:** An invitation to participate in a drafting team has now been circulated and sent to all ICANN SO & ACs. Here the Council will take the opportunity, as manager of the policy development processes of the GNSO, to provide direction on the formation, development and work of a CWG on the NTIA transition.

James Bladel provided an update on the London Coordination Group meeting and Jonathan Robinson provided an update on the CCWG chartering process of the group to look at ICANN-centric issues.

John Berard mentioned that the Business Constituency has proposed that a STANDING cross-community group be formed on ICANN accountability and transparency. The recommendation can be found starting at the 4th paragraph on page 7 of the [BC Comment on Enhancing ICANN Accountability](#),

## GNSO Council Meeting - 25 June 2014 - London ICANN meeting

**Agenda:** <http://london50.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-gnsocouncil/agenda-gnsocouncil-25jun14-en>

**Motions:** <https://community.icann.org/display/gnsocouncilmeetings/Motions+25+June+2014>

**MP3:** <http://audio.icann.org/meetings/london2014/gnsocouncil-25jun14-en.mp3>

**Transcript:** <http://london50.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-gnsocouncil/transcript-gnsocouncil-25jun14-en.pdf>

**Minutes:** NOT YET AVAILABLE

### Items meriting ALAC/At-Large focus:

- **The GNSO approve the creation of a discussion group to start the post-mortem of the new gTLD program. Although it is still ongoing, it is felt that it is important to start the discussion while issues are still fresh in our minds. The outcomes would likely (or perhaps) feed into a later PDP to revise the program. This is a very interesting idea and deserves support and participation from At-Large.**
- **In light of the GAC approving the concept of having a Liaison from the GNSO on a 1 year trial bases, such a Liaison will be recruited.**
- **Based on the Letter from the NGPC, at its next meeting, the GNSO will consider re-opening the IGO/INGO to address the two specific issues addressed in the letter (extended notification of IGO acronyms (but apparently no claims notice) and permanent protection of a limited number of RC/RC country names from unauthorized use.**
- **Following the meeting, the GAC Communique was issued telling the Board that the RC/RC decision must NOT be subjected to, or conditioned upon, a policy development process.**

**MOTION – Approval of a charter for a PDP working group for the IGO & INGO access to curative rights protection mechanisms:** The Final Issue Report on the topic of amending the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) and the Uniform Rapid Suspension procedure (URS) to enable International Governmental Organizations (IGOs) and International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs) to access and use these curative rights protection mechanisms (UDRP & URS) contains a draft charter for the proposed PDP WG.

The draft Working Group Charter is appended as Annex 3 to the Final Issue Report and was delivered to the GNSO Council on 25 May 2014.

The PDP was approved with one vote against (Robin Gross, NCSG).

**MOTION – Consideration and evaluation of the New gTLD programme:** In 2005 the GNSO began a policy development process which ultimately resulted in the introduction of new gTLDs and the creation of policy recommendations for the launch of a new gTLD application process. In 2007, the GNSO Council adopted the policy recommendations from the GNSO policy development process and these were adopted by the ICANN Board, leading to the approval by the Board of an Application Guidebook ("AGB") for new gTLDs and the launch of the New gTLD Program.

The AGB was intended to govern the first round of an ongoing process for the introduction of new TLDs and ICANN's stated goal to launch subsequent gTLD application rounds as quickly as possible, potentially within one year of the close of the application submission period for the initial round. The first round application submission period closed in June 2012.

The Council believes that it has a continuing interest and role to play in evaluating the experiences of the first round and in proposing policy recommendations, if necessary, for changes to subsequent rounds.

The motion passed unanimously.

**Discussion – Letter from the NGPC regarding protection of IGO-INGO identifiers in all gTLDs:** On 16 June 2014, the Council received a letter from the New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) of the ICANN Board regarding the protection of International Governmental Organization and International Non-Governmental Organization (IGO-INGO) identifiers in all gTLDs.

Previously, on 30 April 2014, the ICANN Board adopted the GNSO Council's policy recommendations on IGO-INGO protections that were not inconsistent with the GAC's advice, and requested additional time to consider the remaining policy recommendations on the same topic that are inconsistent with the GAC's advice.

The GNSO policy recommendations on protections for IGO acronyms differ from the GAC advice and a current proposal being discussed with IGOs. The GNSO policy recommendations presented to the Board for adoption would permit eligible IGO acronyms to be added to the TMCH for 90-day claims notification.

In writing the letter, the NGPC has stated that it wants to provide an update to the GNSO to appreciate the GNSO's work but also highlight concerns and to give the GNSO an opportunity to consider modifying the elements of the approved policy recommendations in accordance with the relevant procedure established in the GNSO Operating Procedures.

After a very spirited discussion, there was general agreement to formally consider whether to reconvene the PDP WG at its next scheduled meeting. Consideration was given to an emergency meeting prior to that date, but it was decided that they would not give sufficient time to properly prepare.

**UPDATE – On the work of the GAC / GNSO Consultation Group:** The Council received an update, including reactions to the Group's work presented during ICANN 50 in London and to discuss any actions being planned. In particular, the Consultation Group sought support for the overall direction of its work and specifically, the decision to recruit and appoint a GNSO Liaison to GAC as well as the selection process for such a liaison. The Consultation Group envisages that the actual appointment will take place as soon as possible and, in any event, before ICANN 51. Moreover that such an appointment will be subject to a motion before the GNSO Council.

There GNSO Council agreed to proceed.

**DISCUSSION – A cross-community working group to develop a transfer process for the IANA stewardship role:** A proposal was made in Singapore for the formation of a Cross-Community Working Group (CWG) to work on transition of the IANA stewardship function from the NTIA and an early stage initial draft of a charter for such a CWG was circulated. An invitation to participate in a drafting team has been drafted and sent to all ICANN SO & ACs.

## GNSO Council Meeting - 05 June 2014

**Agenda:** <https://community.icann.org/display/gnsocouncilmeetings/Agenda+5+June+2014>

**Motions:** <https://community.icann.org/display/gnsocouncilmeetings/Motions+5+June+2014>

**MP3:** <http://audio.icann.org/gnsocouncil/gnsocouncil-20140605-en.mp3>

**Transcript:** <http://gnsocouncil.icann.org/en/meetings/transcript-council-05jun14-en.pdf>

**Minutes:** <http://gnsocouncil.icann.org/en/meetings/minutes-council-05jun14-en.htm>

**Items meriting ALAC/At-Large focus: Nothing out of the ordinary. A productive meeting which again kept to schedule!**

**MOTION – Close the work on WHOIS Studies and discuss any appropriate next steps:** The last of a series of studies on WHOIS, commissioned by the GNSO, were recently completed and published. The results of these studies may be useful to the ongoing work on WHOIS, both in the GNSO and elsewhere in the ICANN community (e.g. the Expert Working Group on gTLD Registration Data Directory Services). The motion to close this phase of Whois policy work was passed unanimously.

### **DISCUSSION – Internet Governance Issues**

The transition of the IANA function from the US government oversight is now firmly on the GNSO's agenda and the Council must determine its role and function with respect to this. A proposal was made in Singapore for the formation of a Cross-Community Working Group (CWG) to work on transition from NTIA and a very early stage initial draft of a potential charter for such a CWG was circulated. This has been modified a little since and is available [here](#).

The existing CWG on internet governance has since commenced work on its own charter and indications are that such a charter will not include detailed work on the NTIA transition. In addition, indications are that the ccNSO may be interested in jointly initiating a new CWG on the NTIA transition together with the GNSO and that other AC/SO parts of ICANN will participate in such a CWG. Given the scope and impact of the IANA transition, it is likely that such a CWG will need to reach out beyond the ICANN community for participation and input.

Concern was expressed about the number of efforts. There was a proposal to submit something to the Accountability Issues comment. No further work was done during the meeting, but the Chair will take the action item to move this forward.

### **MOTION – Initiation of a PDP on IGO and INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms:**

In November 2013, the GNSO Council [adopted](#) a consensus recommendation for an Issue Report from the Policy Development Process Working Group on the Protection of International Organization Identifiers in All gTLDs (IGO-INGO PDP WG). The Issue Report on the topic of amending the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) and the Uniform Rapid Suspension procedure (URS) to enable International Governmental Organizations (IGOs) and International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs) to access and use these curative rights protection mechanisms was published in [preliminary form](#) and offered for [public comment](#).

The [Final Issue Report](#) was updated following staff review of public comments, delivered to the Council on 25 May 2014 and published on 26 May 2014. The Final Issue Report recommends that the GNSO Council proceed with a Policy Development Process (PDP), limited to consideration of the issues discussed in the report, and the General Counsel of ICANN has indicated the topic is properly within the scope of the ICANN policy process and within the scope of the GNSO.

The Final Issue Report recommends that the GNSO Council proceed with a Policy Development Process (PDP), limited to consideration of the issues discussed in the report, and the General Counsel of ICANN has indicated the topic is properly within the scope of the ICANN policy process and within the scope of the GNSO.

The motion to initiate a PDP was approved unanimously. Soliciting volunteers for the PDP will begin.

#### **MOTION – Approval of a Charter for a PDP Working Group for the IGO & INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms PDP:**

The Final Issue Report on the topic of amending the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) and the Uniform Rapid Suspension procedure (URS) to enable International Governmental Organizations (IGOs) and International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs) to access and use these curative rights protection mechanisms (UDRP & URS) contains a draft charter for the proposed PDP WG.

The draft Working Group Charter is appended as Annex 3 to the Final Issue Report and was delivered to the GNSO Council on 25 May 2014.

At the request of several Councillors, the decision of the charter was deferred until the next meeting.(in London)

**Update – Issues for the SCI:** A couple of issues have arisen recently which may be relevant for consideration by the SCI. One issue is how to handle motion amendments (treated as "friendly" if acceptable to motioner and seconder) or requiring a formal vote as specified in Robert's Rules of Order. The other is what voting threshold should apply if the Council is altering a former PDP recommendation (as it did at the last meeting with Spec 13).

The first issue will be further discussed on the list, as there seems to be a variety of opinions on how to address it (leave as is or refer to the SCI). The second will be scoped out by Alan Greenberg and Avri Doria and passed on to the SCI.

**Any Other Business:** I called attention to the statement I submitted to the Public Comment on Board member compensation, and suggested that if anyone agrees, posting additional comments would be appreciated.

## **GNSO Council Meeting - 08 May 2014**

**Agenda:** <https://community.icann.org/display/gnsocouncilmeetings/Agenda+8+May+2014>

**Motions:** <https://community.icann.org/display/gnsocouncilmeetings/Motions+8+May+2014>

**MP3:** - <http://audio.icann.org/gnsocouncil/gnsocouncil-20140508-en.mp3>

**Transcript:** - <http://gnsocouncil.org/en/meetings/transcript-council-08may14-en.pdf>

**Minutes:** - NOT YET AVAILABLE

**Items meriting ALAC/At-Large focus: The decision on Spec 13 was a critical one. Although it explicitly is not to be taken as a precedent, it is allowing the implementation of something that was explicitly not allowed in the original new gTLD Policy Recommendation.**

**Consent agenda:** Former GNSO Councillor Mikey O'Conner has resigned from the Data and Metrics for Policy Making non-PDP working group. The Council confirms the new Chair and Co-Chairs for the Data and Metrics for Policy Making non-PDP working group, namely Jonathan Zuck (IPC) as Chair as well as Rudy Vansnick (NPOC), Olevie Kouami (NPOC) and Cheryl Langdon-Orr (At-Large) as Co-Vice-Chairs. Confirmation of Avri Doria as member of the GAC / GNSO Consultation Group and replacement for Mikey O'Conner.

**MOTION – Specification 13 to the New gTLD Registry Agreement:** The ICANN new gTLD Programme Committee (NGPC) has [resolved](#) to approve Specification 13 to the New gTLD Registry Agreement. However, this does not currently include a proposed additional clause. Incorporation of the proposed additional clause (allowing a .Brand registry operator to designate a limited number of preferred registrars) is approved but will not be implemented until 45 days from the publication of the NGPC resolution in order to: (i) provide the GNSO Council with an opportunity to advise ICANN as to whether the GNSO Council believes that this additional provision is inconsistent with the letter and intent of GNSO Policy Recommendation 19 on the Introduction of New Generic Top-Level Domains; OR (ii) advise ICANN that the GNSO Council needs additional time for review, including an explanation as to why additional time is required.

The motion that resulted from mailing list discussions essentially said that the GNSO Council notes that the proposal is in violation of the original policy, but that notwithstanding, the Council is not objecting to the NGPC proposal.

Two amendments were accepted as friendly. One removed any reference to future rounds. The other (suggested by me but formally proposed by a Councillor with such privileges) clarified the intent of the motion (and highlighting the conflict) and adding that this cannot serve as a precedent.

An amendment made by Registrars which essentially removed the 2nd clause and would not allow the exemption suggested by the NGPC. That motion failed.

The overall motion narrowly passed with the NCSG and RrSG voting against the motion, and RySG and CSG supporting it, along with the two voting NCAs.

Here the Council will review and vote on a motion which deals with the issue of Specification 13 in so far as the Council attempts to answer the question posed by the NGPC.

**DISCUSSION – Internet Governance Issues:** The transition of the IANA function from the US government oversight is now firmly on the GNSO's agenda and the Council must determine its role and function with respect to this. A proposal was made in Singapore for the formation of a Cross-Community Working Group (CWG) to work on transition from NTIA and a very early stage initial draft of a potential charter for such a CWG was circulated. This has been modified a little since and is available [here](#).

The existing CWG on internet governance has since commenced work on its own charter and indications are that such a charter will not include detailed work on the NTIA transition. In addition, indications are that the ccNSO may be interested in jointly initiating a new CWG on the NTIA transition together with the GNSO and that other AC/SO parts of ICANN will participate in such a CWG. Given the scope and impact of the IANA transition, it is likely that such a CWG will need to reach out beyond the ICANN community for participation and input.

After a substantive discussion, a letter will be written by the Chair on behalf of the Council suggesting the the GNSO Council is both interested in future activities and intends to participate. That being said, the charter as written is not deemed to be acceptable.

**Update – Forthcoming review of the GNSO:** As part of a periodic review process that is built into the ICANN model, ICANN board initiated reviews of the GNSO (and the GNSO Council and related functions) will take place. The objective of the Review has been clarified as i.e. to examine the organizational effectiveness of the GNSO, including its components (GNSO Council, GNSO Working Groups, GNSO Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies). The review will be tightly scoped based on objective and quantifiable criteria provided to the independent examiner. A webinar to discuss this in more detail has been recently [announced](#).

The Structural Improvements Committee (SIC) is requesting that a GNSO Review Working Party be assembled to function as a liaison between the GNSO, the independent examiner and the SIC, to provide input on review criteria and the 360 Assessment, coordinate interviews and objectively supply clarification and responses to the draft findings and recommendations.

The SIC envisages that once a final report is issued and the Board takes action on it, as appropriate, the GNSO Review Working Party will coordinate with the GNSO community to prepare an Implementation Plan and champion implementation of improvement activities.

**Update – Work on IDN Variants:** IDN variants cannot be introduced into the root zone until a set of uniform Label Generation rule sets (LGRs) have been developed for each identified script and integrated into a uniform mechanism for permissible variant TLD labels. ICANN's IDN Variant Project is a multi-phase program that is currently working on the creation of these LGRs. ICANN staff will provide a brief primer on IDN variants and the Project, in order to ensure that the Council is informed and to facilitate deeper understanding of the issues and possible solutions. [The presentation will be appended here once distributed](#).

## • GNSO Council Meeting - 26 March 2014 Singapore ICANN meeting

**Agenda:** <http://singapore49.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-gnsocouncil/agenda-gnsocouncil-26mar14-en>

**Motions:** <https://community.icann.org/display/gnsocouncilmeetings/Motions+26+March+2014>

**MP3:** <http://audio.icann.org/meetings/singapore2014/gnsocouncil-26mar14-en.mp3>

**Transcript:** <http://singapore49.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-gnsocouncil/transcript-gnsocouncil-26mar14-en.pdf>

**Minutes:** <http://singapore49.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-gnsocouncil/minutes-gnsocouncil-26mar14-en>

**Items meriting ALAC/At-Large focus: The largest issue of import to the ALAC and requiring action is the CCWG on CCWGs. ALAC MUST participate actively.**

**MOTION - To approve the charter for a cross community working group to develop a finalised framework of operating principles for future CWGs:** The GNSO Council previously [approved](#) a set of [initial draft principles](#) relating to the formation and operation of cross community working groups (CWGs) and [directed](#) ICANN staff to solicit feedback on the principles from the other ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees (SO/ACs). The GNSO Council then [approved](#) the formation of a Drafting Team to develop a Charter for a new CWG to take forward and synthesize the initial work of the GNSO and ccNSO feedback, and to develop a final framework of operating principles that can function effectively across all SO/ACs relating to the formation, operation, decision making and termination of future CWGs (the "Final Framework"). The Drafting Team, co-chaired by the ccNSO and GNSO, has now completed its work on a proposed charter for this new CWG. The GNSO Council approved the proposed [charter](#).

The charter calls for and 2-5 members from the ALAC and I strongly recommend that we take advantage of this. The Charter also allows for additional "observers" who will have full rights to participate in the group with the exception of voting, should votes be necessary.

**MOTION - To adopt the charter for a cross community working group to develop a framework for the use of country and territory names as TLDs:** The ccNSO Study group on the use of Names for Country and Territory published its Final Report in September 2013 (<http://ccnso.icann.org/node/42227>). One of the two recommendations of the Study Group to the ccNSO Council was to establish a cross community working group. The ccNSO Council adopted the recommendation and, as the objective of the proposed Working Group is considered to be of common interest to the broader community, the GNSO, in addition to other Supporting Organisations (SOs), Advisory Committees (ACs) and others, is invited to participate in the working group on equal footing. The ccNSO submitted a proposed [charter for this Cross-Community Working Group](#), which the GNSO Council has reviewed and discussed. The GNSO Council unanimously approved the proposed charter and will issue a call for volunteers to the CWG. }

**MOTION – To approve the Charter for a GAC-GNSO Consultation Group on GAC Early Engagement in GNSO Policy Development Processes:** There is wide agreement on the need to engage the GAC early within the GNSO policy development process. This is something that has been highlighted on a number of occasions including through the Accountability and Transparency Review process. Accordingly, the GAC and the GNSO have formed a Consultation Group to work on the principles and mechanics of improved future early engagement. The GNSO Council approved the charter for the GAC-GNSO Consultation Group.

Note that despite the charter just being approved, the group is already active and there appears to be real progress and things that were thought to be impossible are now appearing far more possible.

**MOTION – To close the Joint IDN Working Group and next steps for certain IDN-related Issues:** The Joint IDN Working Group (JIG) was chartered by the ccNSO and GNSO Councils in 2009 to discuss issues of common interest between the two Supporting Organizations in relation to Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs). The JIG identified three issues of common interest, viz. single character IDN TLDs, IDN Variant TLDs, and Universal Acceptance of IDN TLDs and went on to prepare a series of reports on these. Recognizing that further work needed to be done in relation to IDNs, in particular IDN variants and universal acceptance of IDNs, the ccNSO and GNSO Councils requested in November 2013 that the JIG put forward suggestions on how to deal with these issues and deliver these suggestions to the Councils by the ICANN Singapore Meetings in March 2014. Members of the JIG now support the ICANN staff recommendations that the ccNSO and GNSO Councils should each continue to monitor ICANN's community efforts to resolve issues relating to single character IDN TLDs, IDN Variant TLDs and Universal Acceptance of All TLDs (including IDN TLDs). The Council will vote to formally close the JIG and committed to the ongoing monitoring work.

**Motion to Adopt Revised GNSO Operating Procedures to Address Resubmission of a Motion and Working Group Self Assessment:** The GNSO Council requested that the Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation (SCI) should consider whether there should be a modification to the GNSO Council Operating Procedures to address the issue of the resubmission of a motion and to develop a survey that WGs could use to perform a self-assessment once their work is complete. Accordingly, the SCI developed procedures to be inserted in Section 4.3 (Motions and Votes) of the GNSO Operating Procedures that provide for the resubmission of a motion to the GNSO Council. The revised GNSO Operating Procedures, including the proposed additions to the Working Group Guidelines, were put out for public comment for a period of a minimum of 21 days beginning on 10 February 2014 and ending on 03 March 2014 (see <http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/gnsop-procedures-10feb14-en.htm>), as required by the ICANN Bylaws. The GNSO Council approved the revised GNSO Operating Procedures.

**DISCUSSION – Internet Governance Issues:** Discussions and activity relating to the Internet governance ecosystem are attracting a great deal of attention. This item was on the Council's agenda in order to provide an opportunity for discussion within the Council about how this impacts the role and work of the Council and mindful of the scope and remit of the Council, what action the Council should or could be taking. In addition, the transition of stewardship of the IANA function from the US government is now firmly on the GNSO's agenda and the Council must determine its role and function with respect to this.

There was a spirited discussion.

**DISCUSSION - Data retention waiver and the apparent conflict of national data protection laws with the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement:** Many European registrars have expressed frustration with ICANN's handling of their requests for a waiver from the Data Retention requirements under the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA), particularly considering recent statements by various data protection authorities that these requirements violate national privacy laws. Other ICANN stakeholders have expressed concern about the treatment of legal data protection requirements when the ICANN contract appears to conflict with certain laws. Still other stakeholders are concerned that the ability of law enforcement and private enforcement actions to access data be kept in place.

The RAA includes language that allows ICANN to temporarily suspend enforcement of the data retention provisions. As this situation has now been ongoing for over six months, pending a resolution of the issue, there is desire among registrars that ICANN should suspend enforcement for any registrar requesting a waiver.

## GNSO Council Meeting - 27 February 2014

**Agenda:** <http://gnsso.icann.org/en/meetings/agenda-council-27Feb14-en.htm>

**Motions:** <https://community.icann.org/display/gnscouncilmeetings/Motions+27+February+2014>

**MP3:** <http://audio.icann.org/gnsso/gnsso-council-20140227-en.mp3>

**Transcript:** <http://gnsso.icann.org/en/meetings/transcript-council-27Feb14-en.pdf>

**Minutes:** <http://gnsso.icann.org/en/meetings/minutes-council-27feb14-en.htm> - NOT YET AVAILABLE

**Items meriting ALAC/At-Large focus: There were no decision items on the agenda, but some very good discussions. Listening to Sally Costerton's Internet Governance overview is worthwhile listening to. The briefing starts at about 10 minutes into the MP3 and runs for about 45 minutes (25 for the briefing and the rest for questions/comments). The translation/transliteration section is also worthwhile (although of less general interest) and quite short. The discussion on the strategy panels also merits review.**

**UPDATE & DISCUSSION – International Internet Governance Issues:** Discussions and activity relating to international Internet Governance issues are attracting a great deal of attention in ICANN and related groups. This item is on the agenda to provide an opportunity for discussion within the Council about how this impacts the role and work of the Council and mindful of the scope and remit of the Council, what action the Council should or could be taking. The update was done by Sally Costerton and was a (relatively successful) attempt to summarize all of the Internet Governance issues and putting them into perspective.

**UPDATE – PDP Working Group on Translation & Transliteration of Contact Information:** The GNSO Council recently initiated a [Policy Development Process](#) (PDP) on the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information. As part of its efforts to obtain broad input from the ICANN Community at an early stage of its deliberations, the Working Group has requested input from the Supporting Organizations (including the GNSO) and Advisory Committees on several questions relating to the issues identified in the PDP Final Issue Report.

**UPDATE & DISCUSSION – GNSO Engagement with the work of the ICANN Strategy Panels:** Here the Council will receive an update on any relevant interaction with and output from the strategy panels and discuss any appropriate action going forward. There has been considerable concern expressed among GNSO Councillors that the multi-stakeholder panel seems to be oblivious of the GNSO and its mandate.

**UPDATE & DISCUSSION – GAC Engagement – the work of the Joint GAC / GNSO Consultation Group:** An update and presentation of the recently agreed up charter for the group. The charter can be found at <http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gac-gnsso-cg/attachments/20140212/c6e3f7b6/GAC-GNSO-final-0001.pdf>.



## GNSO Council Meeting - 23 January 2014

**Agenda:** <http://gns0.icann.org/en/meetings/agenda-council-23Jan14-en.htm>

**Motions:** None

**MP3:** <http://audio.icann.org/gns0/gns0-council-20140123-en.mp3>

**Transcript:** <http://gns0.icann.org/en/meetings/transcript-council-23Jan14-en.pdf>

**Minutes:** <http://gns0.icann.org/en/meetings/minutes-council-23jan14-en.htm>

**Items requiring ALAC/At-Large focus: CCWG Drafting team membership. Membership of Metrics and Reporting WG (name to be changed).**

**Opening Remarks - Chair, Review of Action Items:** The new CCWG Drafting Team is about to kick off with the first meeting as soon as a week from now, so membership is crucial.

### Consent agenda

1. [Approve Council Recommendations Report on protection of IGO-INGO names and acronyms to the ICANN Board](#)
2. Confirm Chair and Vice-Chairs of the Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues PDP working group namely Don Blumenthal (RySG) as Chair as well as Steve Metalitz (IPC) and Graeme Bunton (RrSG) as Vice-Chairs.
3. Confirm Chairs of the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group namely Chris Dillon (NCSG) and Rudi Vansnick (NPOC) as co-Chairs..

**MOTION – Metrics and Reporting Working Group Charter:** The 2010 Registration Abuse Policies Working Group (RAPWG) identified the an issue relating to Uniformity of Reporting which it described as “need for more uniformity in the mechanisms to initiate, track, and analyze policy-violation reports.” The RAPWG recommended in its Final Report that “the GNSO and the larger ICANN community in general, create and support uniform [problem-] reporting [and report-tracking] processes.”

The GNSO Council recommended the creation of an [Issue Report](#) to further research metrics and reporting needs with the aim of improving the policy development process. The report created by ICANN Staff outlined accomplishments regarding reporting and metrics by the Contractual Compliance function and it also reviewed other reporting sources that may be of relevance.

The GNSO Council subsequently adopted a recommendation to form a non-PDP Working Group tasked with exploring opportunities for developing reporting and metrics processes and/or appropriate standardized methodologies that could better inform fact-based policy development and decision making.

I raised the issue that the name be changed since it does not reflect what the group will be about. That was accepted and the name will be changed by a small group (including me) in the next day or two prior to announcement and launching. The motion was approved subject to the name change.

**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 which has been revised through various discussions at council meetings and on email lists. The document now also includes reference to the related recommendations of the ATRT2.

The Council agreed to form a group to continue this work, particularly with a focus on items 3 & 5 in the table. Such a group was approved (without a formal vote).

**UPDATE – GAC Engagement – the work of the Joint GAC / GNSO Consultation Group:** The group (including the GNSO Chair, Vice-chairs and a few others on the GNSO side) and is working. They have a public mailing list, and so the work is not being conducted in secret (as was feared it would by some).

**Update – Forthcoming review of the GNSO:** As part of a periodic review process that is built into the ICANN model, ICANN board initiated reviews of the GNSO (and the GNSO Council and related functions) are expected. In order to be informed and effectively prepared for this work, we have begun to engage with the body that commissions such reviews (the structural improvements committee) through its chair, Ray Plazk.

The Council will track the planning work of the SIC and, where appropriate; provide relevant input to the process. We will also prepare to undertake a form of self-review in a similar format to that which we expect to arise out of the work of the SIC. A self-review will ensure that we are not only prepared for the board initiated work but also able to flag areas for potential improvement in as timely as possible a manner.

**DISCUSSION – International Internet Governance Issues:** Discussions and activity relating to international Internet Governance issues are attracting a great deal of attention in ICANN and related groups. This item is on the agenda to provide an opportunity for discussion within the Council about how this impacts the role and work of the Council and mindful of the scope and remit of the Council, what action the Council should or could be taking. There was considerable concern with the volume of work and the difficulty with both keeping up on the governance issues as well as making sure that other issues are not ignored. Avri volunteered to lead an effort to keep the ccouncil up to date (a summary report perhaps) and either Theresa Swineheart or Sally Costerton will be asked to do a brief presentation at the next Council meeting.

**UPDATE & DISCUSSION – Planning for Singapore:** Making the most out of the face-to-face meeting time available at the ICANN Meeting in Buenos Aires will take planning. GNSO Council Vice Chair, David Cake will lead this and will be working with the Council and staff on this effort. Here the Council has the opportunity to feed into plans and provide input based on past experience. Included in this item will be the opportunity to shape the approach to and substance of the Council's proposed meetings with other groups in such as the CCNSO, the GAC and the ICANN board.



There was a substantive discussion, particularly on the merits and utility of WG reports during the weekend session.

**Any Other Business:** Proposal to review SSAC reports and determine whether or not any recommendations impact on GNSO Consensus Policy. There was also a brief discussion (but no conclusion) on the concept of a Liaison to or from the SSAC.