

GNSO Activity Update for ccNSO Council
Prepared by Patrick Myles – January 2015

CWG to develop transition proposal for IANA Stewardship

An update on the work of this group was provided to the council with the following points

- Public comments on proposal reviewed in some detail. The group will produce a detailed update prior to ICANN Singapore meeting and are likely to draft a revised timetable given the time challenges.
- Suggestion that GNSO publicly recognise work already done by all SO/ACs. This was suggested to come in form of a statement to recognise the work of all groups concerned in the process
- GNSO will meet on 28th January to discuss in more detail where they intend also to work up some principles to include in a statement recognising the work of all groups in the process.
- Given unlikelihood to meet original ICG deadlines, care must be taken to communication aspects to ensure there misconceptions on performance of those involved.
- GNSO considers its role as a chartering organisation (as well as in the below Accountability topic) an important one and intends to remain vigilant in tracking the progress of work.

CWG on ICANN accountability

Thomas Rickert (co-chair) provided an update to the Council:

- A focus point is to co-ordinate with the CWG on IANA transition.
- Progress statement on progress (high level statements) was issued. They are initial thoughts given the early stages of work in the group. Themes are:
 - The fact that there are no means by which community can challenge or have Board decision reversed.
 - The mandate of ICANN and potential for it to extend this scope after US transition of IANA stewardship. This needs control by an independent mechanism.
 - Possibility to recall one or multiple Board members. Legal nature of this mechanism is yet to be determined.
- The term ‘accountability’ is also being discussed in the group, eg. to whom ICANN should be accountability, on what they should be accountable and how the Board should be held accountable.
- 4 sub-committees established:
 - inventory of current accountability mechanisms (work completed)
 - analysing public comments for requests for accountability work (work soon complete)
 - interaction with the CWG on IANA transition
 - Creation of inventory of contingencies. Stress tests to ensure accountability is robust (and whether they already exist or new ones needed)

Policy work on name collisions

NGPC asked GNSO in October 2014 to consider potential policy work on long term plans to manage gTLD name collision issues. The GNSO have the view that policy work on the issue would be premature particularly as the name collision framework has only recently been implemented (hence limited data whether successful or not). Letter from GNSO to NGPC available upon request.

Discussion on new gTLD auctions

The topic of auctions on new gTLDs was brought up as a discussion point with view for potential work such as a cross-community WG. (Note: auctions refer to those that are not conducted privately and rather facilitated by ICANN and which produce revenue for ICANN). Points from discussion:

- In a previous ICANN meeting, the Board stated they are waiting for the community to come forward with ways to deal with this money. It was noted within the GNSO that they wouldn't wait forever – so this topic is timely.

- A cross community WG is considered the best approach and it should begin ideally at the Singapore meeting

GAC/GNSO consultation group and related work

The GAC/GNSO consultation group are establishing processes for better engagement between GNSO and GAC on policy development matters such as notification of relevant issues early in the PDP (at issue report phase). Other updates:

- Consultation group aims to have an established/ratified process in place by ICANN Singapore
- Current topic interactions: curative rights mechanisms on IGO/INGO's with active engagement between the WG and GAC already ongoing.
- Council discussed participation to the group and potential review its composition and balance (some GAC members reported to have dropped off).

The GNSO are also reviewing ways the better deal with GAC communique's. More info to come.

Future gTLD application rounds

Council have prepared a [letter](#) to the Board regarding topics of consideration for potential future new gTLD application rounds. The letter provides details on a set of topics in relation new gTLD applications based on previous experiences and where any ongoing work is occurring on specific topics. It's worth noting that the GNSO discussion group is dealing with more issues on the subject of future new gTLD rounds than the ones listed in the above letter.

IRTP Part D

The GNSO Council will submit a report to the ICANN Board for adoption of its consensus policy on the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (Part D). The policy provides a mechanism to transfer domain names between registrars and will (with Board approval) impose new obligations on certain contracted parties. It's highly likely the policy will be adopted by Board as Council voted with supermajority support. See report at <http://gnso.icann.org/en/council/drafts>

Note: The GNSO voted on the final copy of this report by way of electronic vote – a procedure potentially useful for ccNSO.

Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP

Questions in the charter for this group were whether it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language or transliterate contact information to a single common script, and, who should decide who should bear the burden translating contact information to a single common language or transliterating contact information to a single common script.

Update: [Initial report](#) was published in December with public comment to 1 February. Next steps are that the group will review comments and meet at ICANN52 Singapore.

Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP WG

The WG was chartered to determine whether contact information data should be translated or transliterated into a common language and/or script. The group published an initial report recommending not to make translation/transliteration of contact information mandatory but to allow for it on a voluntary basis. Provisional recommendations pending review:

- That translation and transliteration of contact information should not be mandatory.
- Any new RDS contemplated by ICANN should allow for non-Latin script to be usable.
- Registrants should provide their contact information in the language/script appropriate for the language the registrar operates in
- Registrars and registries should assure that data fields are consistent and correctly tagged to facilitate future transformation if ever needed
- If registrars wish to transform contact data, this should be displayed in the WHOIS as additional fields along with the original information provided by the registrant
- The field names in the WHOIS should be translated into as many languages as possible
- Based on these recommendations, the question of bearing the burden of transformation is moot. The working group is asking for input specific to this question, especially from those providing input in favour of mandatory transformation.