

Marika Konings: GNSO Council Meeting - 20 July 2012

David Olive: Hello Glen and Nathalie

Glen de Saint Gery: Welcome David, you are awake early!

David Olive: Who sleeps these days? haha

David Olive: Yes in LA with the team

Nathalie Peregrine: Hello David and Glen!

Glen de Saint Gery: Indeed you will have to make up for lost sleep over the weekend:-)

David Olive: For all of us yes

David Taylor: I cant, I'll be cheering the Brit winning the Tour de France (I hope) on Sunday and then celebrating all week.

David Olive: Good for you David

David Taylor: If Wiggins does it will be the first time in over 100 years that a brit has won it. I know you all follow this in the US avidly. Liverpool will win the Superbowl next at this rate!

stephane van gelder: calm down David!

David Taylor: I will now you finally joined the call

stephane van gelder: I said calm down!

Osvaldo Novoa: Hello everyone, I'm on line now

Wendy Seltzer: what a huge number of staff for a no-motion call

Wendy Seltzer: but thanks for getting up early!

David Taylor: Glen, could I be called back please, for some reason the call got dropped

Zahid Jamil: lol!!!

Wendy Seltzer: sorry, too early for jokes I suppose

Brian Winterfeldt: Well - it is definitely early for th East Coast of the U.S.

Brian Winterfeldt: :)

David Taylor: Thanks, I am back on

Zahid Jamil: sorry - was on mute

Zahid Jamil: ready after jonathan

Zahid Jamil: thanks brian

Jeff Neuman: All- I am dropping off online, but listening in for next 10 minutes

Zahid Jamil: BTW - its 60 days after launch that claims notice ends - maybe we could extend it

Zahid Jamil: also re public comments here is what the briefing paper states: ' Possible options that were raised in the "Defensive Applications" public comment forum to address the perceived need for defensive registrations at the second level include: 1) Continue implementing and expand targeted communications about the protections available at the second level that would mitigate the need for defensive registrations, especially among small and medium-sized right holder entities. 2) Open a public comment period specifically focused on the issue of concerns related to the perceived need for defensive registrations at the second level'

Zahid Jamil: is this a PDP or an implementation issue?

Mary Wong: I agree with Thomas

Thomas Rickert: @Zahid: The idea would be to explicitly open the RPMs to IOC RCRC

Zahid Jamil: right - but that is a result - the issues when opened to public comment should be focused to get effective and focused comments

Zahid Jamil: eventually when we implement maybe they can be combined - but the issues are seperate

Zahid Jamil: combined in terms of tools

David Taylor: agree with Alan

Brian Winterfeldt: I agree with Alan as well re URS.

Wendy Seltzer: [disagree.s/unimplementable/hasbeenassertedtobeunimplementable/](#)

Wendy Seltzer: [myspacebarhasstoppedworking](#)

Zahid Jamil: I think an Issues report would consider more issues - the briefing paper is thinner as mentioned by us in the BC some of our suggestions are not included

Jonathan Robinson: Use of "STI" as a term is potentially confusing. It would be helpful to me at least if we refer to an expert or specialist group

Brian Winterfeldt: Good point Jonathan.

Zahid Jamil: Agree with jonathan

Zahid Jamil: Possible way forward - a deeper Issues Report - followed by a comment period - followed by an expert or specialist group

David Taylor: agree with Jonathan, which is why I said an STI-like expert group. Expert group is the key

Mary Wong: Agree with Jonathan, but would caution against use of the word "expert group" which implies a certain specialist subset group; rather, the STI was a "community" group.

David Taylor: an expert community based group

Mary Wong: :)

Zahid Jamil: :)

Zahid Jamil: consensus? :)

Mary Wong: @Zahid, LOL

David Taylor: ECBG

Zahid Jamil: Lol!!

Brian Winterfeldt: Agree with David.

Alan Greenberg: RE Thick WHOis - that implies a call going out for DT members?

Marika Konings: @Alan - Yes, I'll be preparing a call for volunteers.

Alan Greenberg: Thx

Zahid Jamil: sure

Brian Winterfeldt: I am happy to volunteer to work on the draft letter.

stephane van gelder: Thanks Brian, much appreciated.

Zahid Jamil 2: who can help us weed out what is or is maybe or is not PDP issue

Zahid Jamil 2: AoC Review recommendations have special significance. ICANN is obligated to implement, and that's where Council can help

Wendy Seltzer: I'll join Brian

Thomas Rickert: Happy to help!

Mary Wong: @Marika, @Stephane - on the WHOIS PDP DT (I wanted to type that, yippee), is the charter DT open only to Council members? I assume not but wanted to be sure.

Marika Konings: @Mary - It would be open to anyone interested

Mary Wong: Thanks Marika!

Marika Konings: And to add to Mikey's comments, you may recall that the RAPWG recommendation was to initiate a PDP on this issue. What the DT has done is to explore some other issues that the Council may also want to consider to address this issue.

Marika Konings: issues = other approaches

David Taylor: back to item3, the link <http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/gnso-council-chair-election-13jul12-en.pdf> mentioned in the agenda doesnt resolve to a page. Could the link be confirmed?

Marika Konings: @David - please try this link: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/node/32779>

Zahid Jamil: agree

Joy Liddicoat: good idea Mason

Thomas Rickert: +1, Mason

David Taylor: Thanks Marika

Mikey O'Connor: +1 Mason -- especially the "build the process before you launch it" part

Zahid Jamil 2: agree with mikey

Joy Liddicoat: @mason - thanks for being a principled pragmatist

David Taylor: I agree and also think "build the process before you launch it" could also be "finish to build the process before you launch it" as if you forget a wing or even a bolt or two your plane may just fall out of the sky.

Zahid Jamil 2: it is ambiguous - since we did say we will be getting back to you

Zahid Jamil 2: to the board

Zahid Jamil 2: Maybe we could have a resolution endorse the report

Zahid Jamil 2: or maybe a letter from the Chair

Zahid Jamil 2: could this be part of a consent agenda?

Zahid Jamil 2: i volunteer Ching

Joy Liddicoat: thanks Ching

Ching Chiao: :-)

Han Chuan Lee: Is translation of contact information within the scope of SSAC?

Julie Hedlund: Han Chuan Lee -- it is not in the scope of the SSAC

Julie Hedlund: it is a policy issue so in GNSO

Julie Hedlund: not a security and stability of the DNS issue

Han Chuan Lee: So it is quite odd for a joint Issue Report if it is lookng at translation of Contact Information as proposed

Han Chuan Lee: and contact information is in the WHOIS, not DNS

Julie Hedlund: Han Chuan Lee -- but the SSAC can request an Issue Report, but but wanted to do so with the GNSO

Julie Hedlund: yes WHOIS, not DNS you are right

Julie Hedlund: The IRD-WG was a joint SSAC/GNSO working group so the recommendation was for both the SSAC and the GNSO to request an Issue Report

Zahid Jamil 2: in favor of a group

Jonathan Robinson: Helpful. Thanks Stephane.

Zahid Jamil 2: i agree with Wendy

Jonathan Robinson: Disagree with the use of criminal. Perhaps a little softer like remiss of us ;-)

Wendy Seltzer: that's a friendly amendment, Jonathan

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks

Zahid Jamil: Zahid interested

Zahid Jamil: Bylaw: Section 4. PERIODIC REVIEW OF ICANN STRUCTURE AND OPERATIONS<sup>1</sup>. The Board shall cause a periodic review of the performance and operation of each Supporting Organization, each Supporting Organization Council, each Advisory Committee (other than the Governmental Advisory Committee), and the Nominating Committee by an entity or entities independent of the organization under review. The goal of the review, to be undertaken pursuant to such criteria and standards as the Board shall direct, shall be to determine (i) whether that organization has a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure, and (ii) if so, whether any change in structure or operations is desirable to improve its effectiveness. These periodic reviews shall be conducted no less frequently than every five years, based on feasibility as determined by the Board. Each five-year cycle will be computed from the moment of the reception by the Board of the final report of the relevant review Working Group.

Zahid Jamil: Under AoB: Re – Defensive Registration - Could we ask staff to go a level deeper with their Briefing Paper. Add "specifics" about possible measures that could mitigate defensive registrations, since Biran said this report was only general. Also could we ask staff to assess relative benefits/costs of each measure

Ching Chiao: sorry guys i got cut off

Joy Liddicoat: thanks all

David Olive: thanks ALL

Zahid Jamil: thanks everyone