GNSO Prague wrap-up

Defensive registrations paper – any next steps / links with other ongoing initiatives (RC/IOC DT, IGO Issue Paper), see also request from new gTLD Program Committee ('Resolved (2012.04.10.NG2), while the New gTLD Program Committee is not directing any changes to the Applicant Guidebook to address defensive gTLD applications at this time, the New gTLD Program Committee directs staff to provide a briefing paper on the topic of defensive registrations at the second level and requests the GNSO to consider whether additional work on defensive registrations at the second level should be undertaken').

* Recommend practising anything with explanations of 1st round and 2nd round.

'Thick' Whois PDP – with the renewal of the .com agreement (see http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-23jun12-en.htm#2), does the Council still want to wait until November before a DT is formed to develop a charter for the 'thick' Whois PDP WG?

WHOIS Policy Final Review Team - 'Resolved (2012.06.23.26), the Board encourages public input on the Final Report and Recommendations, and requests that the ASO, ccNSO, GNSO, ALAC, GAC, and SSAC provide input to the Board by 31 August 2012' (see http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-23jun12-en.htm#5) - does the GNSO Council want to provide input and if so, how to proceed?

GNSO Review – does the GNSO Council want to send a message to the SIC or set up a discussion with regard to its views on the next GNSO Review?

* Response to the Board to suggest we might want to delay.
* NCSG feels the current structure is failing us and we should produce a review charter ahead of the review.
* Form a small discussion group to iron out and identify what we feel needs to be reviewed?
* Explain in the letter why we would like to delay because we lack facts to base our decision in the light of the new gTLD program.
* Highlight in the letter that we are starting a small group on this, to show that we are being proactive on this topic.
* Restructuring should come as a result of a review, rather than being a prerequisite for a review.
* Process versus substance debate.

One additional item we might consider adding is a discussion of how the GNSO Council would like to engage in a dialogue of next steps re: IRD WG report and recommendations, with the idea that a GNSO view (or views if diverse) could be forwarded to the Board by a certain time.

Sending a welcome note to the new CEO.

* SVG to draft messages and send to the list.
* Make sure the note is coherent with the letter Thomas is drafting on the .COM contract.

Thomas to draft a letter on the .COM contract and the issue of the GNSO or the community being bypassed.

IPC comment on .COM to be sent to the Council list.

Effectiveness of the discussion at the wrap-up: how about starting the week with a brain storming session, as well as ending it with one?