

October 2010 Question from ATRT to ICANN Staff:

**How many specific occasions has the ICANN Board or Chair sent a written request to the GAC seeking its advice pursuant to Article XI, Section 2(1)(h) of the Bylaws?**

#### BOARD RESOLUTIONS

\* Board meeting date: 27 March 2003

\* Resolution number: 03.43

\* URL for Board minutes/resolution: <http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/prelim-report-27mar03.htm>

Whereas, Article XI, Section 2(1)(h) of the bylaws states: The Board shall notify the Chair of the Governmental Advisory Committee in a timely manner of any proposal raising public policy issues on which it or any of ICANN's supporting organizations or advisory committees seeks public comment, and shall take duly into account any timely response to that notification prior to taking action;

Whereas, awaiting individual action by the Board in giving notice at each stage of public comment within the ICANN's process for adopting policies would result in significant delays in the process;

Resolved [03.43] that the Board delegates to the President the authority to give notice by the Board to the Chair of the Governmental Advisory Committee under Article XI, Section 2(1)(h) of the bylaws of proposals deemed to raise public-policy issues.

=====

\* Board meeting date: 6 March 2009

\* Resolution number: 2009.03.06.07, 2009.03.06.08

\* URL for Board minutes/resolution:

<http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-06mar09.htm>

Whereas, the GNSO's Reserved Names Working Group recommended that an objection mechanism be the sole basis for protection of geographic names. See <<http://gnso.icann.org/issues/new-gtlds/final-report-rn-wg-23may07.htm>>.

Whereas, the GAC through the GAC Principles regarding New gTLDs recommended that country, territory, and place names should be protected at the top and second levels in new gTLDs. See <[http://gac.icann.org/web/home/gTLD\\_principles.pdf](http://gac.icann.org/web/home/gTLD_principles.pdf)>.

Whereas, version 2 of the draft Applicant Guidebook includes a compromise between the GNSO and GAC recommendations, requiring gTLD applicants for certain types of top-level geographical names to provide evidence of support or non-objection from the relevant governments or public authorities. See

<<http://www.icann.org/en/topics/new-gtlds/draft-evaluation-procedures-clean-18feb09-en.pdf>>.

Whereas, the Board has discussed in detail the issues and implementation consequences raised by these various positions.

Resolved (2009.03.06.07), the Board is generally in agreement with the proposed treatment of geographic names at the top-level, and staff is directed to revise the relevant portions of the draft Applicant Guidebook to provide greater specificity on the scope of protection at the top level for the names of countries and territories listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard, and greater specificity in the support requirements for continent names, and post the revised position for public comment.

Resolved (2009.03.06.08), staff is directed to send a letter to the GAC by 17 March 2009 identifying the implementation issues that have been identified in association with the GAC's advice, in order to continue communications with the GAC to find a mutually acceptable solution. The Board would request a preliminary response by 24 April 2009 and a final report by 25 May 2009.

=====

\* Board meeting date: 2 November 2007

\* Resolution number: 07.88, 07.89

\* URL for Board minutes/resolution:

<http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-02nov07.htm>

Whereas, the ccNSO and the GAC collaborated to develop and submit to the Board at the San Juan ICANN meeting an "Issues Paper" relating to the selection of IDN ccTLDs associated with ISO 3166-1 two letter codes.

Whereas, the ICANN Board resolved at its meeting in San Juan on 29 June 2007 that the ICANN community, including the GNSO, ccNSO, GAC, and ALAC, provide the ICANN Board with responses to the published list of issues and questions that need to be addressed in order to move forward with IDN ccTLDs associated with the ISO 3166-1 two-letter codes (IDNC) in a manner that ensures the continued security and stability of the Internet. Further, the Board resolved that the ICANN community, including these key groups, continue to work collaboratively to explore both an interim and an overall approach to IDNC (taking the technical limitations and requirements into consideration) and recommend a course of action to the ICANN Board in a timely manner.

Whereas, the GNSO, GAC and ALAC are in the process of, or have concluded, their responses on the Issues Paper.

Whereas, regarding the overall approach, the ccNSO Council approved a resolution on 2 October 2007 requesting that an Issue Report be prepared to address inter alia

the questions in the Issues Paper, which is a first step in considering the launch of a ccNSO policy development process (PDP).

Whereas, based on the results of a survey conducted by the Chair of the ccNSO, the ccNSO Council concluded at its Los Angeles meeting that there is a strong indication for near term demand for IDNCs in some countries, territories, and areas of geographical interest or their subdivision. The ccNSO Council therefore recommended to the ICANN Board that an Internationalised Domain Name Working Group (IDNC Working Group) be formed under the proposed charter submitted to the Board by the ccNSO Chair.

Whereas, the GAC reaffirmed its support in principle to the possibility of an interim (or "fast track") approach, welcomed the proposal of the ccNSO Council for an IDNC Working Group, and indicated its intention to actively engage in the process.

Whereas, the GNSO and ALAC also indicated in public discussions their support for an interim approach as proposed by the ccNSO Council.

Whereas, the cross-community process as envisioned and proposed by the ccNSO Council, is consistent with ICANN's bottom up, multi-stakeholder model for considering issues and recommending to the ICANN Board a course of action.

Resolved (07.88), the Board expresses its gratitude to the work completed so far by the GNSO, ccNSO, GAC, and ALAC.

Resolved (07.89), the Board respectfully invites the Chairs of the ccNSO, GNSO, GAC, ALAC, and SSAC to set-up the IDNC Working Group and appoint members to this group as soon as possible and, when established, requests the IDNC Working Group to commence its work, in accordance with the Charter adopted by the ccNSO Council. The ICANN Board directs staff to provide the necessary support to the IDNC Working Group, and requests that the IDN Working Group provide a status report on its progress by the conclusion of the ICANN meeting in New Delhi in February 2008.

=====

\* Board meeting date: 29 June 2007

\* Resolution number: 07.56, 07.57

\* URL for Board minutes/resolution:

<http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-29jun07.htm>

Whereas, the Board expresses its gratitude to the ICANN community, including the GNSO, ccNSO, GAC, and ALAC for their work related to the deployment of IDNs.

Whereas, the ccNSO, GNSO, GAC and ALAC are actively addressing policy aspects related to the introduction of internationalized top-level labels.

Whereas, a joint effort involving the ccNSO and GAC has made considerable progress, publishing a list of issues and questions that need to be addressed in order to move forward with IDN ccTLDs associated with the ISO 3166-1 two-letter codes.

Whereas, the ICANN community is discussing the details involved in using an interim approach to IDN ccTLDs associated with the ISO 3166-1 two-letter codes to meet near-term demands and to gain experience with mechanisms for selection and authorization of such TLDs that can inform a policy development process aimed at creating an overall policy.

Whereas, the ICANN Board remains committed to the development and deployment of IDNs that enable people to use domain names with characters other than a through z and 0 through 9, and at the same time benefit from the promise of a single interoperable Internet.

Resolved (07.56), the ICANN Board respectfully requests that that the ICANN community including the GNSO, ccNSO, GAC, and ALAC provide the Board with responses to the published list of issues and questions that need to be addressed in order to move forward with IDN ccTLDs associated with the ISO 3166-1 two-letter codes in a manner that ensures the continued security and stability of the Internet. The Board requests status reports regarding progress by the conclusion of the ICANN meeting in Los Angeles in October 2007.

Resolved (07.57), the ICANN Board respectfully requests that the ICANN community including the GNSO, ccNSO, GAC, and ALAC continue to work collaboratively, taking the technical limitations and requirements into consideration, to explore both an interim and an overall approach to IDN ccTLDs associated with the ISO 3166-1 two-letter codes and recommend a course of action to the Board in a timely manner.

=====

\* Board meeting date: 14 March 2002

\* Resolution number: 02.42, 02.43, 02.44

\* URL for Board minutes/resolution: <http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/prelim-report-14mar02.htm>

Whereas, in resolution 01.93 the President was directed to propose to the Board an action plan for rapid analysis of the technical and other issues related to registration of domain names in .info corresponding to geographic and geopolitical names;

Whereas, on 11 October 2001 the Names Council adopted a resolution commenting on this issue, and on 26 October 2001 the Governmental Advisory Committee submitted additional commentary, both of which were posted on ICANN web sites;

Whereas, the President's proposed action plan was posted on the ICANN website on 9 October 2001, proposing creation of an .info Country Names Discussion Group

(ICNG) consisting of Board members and representatives of GAC participants and additional individuals invited by the President;

Whereas, in resolution 01.122 the Board accepted the President's recommendation to appoint the ICNG;

Whereas, under resolution 01.123 the President invited representatives from WIPO, Afiliations, and the DNSO Chair also to participate in the ICNG;

Whereas, the ICNG extensively discussed the issues through a preliminary physical meeting, conference calls, and e-mail;

Whereas, the ICNG's draft final report was posted for public comment on 21 February 2002;

Whereas, public comment and input to the draft report by the community occurred;

Whereas, the ICNG notes that while it recommends to proceed with restriction of use of the reserved names in .info to governments and distinct economies, because of the variety of ways of spelling country names, the ICNG recommended exploring the potential utility of a new top level domain (TLD) specifically for uses only by governments of countries and distinct economies; and

Whereas, the ICNG deserves recognition as an example of the ability of the Board and the GAC, as an advisory body, to constructively reach resolution on a controversial issue;

Resolved [02.42] that the Board thanks the ICNG for its work and accepts its report;

Resolved [02.43] that the Board adopts the ICNG recommendation that the 329 country names reserved under resolution 01.92 should be made available for registration by the governments and public authorities of the areas associated with the names and directs the General Counsel to cause those names to be made available to those governments and public authorities according to procedures established by the GAC;

Resolved [02.44] that, in view of the second recommendation in the ICNG report, the Board invites the GAC to investigate the level of interest by governments and distinct economies for a TLD to be used internationally for official purposes, and if established, what criteria and ground rules are necessary for such a TLD.

=====

\* Board meeting date: 26 June 2009

\* Resolution number: 2009.06.26.19, 2009.06.26.20, 2009.06.26.21, 2009.06.26.22

\* URL for Board minutes/resolution:

<http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-26jun09.htm>

Whereas, on 10 June 2009, the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) has forwarded an advisory which determines that the redirection and synthesizing of DNS responses by TLDs poses a clear and significant danger to the security and stability of the domain name system.

Whereas, the topic of redirection and synthesizing of DNS responses by TLDs and TLD operators has been studied by members of the community with knowledge and expertise in this area. See:

- \* SAC032 "Preliminary Report on DNS Response Modification" (20 June 2008) <<http://www.icann.org/committees/security/sac032.pdf>>;
- \* RSTEP "Search.Travel RSTEP Report" (2 November 2006) <[http://www.icann.org/registries/rsep/tralliance\\_report.pdf](http://www.icann.org/registries/rsep/tralliance_report.pdf)>;
- \* SAC015 "Why Top Level Domains Should Not Use Wildcard Resource Records" (10 November 2006) <<http://www.icann.org/committees/security/sac015.htm>>;
- \* SAC006 "Redirection in the COM and NET domains" (9 July 2004) <<http://www.icann.org/committees/security/ssac-report-09jul04.pdf>>.

Whereas, the Board recognizes that resolution of these issues would be beneficial to the security and stability of the Domain Name System.

Resolved (2009.06.26.19), that new TLDs, including ASCII and IDN gTLDs and IDN ccTLDs, should not use DNS redirection and synthesized DNS responses. Staff is directed to revise the relevant portions of the draft Applicant Guidebook to prohibit such redirection and synthesis at the top-level for new gTLDs, and to take all available steps with existing gTLDs to prohibit such use.

Resolved (2009.06.26.20), the Board further directs staff to communicate and disseminate in July 2009 the concerns regarding harm caused by the redirection and synthesizing of DNS responses with appropriate parties, including the ccNSO, ccTLD operators and the GAC, who might be able to ensure measures are taken to assure the integrity of error responses as well as name resolution for ccTLDs.

Resolved (2009.06.26.21), the Board requests that the ccNSO provide a report on mechanisms that could be employed to ensure that redirection and synthesis at the top level is effectively prohibited.

Resolved (2009.06.26.22), the Board invites the GAC to consider what measures could be taken to alleviate harm that can be caused by redirection and synthesis of DNS responses at the top level.

=====

\* Board meeting date: 2 June 2003

\* Resolution number: 03.83, 03.84

\* URL for Board minutes/resolution: <http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/prelim-report-02jun03.htm>

Whereas, the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) sent ICANN a letter dated 21 February 2003 providing information about two decisions, concerning recommendations about the names and acronyms of International Intergovernmental Organizations and about the names of countries, which WIPO member states requested be transmitted to ICANN;

Whereas, in resolution 03.22 the Board requested the President to inform the Governmental Advisory Committee, the Supporting Organizations, and the other Advisory Committees of the 21 February 2003 letter from WIPO and to invite their comments;

Whereas, advice and comments were received from the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC), the GNSO Council, the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC), and the Intellectual Property Interests and the Commercial and Business Users Constituencies of the GNSO;

Whereas, the Board has considered the advice and comments received, as well as the discussion and analysis in the 1 June 2003 General Counsel's Briefing Concerning Policy-Development Process on WIPO-2 Recommendations;

Resolved [03.83] that the President is directed to form, in consultation with the chairs of the GNSO Council, the ALAC, and the GAC, a working group including participants in the GNSO, the ALAC, and the GAC as well as Board members, for the purpose of analyzing the practical and technical aspects of implementing the WIPO recommendations, and notably the implications for the UDRP; and

Further resolved [03.84] that the President and General Counsel are directed to investigate and analyze legal aspects of the relationship between ICANN's mission and the recommendations conveyed by the 12 February 2003 letter from WIPO, and to report to the Board and to the working group formed under resolution 03.83 on the result of that investigation and analysis. Among topics to be considered should be whether implementation of the WIPO recommendations would require ICANN to prescribe adherence to normative rules, not based on established laws, for the resolution of competing third-party claims to rights to register names. (The Board approved the above resolutions by a 15-1-0 vote, with Mr. Auerbach voting against.)

=====

\* Board meeting date: 8 December 2006

\* Resolution number: 06.\_, 06., 06.\_

\* URL for Board minutes/resolution:

<http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-08dec06.htm>

Whereas, the Board expresses its gratitude to the volunteers, in particular from the technical community including the IETF, IAB, RSSAC, the TLD registries working group, and the IDN President's Advisory Committee, for their work related to the insertion of internationalized top level labels.

Whereas, the preliminary laboratory test conducted by Autonomica and development of root zone and application test plans are significant steps toward the stable deployment of IDNs.

Whereas, the TLD registries working group has met regularly on the IDN Guidelines revisions and a best practices document.

Whereas, the ccNSO, GNSO, and the GAC have active working groups considering policy aspects related to the introduction of internationalized top-level labels.

Whereas, the community has had considerable discussions regarding the development of a process by which internationalized labels corresponding to territories could be developed through a joint effort involving the ccNSO and GAC.

Resolved (06.\_\_\_), the ICANN Board acknowledges the significant work performed by the members of the community working on this important topic and urges this work to continue to move forward in a manner that emphasizes the security and stability of the Internet and enhances the usability of and accessibility to the Internet.

Resolved (06.\_\_\_), the ICANN Board respectfully requests that all volunteers work closely together in their continued work to ensure that the introduction of IDNs proceeds in a coordinated, timely manner.

Resolved (06.\_\_\_), the ICANN Board requests the ccNSO and the GAC, through a joint collaborative effort, in consultation as needed with the relevant technical community, to produce an issues paper relating to the selection of IDN ccTLDs associated with the ISO 3166-1 two-letter codes.

=====

\* Board meeting date: 2 November 2007

\* Resolution number: 07.92

\* URL for Board minutes/resolution:

<http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-02nov07.htm>

Whereas, an ICANN Board resolution in 2000 directed staff to assign countries to geographic regions on the basis of the United Nations Statistics Division's current classifications, and introduced the concept of "citizenship" in relation to the definition of ICANN Geographic Regions.

Whereas, Article VI, section 5 of the ICANN bylaws directs that a review of the definition of ICANN Geographic Regions should occur at least every three years, and the last review was completed at the ICANN Board meeting in Montreal in June 2003.

Whereas, the ICANN Bylaws define the five geographic regions as Africa, North America, Latin America/Caribbean, Asia/Australia/Pacific and Europe -- and also expand the concept that "persons from an area that is not a country should be grouped together with the country of citizenship for that area" so that the area or territory itself was similarly allocated to the region of the "mother country".

Whereas, the ICANN Geographical Regions were originally created to ensure regional diversity in the composition of the ICANN Board and were subsequently expanded in various ways to apply to the GNSO, ALAC and ccNSO.

Whereas, the ccNSO has concerns about the present Geographic Regions and related representational issues, and the ccNSO Council adopted the recommendations in the Final Report by the ccNSO Regions Working Group which addressed these issues.

Whereas, the ccNSO Council approved a resolution recommending that the ICANN Board appoint a community-wide working group to further study and review the issues related to the definition of the ICANN Geographic Regions, to consult with all stakeholders and submit proposals to the Board to resolve the issues relating to the current definition of the ICANN Geographic Regions.

Whereas, because any change to ICANN Geographic Regions could have wide-spread effect in ICANN, the views of other Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees should be sought by the Board.

Resolved (07.92), the Board respectfully requests that the ICANN community, including the GNSO, ccNSO, ASO, GAC, and ALAC, provide the ICANN Staff with input on the ccNSO Council's resolution relating to ICANN's Geographic Regions. The Board further directs staff to summarize and analyze this input and prepare a report for consideration by the Board.

=====

\* Board meeting date: 30 June 2006

\* Resolution number: 06.49, 06.50

\* URL for Board minutes/resolution: <http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/minutes-30jun06.htm>

Whereas, the GNSO began a Policy Development Process on new gTLDs in December 2005 ( PDP-Dec05 ).

Whereas, on 31 March 2006 the Board adopted resolutions 06.22-.24 giving notice of its intent to advance the implementation of a new gTLD process on or before

January 2007, and calling on the GNSO to complete PDP-Dec05 with sufficient time to allow for such implementation.

Whereas, since the initiation of PDP-Dec05, the GNSO has obtained formal constituency statements, issued a call for expert papers, and opened a public comment period, and the GNSO Council's New TLDs Committee has conducted several face-to-face consultations to discuss each term of reference within PDP-Dec05.

Whereas, in preparation for this Marrakech meeting, a Draft Initial Report has been posted which reflects strong support for the introduction of new TLDs and strong support for the adoption of objective procedural, technical, and financial criteria, but asks for additional community input as to additional selection criteria, selection methods, and compliance regimes.

Whereas, it is the Board's understanding that the New TLDs Committee of the GNSO intends to publish its Initial Report for public comment in July 2006, to publish its Final Report in October 2006, to hold a Council vote on the Final Report in October 2006, and then to publish a Board Report in November 2006 for action by the Board at the Sao Paulo meeting in December 2006.

Whereas, the Board particularly notes that the GNSO seeks to have an open dialogue with the GAC regarding the public policy implications of a new gTLD process, and welcomes comments at any stage in this process, in particular following the publication of the Board Report in November 2006.

Whereas, the Board wishes to thank the participants in the GNSO Council and the New TLDs Committee of the GNSO for their hard work in this key policy area.

Resolved (06.49), the Board asks the GNSO to continue to work towards having a report ready for community comment by November 2006 .

Resolved (06.50), the Board calls on the ICANN community to convey its comments as to the various reports generated by the New TLDs Committee in a timely fashion.

=====

\* Board meeting date: 10 September 2001

\* Resolution number: 01.94, 01.95, 01.96, 01.97, 01.98, 01.99, 01.100

\* URL for Board minutes/resolution: <http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/prelim-report-10sep01.htm>

Whereas, in resolution 01.39 the Board established an internal working group on Internationalized Domain Names to identify the various internationalization efforts and the issues they raise, to engage in dialogue with technical experts and other participants in these efforts, and to make appropriate recommendations to the Board;

Whereas, the internal working group conducted various information-gathering activities, including the posting of a community survey;

Whereas, the internal working group presented an interim report at the ICANN Public Forum held in Stockholm on 3 June 2001, and that report was discussed at the Public Forum, at the Board Meeting, and on ICANN's Internationalized Domain Names web-based public forum;

Whereas, the internal working group presented its final report at the ICANN Public Forum held in Montevideo on 9 September 2001;

Whereas, the final report identified several policy issues meriting further evaluation and recommended that the examination of these issues proceed in parallel with continuing technical standardization and other preparatory work for the introduction of IDNs;

Whereas, these policy issues cannot be fully resolved until the Internet Engineering Task Force completes work on a deployable IDN standard, but initial work on the policy issues that will arise can and should proceed concurrently;

Whereas, the final report also recommended that the Board establish an IDN Committee to coordinate the work of various ICANN supporting organizations, committees, and other groups on the policy issues and to promote timely development of policy recommendations on them; and

Whereas, the Board has considered public comment on the final report made electronically and at the Montevideo Public Forum;

Resolved [01.94] that IDN Committee is hereby established under Article VII, Section 1(c), of the ICANN bylaws to serve as a general coordination body for the work on policy issues identified in the IDN Working Group Report and such other policy issues that the IDN Committee shall identify;

Further resolved [01.95] that the IDN Committee shall be responsible for promoting the coordination of the work of the ICANN supporting organizations, committees, and other groups on the policy issues arising from IDNs, as documented in the final report, and to promote timely development of policy recommendations on those issues for consideration by the community and the ICANN Board;

Further resolved [01.96] that in its policy-coordination activities, the IDN Committee should seek to ensure that any recommendations are achieved through a bottom-up process, and that those recommendations reflect a wide range of expertise on the different aspects relevant to the issues;

Further resolved [01.97] that the IDN Committee shall be chaired by Director Masanobu Katoh;

Further resolved [01.98] that the President, in consultation with the IDN Committee Chair, shall propose, for approval by the Board, representatives to serve on the IDN Committee from the ICANN Board, the Supporting Organizations, the Governmental Advisory Committee, and such other individuals who in his judgment could meaningfully contribute to this effort;

Further resolved [01.99] that the IDN Committee is encouraged to commission panels of volunteer experts from different countries with practical experience in the policy issues identified in the Final Report, and linguistic experts (including experts in non-ASCII character sets and languages not spoken by persons active in current discussions); and

Further resolved [01.100] that the IDN Committee is requested to present its initial work plan, schedule, and proposed budget for approval by the ICANN Board at the third ICANN annual meeting, to be held in Marina del Rey in November 2001.'

=====

\* Board meeting date: 12 March 2003

\* Resolution number: 03.22

\* URL for Board minutes/resolution: <http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/prelim-report-12mar03.htm>

Whereas, the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) sent ICANN a letter dated 21 February 2003 providing information about two decisions, concerning recommendations about the names and acronyms of International Intergovernmental Organizations and about country names, which WIPO member states requested be transmitted to ICANN;

Whereas, Article XI-A, Section 1(6) of the bylaws provides that "The Governmental Advisory Committee, in addition to the Supporting Organizations and other Advisory Committees, shall have an opportunity to comment upon any external advice received prior to any decision by the Board";

Whereas, the WIPO recommendations appear to be directed to substantive policies relating to generic top-level domains, and are thus within the policy-development scope of the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO);

Whereas, the Board believes that in the future a policy-development process should be initiated in the GNSO concerning issues discussed in the WIPO letter, but believes that the formulation of the issues would benefit from comments from Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees before the process is formally initiated;

Resolved [03.22] that Board hereby requests the President to inform the Governmental Advisory Committee, the Supporting Organizations, and the other Advisory Committees of the 21 February 2003 letter from WIPO; to provide those bodies with a copy of the text of the letter; and to invite them to provide, no later than 12 May 2003, any comments they may formulate, according to their processes, concerning the matters discussed in the WIPO letter.

=====

\* Board meeting date: 10 March 2000

\* Resolution number: 00.13

\* URL for Board minutes/resolution: <http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/minutes-10mar00.htm>

Whereas, the Board has received a number of serious and carefully crafted recommendations relating to ccTLD administration and delegation policies, best practices, and contractual elements, including recommendations from the Governmental Advisory Committee, ccTLD managers, and others;

Whereas, the elements of these recommendations provide a sound basis for constructive dialogue and the finalization of stable and appropriate relationships;

RESOLVED [00.13] that the President and staff are authorized to work with the ccTLD managers, Governmental Advisory Committee, and other interested parties to prepare draft language for contracts, policy statements, and/or communications, including appropriate funding arrangements, to be presented to the Board and posted for public comment as soon as practicable.

=====

\* Board meeting date: 27 March 2003

\* Resolution number: 03.39, 03.40

\* URL for Board minutes/resolution: <http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/prelim-report-27mar03.htm>

Whereas, at its meeting on 20 February 2003, the GNSO Council voted unanimously to accept the Final Report of the GNSO Transfers Task Force and to forward it to the ICANN Board as a consensus-policy recommendation;

Whereas, the report was posted on the ICANN web site on 4 March 2003, with a call for public comment;

Whereas, various public comments were received and considered by the Board;

Whereas, the report was discussed at the ICANN Public Forum session held on Wednesday, 26 March 2003, with public comment received;

Whereas, Article XI, Section 2(1)(h) of the bylaws provides that the Board will notify the Chair of the Governmental Advisory Committee of proposals raising public-policy issues on which the ICANN Board seeks public comment;

Whereas, the Board believes that the GNSO Council recommendations may involve public-policy issues;

Resolved [03.39] that the President is instructed, on behalf of the Board, to notify the Chair of the Governmental Advisory Committee of its consideration of the policies recommended in the Final Report of the GNSO Transfers Task Force as proposed policies; and

Resolved further [03.40] that the Board expresses its intention to act on the GNSO Council's recommendation to adopt the recommendations in the Final Report of the GNSO Transfers Task Force at its next meeting, anticipated to be held by teleconference in late-April 2003.

=====

\* Board meeting date: 10 March 2000

\* Resolution number: 00.13

\* URL for Board minutes/resolution: <http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/minutes-10mar00.htm>

Whereas, the Board directed the President and staff to prepare "appropriate contractual relationships" with ccTLD registries in connection with the funding arrangements presented in the final report of the Task Force on Funding, in resolution 99.136;

Whereas, the Board has received a number of serious and carefully crafted recommendations relating to ccTLD administration and delegation policies, best practices, and contractual elements, including recommendations from the Governmental Advisory Committee, ccTLD managers, and others;

Whereas, the elements of these recommendations provide a sound basis for constructive dialogue and the finalization of stable and appropriate relationships;

RESOLVED [00.13] that the President and staff are authorized to work with the ccTLD managers, Governmental Advisory Committee, and other interested parties to prepare draft language for contracts, policy statements, and/or communications, including appropriate funding arrangements, to be presented to the Board and posted for public comment as soon as practicable.

=====

CORRESPONDENCE

21 April 2010, Letter from Rod Beckstrom to Janis Karklins, DNS Security

As we move forward with consideration of these initiatives, we would welcome GAC input on the following specific questions:

- 1) What Computer Emergency Response Teams (CERTS) exist in GAC member countries?
- 2) Are these CERTS mature and stable in size and function or still under development?
- 3) Are there any new CERTS under consideration in member countries?
- 4) Are there any DNS experts or botnet experts at these CERTS that might be interested in joining a future possible network of experts on the topics. If so, please share any names and contact information as appropriate,

=====

22 September 2009, Letter from Peter Dengate Thrush to Janis Karklins, Comments to Applicant Guidebook version 2

To conclude, I hope you found this information useful and clear. Please contact my office with follow-up that the GAC might have and I will ensure that those questions are addressed. We look forward to comments of the GAC to the Guidebook excerpts and associated material published at <http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-2-31may09-en.htm> and to the third version of the Guidebook that will be published prior to the Seoul meeting.

=====

17 March 2009, Letter from Paul Twomey to Janis Karklins, New gTLDs: geographic names at the second level

(Connected to 6 march 2009 resolution)

The Board resolution provides a timeframe for arriving at a mutually accepted solution. This letter is intended as the next step (building upon past consultations and revisions to the Guidebook) toward finding a solution. ICANN staff and the GAC might work together in order to create a response by 24 April 2009 and a final report by 25 May 2009 as indicated in the Board Resolution.

=====

15 January 2008, Letter from Paul Twomey to Janis Karklins, Important Recent Initiatives at ICANN

I am sure that both ICANN and the US Department of Commerce would appreciate hearing the views of the GAC on this important review.

=====

8 June 2007, Letter from Vint Cerf to Janis Karklins, GAC advice on 16 October 2006 call for Input on the Development of Transparency and Accountability Management Operating Principles

I welcome the GAC's continuing commitment to participating in the development of accountability and transparency mechanisms, and its willingness to provide further information and advice.

=====

1 December 2004, Letter from Paul Twomey to Mohamed Sharil Tarmizi, Request to GAC (multiple policy issues)

I would like to use this letter to request input from the GAC on the public policy elements of a number of the issues before us. I would also like to propose a few ways in which we could strengthen the interaction between the GAC and ICANN staff.

=====

30 March 2003, Message from Louis Touton to Mohamed Sharil Tarmizi, Notifying GAC of Board consideration of GNSO recommendations on transfers

At its meeting on 27 March 2003, the ICANN Board considered the Final Report and Recommendations of the GNSO Council's Transfers Task Force (Policies and Processes for Gaining and Losing Registrars). This report contains 29 numbered paragraphs that the GNSO Council has recommended to the Board for adoption as consensus policies. The recommendations are posted at <<http://www.icann.org/gnso/transfers-tf/report12feb03.htm#ConsensusPolicyRecommendations>>.

=====

10 February 2003, Letter from Louis Touton to Mohamed Sharil Tarmizi, Request for Advice Concerning Trademark Claims to Top-Level Domain Codes

Recent events concerning the .sg (Singapore) top-level domain, however, have made it timely for the GAC to review and, if appropriate, elaborate its views in this area.

=====

4 May 2006, Letter from John Jeffrey to Mohd Sharil Tarmizi, XXX TLD Application

Consistent with the ICANN Bylaws at Article XI, Section 2, Paragraph 2 (j) and (k), the ICANN Board will formally recognize any public policy advice provided by the GAC and if the Board intends to move forward with the agreement, it must first determine whether the board action is consistent with any GAC public policy advice.

