

# Agenda 19 January 2012

## Agenda for GNSO Council Meeting – 19 January 2012

This agenda was established according to the GNSO Council Operating Procedures approved 22 September 2011 for the GNSO Council and updated.

<http://gns0.icann.org/council/gns0-operating-procedures-16dec11-en.pdf>

For convenience:

\* An excerpt of the ICANN Bylaws defining the voting thresholds is provided in Appendix 1 at the end of this agenda.

\* An excerpt from the Council Operating Procedures defining the absentee voting procedures is provided in Appendix 2 at the end of this agenda.

### Meeting Time 11:00 UTC

Coordinated Universal Time: 11:00 UTC

03:00 Los Angeles; 06:00 Washington DC; 11:00 London; 12:00 Paris; 20:00 Tokyo;

20 January 2012

00:00 Wellington

Dial-in numbers will be sent individually to Council members. Councilors should notify the GNSO Secretariat in advance if a dial out call is needed.

### GNSO Council meeting audiocast

<http://stream.icann.org:8000/gns0.m3u>

### **Item 1: Administrative matters (10 minutes)**

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:

- 15 December GNSO Council minutes --approved on 3 January 2012.  
<http://gns0.icann.org/meetings/minutes-council-15dec11-en.htm>

### **Item 2: GNSO Pending Projects List (5 minutes)**

Standard agenda item looking at changes made to the GNSO's Pending Projects list since the previous meeting.

Refer to Pending Projects list

<http://gns0.icann.org/meetings/pending-projects-list.pdf>

2.1 Changes to Pending Projects List since last Council meeting (Stéphane Van Gelder)

- GNSO activities: 9 (9 - No change).
- Other activities: 10 (10 – No Change)
- Joint SO/AC WGs: 7 (7 - no change).
- Outstanding recommendations: 2 (2 - no change).

### **Item 3: Update Whois Review Team (RT) (10 minutes)**

Recent events like the recent National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) letter <http://www.icann.org/en/correspondence/strickling-to-crocker-03jan12-en.pdf>

show that Whois remains very much in the spotlight. It therefore appears useful for the Council to have an update from the Whois RT so that the Council has a clearer idea of what potential policy development it might be called to work on in the near future.

The Chair of the Whois RT has kindly agreed to participate in this meeting and provide an update.

3.1 Update from Whois RT Chair (Emily Taylor)

3.2 Discussion

### **Item 4: Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B (IRTP B) Rec 9 part 2 (10 minutes)**

As adopted by the Council on 22 June 2011 <http://gns0.icann.org/resolutions#201106-1> the Council requested Staff to provide a proposal for replacing denial reason #7 by adding a new provision in a different section of the IRTP on when and how domains may be locked or unlocked, taking into account the IRTP Part B WG deliberations in relation to this issue (see IRTP Part B Final Report - (Recommendation #9 - part 2).

Staff submitted its recommendation on January 3, 2012

<http://gns0.icann.org/mailling-lists/archives/council/msg12545.html>

ICANN Staff Proposal on IRTP Part B Recommendation #8 <http://gns0.icann.org/issues/irtp-b-8-staff-proposal-22nov11-en.pdf>

ICANN Staff Proposal on IRTP Part B Recommendation #9 part 2 [<http://gns0.icann.org/issues/irtp-b-9-part-2-staff-proposal-22nov11-en.pdf>]

Council must now consider whether to approve it.

Refer to motion: [<https://community.icann.org/display/gnsocouncilmeetings/Motions+19+January+2012>]

4.1 Reading of the motion (Mason Cole).

4.2 Discussion

4.3 Vote

**Item 5: Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B (IRTP B) Rec 8 (10 minutes)**

As adopted by the Council on 22 June 2011 <http://gnso.icann.org/resolutions#201106-1> the Council requested Staff to provide a proposal designed to ensure a technically feasible approach can be developed to meet the following recommendation "prior to the consideration of approval of the recommendation regarding the standardizing and clarifying WHOIS status messages regarding Registrar Lock status".

Staff submitted its recommendation on January 3, 2012  
<http://gnso.icann.org/mailling-lists/archives/council/msg12545.html>

Council must now consider whether to approve it.

Refer to motion <https://community.icann.org/display/gnsocouncilmeetings/Motions+19+January+2012>

5.1 Reading of the motion (Mason Cole).

5.2 Discussion

5.3 Vote

**Item 6: Cross Community Working Group Drafting Team (CCWG DT) (10 minutes)**

On January 4, 2012, the CCWG Drafting Team sent the Council Chair its final recommendations with regard to the GNSO's approach on Community Working Groups.

Refer to:  
Draft Principles for CrossCommunity Working Groups (CWGs)  
<http://gnso.icann.org/drafts/draft-principles-for-cwgs-23dec11-en.pdf>

Council must now consider whether to approve these recommendations.

Refer to motion [Motions 19 January 2012](#)[Agenda 19 January 2012](#)

6.1 Reading of the motion (Jonathan Robinson).

6.2 Discussion

6.3 Vote

**Item 7: Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B (IRTP B) Rec 7 (10 minutes)**

A resolution was passed by the Council at its Dec 15, 2011 meeting to address recommendation 7 of the IRTP part B WG on the requirement to lock a domain subject to UDRP proceedings.

Refer to Dec 15 resolution: <http://gnso.icann.org/resolutions/#201112>

The new GNSO PDP rules state that a group of volunteers should be convened to draft a WG charter, which should then be approved by the Council.

This is an information item on the state of the DT.

7.1 Update by Staff (Marika Konings).

7.2 Discussion

7.3 Next steps

**Item 8: Outreach Task Force Charter (20 minutes)**

As part of the GNSO improvements, the Operations Steering Committee (OSC)'s Constituency and Stakeholder Group Operations Work Team worked on a set of recommendations on a global outreach program

The Council has considered motions on this recently been no agreement has been found. As the original request came from the ICANN Board, the Council leadership feels an answer should be provided. That answer may be not to approve, to approve, or to determine that the Council as a body does not want to voice an opinion, although specific GNSO SGs and Cs are obviously still free to.

The Council leadership suggests that is that this topic be discussed at the GNSO week-end sessions in the forthcoming ICANN International Meeting in March 2012. To set the scene for these discussions, this agenda item is to provide some historical context into this topic.

8.1 Update and presentation from staff (Liz Gasster)<http://gnso.icann.org/correspondence/presentation-outreach-update-to-gnso-council-19jan12-en.pdf>

8.2 Discussion

### **Item 9: Whois Accessibility (20 minutes)**

The GNSO Council resolved at its meeting on 6 October to request the Whois Survey Drafting Team to consider including the issue of WHOIS Access as recommended by the RAP WG as part of the survey it has been tasked to develop. The Whois Survey Drafting Team provided its response to the GNSO Council on 10 January (see <http://gns0.icann.org/mailling-lists/archives/council/msg12559.html>) noting that 'the WSWG determined inclusion of the RAPWG's recommendation aligned more with policy and thus the WSWG considered it to be out of scope'. In addition, the WSWG provided the GNSO Council in its response with additional information 'so that it may make a better informed decision about the access recommendation'.

9.1 Response of WGWS (Wendy Seltzer, Council Liaison to WSWG)

9.2 Discussion

9.3 Next steps

### **Item 10: Any Other Business (5 minutes)**

#### **Appendix 1: GNSO Council Voting Thresholds (ICANN Bylaws, Article X, Section 3)**

9. Except as otherwise specified in these Bylaws, Annex A hereto, or the GNSO Operating Procedures, the default threshold to pass a GNSO Council motion or other voting action requires a simple majority vote of each House. The voting thresholds described below shall apply to the following GNSO actions:

1. Create an Issues Report: requires an affirmative vote of more than 25% vote of each House or majority of one House;
2. Initiate a Policy Development Process ("PDP") Within Scope (as described in Annex A): requires an affirmative vote of more than 33% of each House or more than 66% of one House;
3. Initiate a PDP Not Within Scope: requires an affirmative vote of more than 75% of one House and a majority of the other House ("GNSO Supermajority");
4. Approve a PDP Recommendation Without a GNSO Supermajority: requires an affirmative vote of a majority of each House and further requires that one GNSO Council member representative of at least 3 of the 4 Stakeholder Groups supports the Recommendation;
5. Approve a PDP Recommendation With a GNSO Supermajority: requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO Supermajority; and
6. Approve a PDP Recommendation Imposing New Obligations on Certain Contracting Parties: where an ICANN contract provision specifies that "a two-thirds vote of the council" demonstrates the presence of a consensus, the GNSO Supermajority vote threshold will have to be met or exceeded with respect to any contracting party affected by such contract provision.

#### **Appendix 2: Absentee Voting Procedures (GNSO Operating Procedures 4.4)**

##### **4.4.1 Applicability**

Absentee voting is permitted for the following limited number of Council motions or measures.

- a. Initiate a Policy Development Process (PDP);
- b. Approve a PDP recommendation;
- c. Recommend amendments to the GNSO Operating Procedures (GOP) or ICANN Bylaws;
- d. Fill a Council position open for election.

4.4.2 Absentee ballots, when permitted, must be submitted within the announced time limit, which shall be 72 hours from the meetings adjournment. In exceptional circumstances, announced at the time of the vote, the Chair may reduce this time to 24 hours or extend the time to 7 calendar days, provided such amendment is verbally confirmed by all Vice-Chairs present.

4.4.3 The GNSO Secretariat will administer, record, and tabulate absentee votes according to these procedures and will provide reasonable means for transmitting and authenticating absentee ballots, which could include voting by telephone, e- mail, web-based interface, or other technologies as may become available.

4.4.4 Absentee balloting does not affect quorum requirements. (There must be a quorum for the meeting in which the vote is initiated.)

-----  
Local time between October & March, Winter in the NORTHERN hemisphere

-----  
Reference (Coordinated Universal Time) UTC 20:00

-----  
California, USA (PST) UTC-8+0DST 03:00  
New York/Washington DC, USA (EST) UTC-5+0DST 06:00  
Buenos Aires, Argentina (ART) UTC-3+0DST 08:00  
Montevideo, Uruguay (UYST) UTC-3+1DST 09:00  
London, United Kingdom (BST) UTC+0DST 11:00  
Abuja, Nigeria (WAT) UTC+1+0DST 12:00  
Tunis, Tunisia (CET) UTC+1+0DST 12:00  
Bonn, Germany (CET) UTC+1+0DST 12:00  
Paris, France (CET) UTC+1+0DST 12:00  
Ramat Hasharon, Israel (IST) UTC+2+0DST 13:00  
Karachi, Pakistan (PKT) UTC+5+0DST 16:00  
Beijing, China (CST) UTC+8+0DST 19:00  
Tokyo, Japan (JST) UTC+9+0DST 20:00  
Wellington, New Zealand (NZDT) UTC+12+1DST 00:00 next day

-----  
The DST starts/ends on last Sunday of March 2012, 2:00 or 3:00 local time (with exceptions)

-----  
For other places see <http://www.timeanddate.com>