**Minutes GNSO Council Meeting 7 June 2012**

[Agenda and Documents](http://gnso.icann.org/meetings/agenda-council-07jun12-en.htm)  
  
The meeting started at 20:00 UTC.

**List of attendees:**

https://community.icann.org/display/gnsocouncilmeetings/GNSO+Council+Meeting-+7+June+2012

NCA – Non Voting - Carlos Dionisio Aguirre

**Contracted Parties House** Registrar Stakeholder Group: Stéphane van Gelder, Yoav Keren Mason Cole – absent – proxy Stéphane van Gelder

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Jeff Neuman, Jonathan Robinson, Ching Chiao,

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Thomas Rickert

**Non-Contracted Parties House** Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Zahid Jamil - absent, John Berard – absent – proxy Zahid Jamil, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, David Taylor, Brian Winterfeldt, Osvaldo Novoa

Non Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Rafik Dammak, , Mary Wong, Bill Drake, , Joy Liddicoat, Wendy Seltzer- absent, proxy to Bill Drake, Wolfgang Kleinwächter – absent, proxy to Mary Wong,   
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Lanre Ajayi

**GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers** Alan Greenberg – ALAC Liaison

Han Chuan Lee – ccNSO Observer - absent apologies

**ICANN Staff** David Olive- VP Policy Development,   
Liz Gasster - Senior Policy Counselor

Rob Hoggarth - Senior Policy Director,

Julie Hedlund - Policy Director

Marika Konings - Senior Policy Director,

Brian Peck - Senior Policy Director,

Berry Cobb – Policy consultant   
Steve Sheng – Policy Director

Alexander Kulik – Systems Engineer

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Margie Milam - Senior Policy Counselor - absent

**Guest:**   
Rosemary Sinclair – Chair Consumer Trust Working Group  
  
[MP3 Recording](http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-council-20120607-en.mp3)   
[Adobe Chat Transcript](http://gnso.icann.org/en/meetings/chat-transcript-council-07jun12-en.pdf)  
[Transcript](http://gnso.icann.org/en/meetings/transcript-council-07jun12-en.pdf)

**Item 1: Administrative matters**

1.1 Roll Call

1.2 Statement of interest updates:

* No updates noted

1.3 Review/amend [agenda](http://gnso.icann.org/meetings/agenda-council-07jun12-en.htm)

No changes noted  
  
1.4. The minutes of the [GNSO Council Meeting 10 May 2012](http://gnso.icann.org/meetings/minutes-council-10may12-en.htm) were approved on 28 May 2012.

1.5. GNSO Pending Projects List   
<http://gnso.icann.org/meetings/pending-projects-list.pdf>  
  
**Stéphane van Gelder** reminded the Council to consult theGNSO Pending Projects List.  
**Stéphane van Gelder** thanked Rob Hoggarth and his team for the work done on the new [GNSO website](http://gnso.icann.org/en/)

**Item 2: Consent agenda**   
  
2.1 Council approved sending the [letter](http://gnso.icann.org/en/correspondence/van-gelder-to-dryden-08jun12-en.pdf) to the GAC regarding the IOC/RC DT. (GAC/GNSO Issues Related to International Olympic Committee (IOC) & Red Cross (RC) Names Drafting Team.)

2.2 Council approved **Michele Neylon** as the Working Group Chair and **Alan Greenberg** as the Vice Chair of the UDRP Domain Locking Working Group.     
**Stéphane van Gelder** will inform them of Council’s approval.

**Item 3: Update on** **the Joint Supporting Organisations/Advisory Committee on New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS WG)**

Highlights of the discussion:

* Kurt Pritz noted that the status of applicant support, the process, procedures and the statistics of the evaluation panel are published on the ICANN website.
* The Joint Supporting Organisations/Advisory Committee on New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS) was asked to select a group of its members to work directly with the ICANN Board and Staff on the implementation process of the new gTLD applicant support program and the training of the Support Application Review Panel (SARP) members.
* JAS members do not select SARP members but provide input with regard to geographical diversity, skill set or experience needed.
* Community participation and oversight in the process has resulted in a wealth of SARP members to choose from spreading over 47 different countries.
* It was noted that the Jas Working Group was well supported by members from the ALAC and the Non Commercial Stakeholder Group, but that there was poor support from the remaining GNSO Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies and if there is to be more input from the GNSO these remaining groups are encouraged to take an active role in the process.

**Stéphane van Gelder** thanked **Kurt Pritz** for attending the Council meeting.

**Item 4: Update on the Prague GNSO working weekend sessions (10 minutes)**

**Jeff Neuman** provided a brief overview of the schedule for the GNSO Working sessions on Saturday 23 and Sunday 24 June 2012 in Prague.

Noteworthy:

A session is planned to meet the new CEO however there is uncertainty whether the new CEO will be present. If the new CEO is not present it was suggested that the slot be used to discuss a welcome letter and topics that the Council would like to bring to the attention of the new CEO.

Streamlining workload and document output was suggested as an additional topic.  
Scheduling time with Senior Staff is challenging and for future meetings a system could be established to streamline this process.

Councillors are encouraged to provide **Jeff Neuman** with feedback on any missing topics on the schedule.  
  
**Item 5: Best practices for addressing abusive registrations**

**Stéphane van Gelder** read the following motion, **deferred from the 10 May 2012 GNSO Council meeting,** made by **Zahid Jamil** and seconded by **Carlos Aguirre** to create a drafting team to develop the charters for two Working Groups on the Creation of non-binding Best Practices to help Registrars and Registries address the Abusive Registrations of Domain Names.

Whereas, following the recommendation of the Registration Abuse Policies Working Group, the GNSO Council requested a discussion paper on the creation of non-binding best practices to help registrars and registries address the abusive registrations of domain names in accordance with the Registration Abuse Policies Working Group Final Report;

Whereas, ICANN Staff submitted the discussion paper to the GNSO Council on 28 September 2011 (see

<http://gnso.icann.org/issues/rap/discussion-paper-rap-best-practices-28sep11-en.pdf>);

Whereas the GNSO Council discussed the discussion paper at its working session at the ICANN meeting in Dakar and a public workshop was organized;

Whereas the GNSO Council identified the issue as a priority topic at its wrap up session at the ICANN meeting in Dakar;

Whereas, the discussion paper recommended the creation of two Working Groups, namely one GNSO Working Group to establish the framework for best practices and one Cross-Community Technical Group to propose candidate best practices to address the abusive registration of domain names.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT:

Resolved, that the GNSO Council hereby approves the formation of a GNSO drafting team which will be responsible for developing the Charters for the two Working Groups to address the creation of non-binding best practices to help registrars and registries address the Abusive Registrations of Domain Names as identified above;

Resolved, the drafting team will consider the discussion paper prepared by ICANN Staff well as the discussions of the GNSO Council on the discussion paper and the public workshops on this topic as part of its deliberations and development of the Charters;

Resolved further, that [Name] shall serve as the GNSO Council Liaison for this drafting team.

**The motion failed.**

**Voting results:**[**http://gnso.icann.org/en/node/31995**](http://gnso.icann.org/en/node/31995)

Contracted Parties House: seven (7) votes against.

Non Contracted Parties House seven (7) votes against, four (4) votes in favour

Two votes absent: Zahid Jamil and John Berard

**Jeff Neuman**, on behalf of the Registries Stakeholder Group, noted support for the notion of addressing abusive domain name practices and abusive registrations of domain names, but there are a number of current efforts considering the topic so that it is premature to start another overlapping group. Although the Registries support the notion of addressing abusive domain name registrations they are going to vote against the motion but that should not be taken to mean that they do not support addressing abusive registrations.  
  
**Item 6: WHOIS Access recommendation**

The WHOIS access recommendation was considered as part of the consent agenda at the Council's 16 February 2012 meeting.

At that meeting, the ISP constituency requested that the proposal to end this work be removed from the consent agenda and considered as part of the GNSO's main agenda. A further suggestion was suggested that constituency/stakeholder members work with Staff to identify a path forward.

At the request of the Registry Stakeholder Group the motion was deferred to the next Council meeting.  
  
The NCSG proposed a friendly amendment:

Existing Motion:

THEREFORE BE IT,

Resolved, the GNSO Council recommends that the issue of WHOIS access (to ensure that WHOIS data is accessible in an appropriately reliable, enforceable, and consistent fashion) is included in the RAA Policy Development Process when it commences.

Resolved, the GNSO Council will review by end of September, 2012, whether the RAA PDP has commenced and included this issue or whether alternative approaches should be pursued.

Proposed:

To insert after the word “fashion” the words “which does not violate freedom of expression, privacy and related rights” so it would read:

(to ensure that WHOIS data is accessible in an appropriately reliable, enforceable, and consistent fashion which does not violate freedom of expression, privacy and related rights)

Existing Motion:

THEREFORE BE IT,

Resolved, the GNSO Council recommends that the issue of WHOIS access (to ensure that WHOIS data is accessible in an appropriately reliable, enforceable, and consistent fashion) is included in the RAA Policy Development Process when it commences.

Resolved, the GNSO Council will review by end of September, 2012, whether the RAA PDP has commenced and included this issue or whether alternative approaches should be pursued.

Proposed:

To insert after the word “fashion” the words “which does not violate freedom of expression, privacy and related rights” so it would read:

(to ensure that WHOIS data is accessible in an appropriately reliable, enforceable, and consistent fashion which does not violate freedom of expression, privacy and related rights.

The community appears to be confused about the term Whois access. In considering the motion for the next meeting Councillors are encouraged to refer to the ICANN Draft Roadmap to Implement SAC051 at: <http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/sac-051-draft-roadmap-18feb12-en.htm> which provides a technical definition of the term Whois Access.

**Item 7: Outreach Task Force (OTF)**

**Wolf-Ulrich Knoben** provided the background to the Outreach efforts. The Council set up a drafting team to develop a charter for an Outreach Task Force. At the Dakar meeting a motion to approve the charter failed. A second motion was made at the At the December 15, 2011 Council meeting a second motion was proposed but not seconded and thus not considered. In Costa Rica, the Council decided to form a small group (Chuck Gomes, Bill Drake, John Berard, Rafik Dammak led by Wolf-Ulrich Knoben) to discuss options on how to proceed.  
**Wolf-Ulrich** reported that the team would like to have more transparency with regard to the Outreach work being undertaken by ICANN. It is hoped that the public session in Prague on Outreach will shed some light on what the GNSO could do in future. The group is finding it difficult to reach a compromise and the topic will be discussed further at the GNSO working sessions in Prague.

**Item 8: Update on the Internationalised Registration Data (IRD) Working Group (WG)**

**Stéphane van Gelder** noted that the IRD WG submitted its final report to the GNSO Council and SSAC on March 3, 2012 for review and approval. However, SSAC has recommended some substantial changes and more work may now be needed by the IRD before its final report can be considered. Council is likely to consider a motion on the topic at the Council meeting is Prague.

**Steve Sheng** provided Council with an [overview](http://gnso.icann.org/correspondence/status-update-ird-wg-final-report-slides-07jun12-en.pdf) of the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group Final Report in preparation for a motion in Prague

**Item 9: Consumer Metrics Working Group.**

Rosemary Sinclair, Consumer Metrics (CCI) Working Group chair, stated that there is a letter before Council that the Working Group would like the Chair of GNSO Council to send to the Chair of the Government Advisory Committee GAC. The group has made good progress since the GNSO chartered it towards the end of 2011.

The group's task is to prepare draft advice for consideration individually by each of the Supporting Organisations (SOs) and Advisory Committees (ACs) in order to provide a response to the Board in preparation for a review team which comes into existence 12 months after the launch of the new gTLD program. Three definitions are being considered: consumer trust, consumer choice and competition with a view to assisting the subsequent review team in determining whether the expansion of the gTLD space has promoted each of these topics. There are definitions of the three elements which suggest a range of metrics for assessing progress on the elements and subsequently suggest targets for three years in advance making it long term project. The group is not a cross community working group; it is a GNSO Council working group, but it has been reaching out to stakeholders across the community. The purpose of the letter

<http://gnso.icann.org/issues/cci-draft-letter-gnso-to-gac-23may12-en.pdf>

is to ask the Government Advisory Committee (GAC) to provide early consideration and input to the working group.

**Stéphane van Gelder** asked a question on behalf of **Jeff Neuman**, who had to leave the call early, who wanted get a better understanding of the fact that the Council is being asked to approve the submission to the GAC of a [letter](http://gnso.icann.org/issues/cci-draft-letter-gnso-to-gac-23may12-en.pdf) that contains draft advice or references it but that draft advice has not been sent to the Council itself yet.

**Rosemary Sinclair** responded that the reference to the ‘draft advice’ in the letter was to make it easy for the GAC, because that draft advice was available for public comment.

Council approved that the GNSO Council chair send the [draft letter](http://gnso.icann.org/issues/cci-draft-letter-gnso-to-gac-23may12-en.pdf) to Heather Dryden, the GAC Chair.   
  
**Stéphane van Gelder** thanked **Rosemary** **Sinclair** for attending the Council meeting.

**Action Item:**

* **Rosemary Sinclair** to send the letter to the GNSO Chair with a formal request.
* GNSO Council chair send the letter to Heather Dryden the GAC Chair.

**Item 10: Fake Renewal Notices**

**Marika Konings** provided Council with an [overview of the public comment forum](.%20http:/www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/report-comments-fake-renewal-notices-report-15may12-en.pdf) [submissions](.%20http:/www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/report-comments-fake-renewal-notices-report-15may12-en.pdf) on Fake Renewals. The GNSO Council requested that a small group prepare a request for information concerning Fake Renewal Notices for the Registrar Stakeholder Group to help inform its deliberations on the Registration Abuse Policies Working Group Recommendations on Fake Renewal Notices (#2). The drafting team submitted its report to the GNSO Council on 6 March 2012. Following a presentation of the report to the GNSO Council at the ICANN Meeting in Costa Rica, the GNSO Council decided to put the report out for public comment. A public comment forum was opened (see <http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/fake-renewal-notices-report-21mar12-en.htm>) and has now closed.

The Council decided to request the Fake Renewal Notices Drafting Team to review the comments received, decide whether any changes should be made to its report as a result and report back accordingly to the GNSO Council.

**Action Item:**

**Marika Konings** to report back to the Fake Renewal Notices Drafting Team to review the comments received, decide whether any changes should be made to its report as a result and report back accordingly to the GNSO Council

**Item 11: Uniformity of Reporting**

**Marika Konings** provided Council with a refresher update of the background presentation on the Registration Abuse Policies Working Group Recommendations <https://gnso.icann.org/node/30809>).

To help inform its consideration of the Registration Abuse Policies Working Group Recommendation on Uniformity of Reporting, the GNSO Council requested the ICANN Compliance Department to report on existing systems to track violations and/or complaints; improvements made since the RAPWG Report or foreseen in the near future, and: identify gaps and any improvements that might be desirable but not foreseen at this stage.

The ICANN Compliance Team submitted its report on 18 March 2012 and presented it to the GNSO Council at its meeting on 12 April 2012. ICANN Staff also provided a background presentation on the RAP WG Recommendation (see <https://gnso.icann.org/node/30809>

**Stéphane van Gelder** commented that as the Council does not appear to have any concrete suggestions on moving this forward, one of the options would be to discontinue the work on this item failing any suggestions on pushing it forward and making it part of a consent agenda item for an upcoming meeting.

**Action Item:**

* Add Uniformity of Reporting to consent agenda for next Council meeting

In the absence of any other business, **Stéphane van Gelder** adjourned the GNSO Council meeting and thanked everyone for their participation.

The meeting was adjourned at 21:54 UTC.The next GNSO Public Council meeting will be on Wednesday, 27 June 2012 at 12:00 UTC. in Prague**,** Czech Republic.

See: [Calendar](http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/)