
LOS ANGELES – GAC / GNSO Joint Meeting
Sunday, October 12, 2014 – 15:00 to 16:30 PDT
ICANN – Los Angeles, USA

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Session with the GNSO. We have a few topics on the agenda for today. We're going to start with discussing the GAC-GNSO consultation group and the work that's been under way there, and this is a joint effort between the GNSO and the GAC to look at ways to engage the GAC earlier in the policy development process. It's one of the accountability and transparency review recommendations from the first review. And as you heard earlier in our meetings, this is work that is under way. And one of the suggestions was to put in place a liaison from the GNSO to the GAC. So we have Mason Cole up at the front here with us, and so we can talk a little bit more about that liaison role in our discussions here.

And we have -- -- is it the vice chair, David Cake, of the GNSO Council at the end, Mason who you have been introduced to, and then Manal Ismail, one of the coleads of the effort from the GAC side, and to my right, Jonathan Robinson who is the chair of the GNSO Council.

So I'm going to hand over to Manal and Jonathan to give us an update about this consultation group work.

Thank you.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Heather. Just to give you an overview of the session as we envision it. Primarily a report back from the consultation group, a few slides from Mason to introduce his role as the liaison to the GAC, and then touching on some areas of current interest that you may want to discuss.

So if we could go to the next slide, please.

So primarily this is about the work -- You can just hold on the title slide for a moment. Primarily, this is about the work that Manal and I have done together with our colleagues on the GAC-GNSO consultation group on early engagement in GNSO policy. We are the co-chairs on that group, and we'll tell you a little bit more detail about where we've come from and where we're taking this work.

If I can go to the next slide, please.

So the way we're going to do this is take you through a single slide on the background; then give you a status update to include the two work tracks, the two programs of work; the outcomes from the survey that many of you participated in. Specifically with Mason, we want to focus in on the expectations of the liaison. We feel it's very important that we have a common understanding and expectation of the role of the liaison. We -- This is an experiment that we're working with, and what we don't want to do is fall short in that experiment through some misunderstood or different understanding of the role of the liaison.

And then we want to talk with you about our further work plans and get any input or comment you have, including the outcomes we'd like to see from this meeting.

If we could have the next slide, please.

MANAL ISMAIL:

So as Jonathan mentioned, this is the GAC-GNSO Consultation Group and it is mandated to address the GAC early engagement in GNSO PDP, policy development process.

The early engagement issue was identified by both accountability and transparency review teams, ATRT1 and 2; namely, recommendation 12 of ATRT1 and recommendation 10.2 of ATRT2.

The group started its work in Q1 2014, so it's just early this year. And we have divided our work into two work tracks. One has to do with the day-to-day coordination between the GAC and the GNSO, and the other has to do with the early engagement of the GAC in PDP. And as you can see, both work tracks would intersect through the notifications we get in our day-to-day coordination that may develop into an engagement of the GAC in the PDP.

So if we can go to the next slide, please.

We have the work of work track team 1. And as mentioned earlier, it looks into mechanisms for improving or enhancing our day-to-day cooperation with the GNSO.

The first recommendation of this work track is already implemented, and it has to do with the pilot project of having a GNSO liaison to the GAC, which is being put in place as a pilot for one year that starts fiscal year 2015. So this is the first meeting that we have this in place.

This work track is focusing now on GAC-GNSO chairs' regular interaction and whether, for example, both chairs could have intersessional calls and maybe have the GNSO liaison and GAC topic leads and GNSO PDP liaisons join such calls as deemed necessary or as deemed appropriate.

Also, another aspect is rethinking recurrent joint meetings in terms of, again, maybe having briefs of topics and things like that being done intersessionally through Webinars or conference calls, and focus our sessions on addressing the issues and having some specific questions and concrete answers to them.

The third -- The third area this work track is looking at is the early awareness and notification. And we have already had a survey on this that's coming later in the presentation, because we basically agreed that to improve the early awareness and notification mechanisms, we have to first assess how the current mechanisms are working and where to improve.

So if we can go to the next slide, please.

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

Thank you. If we could just go back to the previous slide just for one minute.

So as Manal said, this is one of the two methods. I think it's very useful to think about the fact that not only have we got a focus on how the GAC might engage with the PDP process, which is the other work track on an -- at an early stage, it's a question of building a functional relationship, if you like. And that's the purpose of this day -- the thinking about this day-to-day ongoing cooperation.

So when we think about -- Whilst I don't want to preempt the work of the consultation group nor your approval of those outcomes, I do think we should -- for example, this reminds me that I believe you're about to see some changes in your leadership with the election cycle coming up and so on. So it will be very important that we build those bridges with the new leadership and think about that. And then as Manal says, thinking about these recurring meetings. We have a slot built into each of these meetings, and currently it's very useful because we can update you primarily on the work of this consultation group and as we go. But in future we'll want to use this slot as productively as possible when we're all face to face and take advantage of that.

So there's some real opportunities coming through here, obviously the first of which is Mason and we'll come back to that in a moment.

So thanks, Manal.

All right, I'll take the next slide on the work track 2, then. And clearly this is, in essence, what we're talking about. Ultimately, if you like, a sort of loose description of the problem is you're receiving a whole a lot of messages, not necessarily recognizing, for whatever reason, the issues or relative importance of the work going on, and coming to it later in the process, you being frustrated that you've discovered it late; we being frustrated that you haven't participated earlier on. So jointly, we're now looking at this.

And when you look at the six phases of the GNSO PDP, first an issue is scoped and defined by what we call an issue report prior to the actual work being initiated and undertaken by the working group. And clearly the obvious opportunity for early engagement and for trying to highlight

where public policy or other GAC-related interests might lie is in that very early stage.

And so our second work track that's being handled by team 2 in this group is to focus very much on those early phases, which is phase 1 and 2.

Next slide, please.

So we undertook, with your cooperation and at the last -- at or around the last GNSO meeting, a survey of GAC members and how you were finding the communication mechanisms you were receiving to date for usefulness and possible improvement.

And, actually, it's very gratifying to see, we got 29 responses. 29 of you filled in that form, that online form, and gave us comprehensive feedback to this consultation group about what you were receiving.

What the rest of this slide does is summarizes what you receive at the moment. Monthly policy updates, some various monthly documents, plus a policy update Webinar on -- ahead of each ICANN meeting, ongoing requests for input, ongoing requests for participation, and so on.

So there's plenty of information and opportunity coming out to you. And so one of the things, before trying to remedy how we might fix that or how we might do it differently, we did the survey. And so thank you very much to those of you who were able to find the time to put that input.

So I think Manal and I will walk you through now some of the outputs or data from that survey, and we'll talk you through that and you may find it interesting to hear what went on there.

Next slide.

MANAL ISMAIL:

So the issues that has been identified -- The issues that have been identified by GAC colleagues who took the survey were, of course, the volume of activities that's being carried out by the GNSO, the number of simultaneous PDPs that are running at the same time, the challenging timeline, lack of both understanding and/or ability to participate in GNSO working groups, also the frequency of the GNSO working group meetings, which sometimes takes place twice a week and lasts for months, and other times, twice a week. And of course it's difficult for government colleagues to participate in such very frequent meetings and dedicate the necessary time and effort.

And we've been using the exact language that has been submitted into the survey, so I'm sure colleagues in the room would be familiar with what we're having on the screen right now.

If we can go to the next slide, please.

Those are some suggestions that were also submitted through the online survey. First, highlight public-policy aspect of a given issue. So some GAC colleagues feel that it would be useful and would facilitate the GAC work if we have some highlight that there is a public-policy aspect for a given issue. I have to recall that at some point in time,

some GAC colleagues also asked for leaving this to the GAC to decide on.

So I think maybe we need to be clear whether we have -- whether we want to receive this as an input, whether it has a public-policy aspect or not, or whether we want it decide this here within the GAC.

The second suggestion has to do with relationship between the policy initiative and existing GAC advice. So if there is a policy initiative and there is already, there has been a GAC advice that this be related to the GAC advice.

Also, there was a suggestion to have more frequent policy updates, direct engagement, engagement with and follow-up with the GAC and GAC executives, of course, as well as the GAC Secretariat. Make clear what stage the GNSO work is in, which relates, of course, to the issue of knowing when and how the GAC can submit input and contribute to the process. Regular feedback on outcome of PDP processes, including a summary of previous processes. More intercommittee relationships. And I think this also has to do with the work on the day-to-day cooperation between the GAC and the GNSO. If we can go to the next slide, please, there are some more suggestions that has to do with the quick links from the home page to main policy activities.

Also highlighting policy activities which require a liaison with and significant inputs from the GAC as well as the expected degree of interest. And the examples that were given were, for example, whether the GAC should be aware of the issue or discussion with the GAC is expected or input is required from the GAC on this particular issue.

And, finally, the GAC Web site should mirror this description of cross-community policy interest and provide links to the GNSO summaries. So those are the suggestions that GAC colleagues has very helpfully submitted on the online survey. And I think, when we come to our discussion, maybe colleagues could highlight more about their suggestions. So Jonathan.

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

Thanks, Manal. So, to capture that, what we didn't want to do is do the work in the consultation group without having talked to you first. And, clearly, we can talk like this and it's great. But it's also very useful to formulate that in the form of some data from the survey. So we, essentially, used the survey to identify the issues you provided, take some concrete suggestions from you, and really work. So we've got data to work with when we come back with practical suggestions. And we've got your identified issues.

So I think if -- yeah. So let's do that.

MANAL ISMAIL:

So, before going further into the presentation, allow me to ask Suzanne, one of our active working group members and she's also been leading on the PDP work track, to submit some comments. Suzanne, please.

SUZANNE RADELL:

Thank you very much, Manal. And thank you, colleagues, for entertaining additional thoughts and additional reactions to this. The survey results were, in fact, extremely helpful. But it is rather notable

that there are 29 and we are 142. And I recall speaking to a few GAC members, colleagues in London who expressed some frustration that they didn't even know how to answer the survey because the documentation we were referring to is simply a part of a flow of information that comes in to GAC email lists constantly.

And so, while I'm very, very grateful to colleagues for helping us realize that it's the volume in part that is really part of the challenge, just to refresh sort of our GNSO colleagues' perspective, the GAC doesn't track only GNSO work. So for us, volume goes beyond the volume of GNSO work, which is, of course, considerable. You all have a lot on your plates. And we try to be very respectful of that. So I guess what I would suggest is we need to understand that, in terms of volume for the GAC, it's anything and everything going on in ICANN. And so we are actually receiving any number of documents and updates and highlights and invitations to webinars and -- on a daily basis. And the struggle is for each of us individually is to know what is currently pressing.

We do our best at ICANN meetings to identify priority work areas. We just had a brief session on WHOIS, for example, before you came in the room. And it's crystal clear that the GAC has for years and years since the beginning had a broad range of interests related to WHOIS. Anything related to WHOIS. Let me amend that.

And our challenge at the moment is that there are so many WHOIS related activities.

So that kind of mirrors, I think, where we might be in terms of GNSO policy development. It's just really struggling to get a grasp on what is going on and at what stage is it? So one question I wanted to put to

colleagues today was to ask whether -- of course, I'm sure you would agree with the results of the survey. Are there other views and other concerns that you want to flag with us today as a full group? Because my personal sense is I'm a little bit hesitant for us to keep moving further unless we have more feedback from colleagues as to what it is you would find useful on a weekly basis, a monthly basis, whatever. It would be really, really helpful for us as a joint consultation group to know what would matter to you. In what format does the information need to be shared?

I think you've identified some, which are on the slide, the survey suggestion slide. So that's very useful. You know, at what stage it's in.

Another issue I would like to put out to colleagues here, GAC colleagues, our focus is on the initial stages of a policy development process. So that's issue scoping and an issues report. Are there triggers that we could agree to to recommend the GNSO take into account such as an explicit reference to national or international law?

And the example I cited, for those of you in the GNSO who weren't here earlier, it's the procedure for handling WHOIS conflicts on national privacy law. So where it might seem self-evident, of course, to the GNSO that this is automatically a GNSO policy development topic, what I would like us to think about -- so it's a rethink, if you will -- are the triggers.

If there is an explicit reference to national or international law, it would be helpful and I would appreciate GAC colleagues' views on this. Is that something we could mutually agree to as a trigger where it's crystal clear from the outset that the issues report needs to not just be publicly

posted for comments but to actually be shared with the GAC so that we're on the same page right at the outset as to what those issues are? And that way the GAC automatically has a work plan. If we're engaged at the outset in an issues report, then we know exactly what is expected of us down the road. So right now I think the current situation -- and fully respect that. All issues reports are posted for public comment. And I believe the understanding is the expectation is the GAC would comment at that time.

I think what we're seeing from the results of the survey is that that doesn't trigger the desired result. Because, again, if the GAC is awash in information and awash in notifications of this is posted and that's posted and comments are welcome, we find ourselves simply unable to plan a work plan to actually submit the comment.

So what I've been struggling with is trying to find a way to make it easier on the GAC side, which will, hopefully, benefit the GNSO process on your side because we have been engaged from the very, very early start.

So I would like to also propose there are some additional proposals perhaps later in the slide deck. So I don't want to steal your thunder up there. But our group has also looked into whether we could do some kind of triage, right? That there would be some small group in the GAC that could take -- you know, be willing to volunteer to the quick look at all of this updated information that comes in on a regular basis and try to make an assessment on behalf of the GAC.

I would also like to propose a slight twist to that, which is that the GAC may want to reconsider an approach we adopted many, many years ago

to our work, which is to have working groups that were created around the other SOs and ACs. So at one time -- I think there are some colleagues -- one right in front of me who remembers the old days, Thomas de Haan -- we had a GAC/ccNSO working group. We had a GAC/GNSO working group. And I believe we experimented with some other with mixed results. And we arrived at a certain conclusion, I believe, between 2010 and 2011 that's captured in our joint working group report, we found that kind of challenging.

I would like to put the question to colleagues if we might want to reconsider that. Because, in fairness to the entirety of the GAC, I think it is hard to sort of impose responsibilities on the chair and vice chairs alone or those few members who participate in these joint working groups to be the monitor.

So one alternative approach would be to have a GNSO working group that would hopefully include as many members from diverse regions so we as a group, as a working group, could voluntarily assume certain responsibilities to help then provide input and propose ideas back to the GAC. So that would have some effect on our meeting plans as well. Because many years ago, when we did do this, the working groups would meet on Saturday as a working group.

And then they would report to the plenary. And then ideas would surface. There would be proposals and ideas would surface as to next steps. So it's something I like to put out there. But I guess what I'm really asking for colleagues to think about is providing feedback to us as to what the next steps really should be that would meet all of our interests and concerns.

Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL:

So thank you very much, Suzanne. This has been very helpful. And maybe we can pause for a moment from proceeding with the presentation and take any immediate reactions to what Susan as suggested. Jonathan, please.

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

I'll give one brief reaction. It would be great, if there was any others. But, certainly, the perspective that it leaves me with is that this consultation group can do some work, can come up with some suggestions. But it does appear that, you know, picking up from what Suzanne has said, some form of action, it feels to me, will need to be taken within the GAC. Whether you go down a working group or a -- whatever you call that group. But some form of mechanism to process the information for the implications for the GAC whether that's public policy or other implications with the help of the liaison will be -- seems to me to be a necessary thing. I'm not surprised that collectively you struggle with the deluge of information. Frankly, it's an ICANN-wide problem. We in the GNSO have similar issues where there's just this flood of information and there are real challenges to deal with it. But, certainly, as far as the GAC dealing with GNSO policy work, it feels to me like there might well be something along the lines of what Suzanne is suggesting where a working group or a triage committee or some kind of functional group subcommittee could help all of you in then knowing whether there was further work to be done on matters coming out of the GNSO or whether you could comfortably let them pass you by

because they didn't have significant implications that you needed to get involved with.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Jonathan. So do we have any other suggestions? Because, I mean, this consultation group has been working on trying to find some mechanisms to enhance the cooperation between the GAC and the GNSO. And this has really to be tested on some substance or substantial issues or PDPs or topics. And then we can even enhance this as we go whether it is functioning properly or we need to fine tune other things.

As Suzanne and Jonathan mentioned, we did not want to come with a proposal and sort of impose it on our constituencies. We'd rather have this come from GAC colleagues and GNSO, of course, how they would like to see this joint effort functioning on specific topics. And, again, we are having this as a trial. And we can fine tune as we go. So, if we don't have any reactions for now -- Indonesia, please.

INDONESIA:

Yes. Thank you, Manal. I understand that when you start to find out to do the so-called scoping issue, one of the things that you do is send a survey and see what's the result on the survey and so on and so on, as was -- as was mentioned before. What I want to ask is perhaps not all what we have -- not all of our problems can be written in the survey that they make. As an example, I had mentioned yesterday during the meeting yesterday morning that in a country like Indonesia, for example, where we have so many people, so many ethnics, so many

religions, so many beliefs, we may have generic names which is socially sensitive. Perhaps a particular name today is okay but in two years' time that might cause a problem, which I do not know -- which I cannot predict today. For example, just an example to give you, .HALAL, .ISLAM, .HARAM, if you like, I mean, or a gTLD with two words. Indonesia, for example, is called Republic of Indonesia. In Indonesia we call it RI. RI. Here we have RU, Russia, and so on, not RI. But if a company -- a company suddenly wants to make itself called .RI, perhaps today we don't have problems. Perhaps in one-year time we have other problems. So that's the kind of things, the issues scoping might have dynamic changes, you see. In one year we may have problems or in two years and so on.

So I would like to know how your PDP, your policy development process and so on, can cover our (indiscernible). It is based on this that I personally think that not only the survey's important but also the -- the meeting with GAC like this might be important to -- to accommodate all this type of issues. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Indonesia. And just a quick response to what you mentioned. The survey was really to test the GAC awareness and how the GAC finds the current mechanisms useful and whether there are suggested things to improve the current mechanisms or maybe suggestions for new ways of communicating with the GNSO. The issues scoping is one phase of the six or seven phases of the GNSO PDP process, and we've trying to get involved as early as the issues scoping. Things like what you've suggested -- and this comes to substance and

we as a consultation group are not looking into substance yet but this is what Suzanne was suggesting, that maybe we could have some joint -- working group of joint efforts with the GNSO to keep on track of their work as early as possible and maybe raise issues like what you mentioned through this working group and through the GAC work also.

So I -- I hope -- Jonathan, would you like --

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

Just an additional response. I think that's a really interesting point. There's a couple of points, and I suppose what we currently are grappling with is how to best assist the GAC with sifting the volume of information and picking out what the current important public policy considerations might be in that. But you make a really good point because today's problem might not be readily identified what could be a problem in the future. Now, right now we're not looking at that, but it's an interesting additional facet to -- to think about. So it's -- just thank you for the comment. It's -- it's -- yeah, it's an interesting point.

MANAL ISMAIL:

So, actually before we got the survey results we were trying to think how to provide the right information at the right time for the GAC. So it was to us more of lack of information, but then the survey turned to be that it is too much information that's not really prioritized and channelized as it should be. So this -- this is part of the findings of the survey.

So if we don't have further reactions to this right now, we can continue this online and we can proceed with the slides.

So Spain, please.

SPAIN:

Thank you. I was thinking of Suzanne's rather plea for ideas and, you know, that to improve GAC engagement in PDPs. I think we -- we have ahead of us the aspect of an issue that is of extreme importance for the GAC which is all that relates to WHOIS and we know that there are several Policy Development Processes going on in the GNSO. So I think we're going to start with -- we could start with this issue by asking the GNSO, maybe through Mason Cole, the new (indiscernible) GAC liaison to provide us with information as to what are the links between the different PDPs going on in relation to WHOIS because for us it's not clear how they interact between them. For instance, privacy and proxy services with the new Registry Directory Service proposal and at what stage each of these PDPs are so that we can prioritize our input into this issue. So this is just a suggestion to move forward with this issue. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

So I'd just like to say thank you, Spain, for that very constructive suggestion. I mean, I think that's a very pragmatic and potentially good use of the liaison function and that is what we envisage. So hopefully Mason -- and I'll look to him -- but together with some staff support will be able to perhaps provide you with some kind of briefing paper which outlines the scope, the landscape of work on WHOIS, how those interrelate, and to assist you in knowing which of those should receive priority input or involvement from you. So that's a very helpful pragmatic suggestion. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Just to add to that point, it matters what we're doing on the GAC side as well. So having that support and that effort coming from the GNSO with the liaison and whatever other things we've put in place in order to help us identify what we need to pay attention to, it needs to be very much supported on the GAC side as well, and, having the Secretariat support that we now have I think is really going to help us do that and meet you halfway, so to speak, in coming up with approaches to do that kind of analysis that we need to. So I think that's very promising, and we need to be managing things well within the GAC in order to work effectively with you. So I think it's important to emphasize that and to make maximum use of having that Secretariat support within the GAC. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: So perfect. Thank you, Spain, and before giving the floor to Mason we have a request for the floor from Thailand.

THAILAND: Thank you, Manal. So from experience ourselves that we participate in translation and transliterations PDP working groups, so I have two points that I'd like to raise. First is it's so confused with the PDP itself. The process is very complicated for the GACs and we have to participate in the -- in another session that brief how the PDP process will be done. That -- I do believe that this will be the same kind of education in the PDP process again sometime because that is essential for the GAC to understand what the PDP process is and how it's developed. Because it has been done once in the early stage of the PDP process, a group that we participate.

Secondly, when you mention about the implications, how its effect to the GAC in general that are the issues that is important, that I urge the GAC members to really participate because on the issues that affects the legal frameworks or the roles of the GAC to coordinate with the local governments and some of the issues and it's important that the working group might not be able to see from what we experience, for example, like even the translation considerations that relate not asking - - so few people that are not asking, in fact, participate in the groups. We have a PDP that defines several points during the works and the collaborations when they want to coordinate with the GAC seems to be quite difficult, from what we see. So I do believe that to have the same formal groups that coordinate will be helpful for the working groups to be able to coordinate with the GAC. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Thailand. And I think we have a quick response from Jonathan first before proceeding. Jonathan.

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

Yeah, thank you, Thailand. That's again helpful input. And I did see that Mason made a note there on terms of your education on the PDP process, so I think that's a point well made.

There are monthly webinars run for -- called newcomer webinars that help to educate on participating in a PDP as such, and actually, I would just like to thank you and acknowledge your participation. I know it's not always possible for GAC members, for both practical and perhaps even procedural reasons, to participate directly in PDPs, but we always

welcome it and appreciate it. So thank you for that, because I understand they're not always as welcome hours of the day as well. So thank you for that.

Let me hand back to Manal and probably Mason at this stage.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Jonathan. And if we can go to the next slide, please. So which comes pretty late in the discussion. So, of course, Mason Cole has been appointed as the GNSO liaison to the GAC for a pilot of one year, starting this ICANN meeting, to be evaluated -- the pilot is going to be evaluated after one year. And at this point in the presentation, allow me to hand over to Mason. And Mason, you can really see how we are looking forward to working with you. We have already started assigning some tasks even before you get to say -- present your slides. Thank you. Go ahead.

MASON COLE:

Thank you. Thank you very much, Manal. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. It's a pleasure to be here with you on my second full day as the GNSO/GAC liaison. So I'll just start right in on these slides. I'll be as brief as I can, while trying to remember to speak slowly enough for the interpreters. So next slide, please.

This is a bit about my own background. Some of you may know that I was involved with a registrar stakeholder group, both as secretary and chair. I was a councilor on the GNSO for two years and I served a term as vice chair as well, and I have been heavily involved in various working

group roles as well, and you see three examples of those as well that I'm currently participating in. Next slide, please.

This is just a bit about the purpose of the liaison role. It has several objectives, as you know. Primarily to facilitate the flow of information from the GNSO to the GAC, to make sure that the GAC is very well informed so that the GAC can determine when public policy implications exist or otherwise when the GAC would like to contribute to GNSO policymaking. So how do we go about doing that? My first duty is to neutrally and objectively represent and communicate GNSO policy work, meaning that I give no favor to any particular house within the GNSO. I present to the GAC all the information available on policy work in a way that's prioritized for the GAC to handle. And that involves timely updates to the GAC on GNSO PDP activities, helping to guide the GAC in opportunities for early engagement in the GNSO's work, ensuring that the GAC has an ongoing understanding of our methods and processes, making sure that the GNSO is equally informed about activities on behalf of the GAC, specifically as it relates to interests of the GNSO. And then finally, to work closely with the GAC/GNSO consultation group to develop early engagement mechanics, and that, in fact, begins this afternoon, again with a meeting of the consultation group, which I look forward to participating in. Next slide, please.

So here are three open questions for us to consider as we embark down this pilot program. The first in green is meant for the GNSO which is, how does the GAC learn about opportunities for policy input? And I think that we've had a couple of very constructive ideas, even this afternoon, on ways to help prioritize the flow of information so that it doesn't seem quite so overwhelming to the GAC. And the second two

questions in red are for the -- for the GAC to consider. And I know that I and other colleagues on the GNSO are happy to help with this where we can. The first is, where and when can the GAC provide policy input? Where it is most beneficial, convenient, and constructive? And then how does the GAC go about providing that input? So those are questions I know I look forward to helping the GAC answer. Next slide, please.

I'm not going to go through these because -- in detail because you've seen all of these, but this is a list of the various forms of information that flows from the GNSO to the community, including the GAC, so that the GAC can learn about issues of public policy -- or potential public policy in which it may want to weigh in on. So there's no need to recite these. I know that everybody here is familiar with these already. So next slide, please.

If I may suggest, this is an excellent way, if you're not immediately familiar with GNSO policy work, to become familiar with it. Staff puts together an excellent one- to two-page summary every month of GNSO activities specifically tailored for the GAC. The information is very boiled down so that it can be digested easily. And it gives the GAC an opportunity to drill down a bit more deeply into areas where individual members or the GAC as a whole may want to engage in assisting the GNSO with policymaking. Next slide, please.

So the GAC survey clearly reveals, as we've discussed here, that the GAC doesn't suffer from a lack of information. In fact, the difficulty is prioritizing that information. And I know that in this role I look forward to helping the GAC prioritize their work and then also assisting the

consultation group on enhanced day-to-day cooperation between the GNSO and the GAC. Next slide, please.

As much as I would like it to be the liaison is not the total solution, although it's a step in the right direction. It is primarily an information conduit from the GNSO to the GAC, although the information does flow both ways, in order for this relationship to be as productive as it can be. As Jonathan alluded to, there is still work to be done by the consultation group to assist the GAC in fully formulating the mechanisms by which we can cooperate. And the GAC, with the assistance of the GNSO, should identify ways to effectively engage with the GNSO. And I know that my GNSO colleagues look forward to that as well. Next slide.

So in the overall ecosystem of the policy work that we're cooperating on, clearly the GNSO is a very active body. PDPs run in parallel, and so we find ourselves dealing with multiple issues at one time. There are multiple vehicles fortunately for informing the GAC, including this role. There are -- the good news also is that there are multiple opportunities for GAC engagement, which the GNSO welcomes. And our next step, working with the consultation group, is identifying a methodology for providing that input. And I believe that's all my slides. Next slide. It is. So I thank the GAC for this opportunity, and I yield to Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Mason. And if we can go to the next slide, please. So this is the looking ahead slide and we have a face-to-face meeting today for the consultation group, 6:30 to 7:30 in Constellation Room. It's an open meeting, so if you can survive one more hour after the day finishes, you're most welcome to attend the consultation group meeting where

we will review the input we've received from -- during the L.A. meeting and plan our work ahead. Of course we plan to continue implementation of the pilot project for the GNSO liaison to the GAC and continue to work on the development of recommendations for other items with the aim to present them for the GAC and the GNSO for approval. Next slide, please.

So we basically appreciate any feedback and discussion on the work of the consultation group and hope we have a shared understanding and shared expectation of the GNSO liaison to the GAC and have your agreement on the route ahead as proposed in the previous slide.

So if we don't have any further comments or reactions at this point in time, I'll hand back to Jonathan and Heather for the rest of the agenda of our joint meeting today.

So, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

Thank you, Manal. Thanks for your attention you've paid to this. And I think you can see there's a genuine good faith attempt here to try and find ways to, on behalf of the consultation group, to facilitate effective early engagement and involvement of the GAC in GNSO policy work.

So I suggest now, if we could, that we move to the first slide again, back up to the top of the slide deck.

Thank you.

So we've given you a report from the consultation group, introduced you to Mason, the new GAC liaison -- or GNSO liaison to the GAC.

I should say we had five or six very well qualified candidates who applied for doing this role and with whom we subjected to a selection process. So this was a rigorous exercise where we advertised for interested persons, went through a selection process, and through that process, with some rigor and care, selected Mason.

So we were aware in preparing this agenda prior to this meeting that there were other areas of potential mutual interest, and we may not need to go through all of these, but some topics that myself and I think, I believe, Heather were aware of was the work of the Cross-Community Working Group on the IANA transition, the fact that there is a GNSO review being commissioned and currently under way, and I think a desire on the part of at least some colleagues to get an update on the work relating to the protection of IGO and INGO names in the gTLD space.

So I suspect that probably, from what I've heard, that there's certainly a desire to get an update on the work going on in the IGO/INGO area. This is something where there's some unique collaboration and some discussions going on outside of the normal processes. We've tried to be as respectful as possible of the PDP processes and of the necessary policy tracks that need to be undertaken, but at the same time, sensitive to the fact that there are various interests and sensitivities around the protection of these names. And, frankly, I think my feeling is that there is, again, a good-faith attempt by Board, GNSO, and GAC colleagues to try and come to a solution which respects our operating processes but, nevertheless, also takes cognizance of the sensitivity of these issues.

Heather, I don't know if there's anything you would like to add there.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you.

So from the GAC side, we did have a brief discussion about this yesterday, and it was really to update the GAC on some of those efforts to contribute to finding a way forward to address the fact that there are some differences of view that have been communicated by the GNSO to the NGPC in terms of what was under discussion between the NGPC and the GAC. And of course we also have GAC advice as well on -- specifically on the issue of the protection of IGO names and acronyms. And so the GAC is going to contribute to or participate in a small group to help provide inputs or maybe some guidance to the GNSO so that it's clear, or as clear as possible, for you about what are the issues there that are really remaining. And then perhaps we can work on finding a solution as a result of that effort.

So that's how the GAC sees its next steps. And the IGOs are very much participating as part of that discussion as well and will participate in the small group effort as well.

So that's really where we are in the GAC. And like I say, this is really the focus of our effort.

Sometimes it can be challenging to know where it is that you should go and be communicating your views and how to influence things. And I know that's been a concern from our colleagues among the IGOs, but I think we have established that if we put this small group together, that this is now where we hope to make progress and make progress in

working with you in looking at these remaining issues where there does seem to be a difference of view.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Okay. Thank you, Heather.

And just to be clear, then, once that -- In an ideal world, that group will form, in a sense, a consensus view or some kind of common view. And then the GNSO is in a position to invoke a procedure which it hasn't ever previously invoked which is to refer back to the working group to revise its recommendations. And that's the procedure that could be invoked after we have clarity on exactly what changes are required.

So that's what we expect to happen after that. And that's in relation to a PDP that was completed for which recommendations had gone to the Board. And instead of the Board accepting our recommendation -- accepting or rejecting those recommendations, we're in a sort of intermediate phase where we can potentially -- prior to the Board taking that final action, if you like, the GNSO can refer it back to the working group for revision of recommendations.

In addition, there is a second PDP which is going on, and that's looking at when and if there is a problem with such a name, how that problem may be fixed. And that's the so-called curative mechanisms PDP. So that's a second piece of work that's all about potentially invoking a UDRP or URS. And these are mechanisms by which a name can be suspended from active use or transferred to another owner, processes that have, to date, only been used for trademark owners and may be able to be used for the purposes of protection of IGO, INGO names.

And that's a piece of work that's going on in addition to this original PDP which we're talking about potentially having modified recommendations made to it.

So there's work in progress. There's a good-faith attempt to try and resolve what has become an intractable and time-consuming problem that, with the best will in the world, I think many of us would like to resolve and move on from in a way that's mutually satisfactory.

David.

DAVID CAKE:

And I -- I just want to make two clarifications on the two processes that Jonathan mentioned. One is about the current revisiting the IGO-related PDP. I just want to say I have -- I do know that there were some points in the GAC earlier that that seemed to be going quite slowly.

In the GNSO, we have certainly noticed that the mechanisms we have at our disposal for doing that are not ideal, have caused us some procedural issues. We are aware of that and are trying to fix it in the future, but for the moment, we are sort of stuck with the mechanisms that we have within the bylaws, and we are trying to do the best we can. So please be -- We are a little hampered by the mechanisms we already have in the bylaws, and so please be a little understanding.

But on the other one, I just wanted to make one clarification to what Jonathan said, because it does relate to some things in the London GAC communique, which is when we have a - we have an IGO for curative rights mechanisms, and actually the terms of that are quite specific, that it is not simply about the UDR -- applying the UDRP or the URS for IGO

or IG -- but it is examining those -- looking at -- using those mechanisms as a starting point, but we are definitely not assuming that they will be treated in the same way as trademarks or -- you know, inside the working group, we are very much aware that they are not trademarks or straight intellectual property concerns and that we are looking very carefully at how those -- how those mechanisms may be modified. They're using those as a starting point, gets us -- you know, seems to start us a fair way along the process rather than going back to the beginning. But certainly, for example, things like how we adjudicate whether or not, you know, who has the rights will be looked at in the UDRP and will be applied in a very different way. So just to rest that concern that was expressed in previous communiques. We are definitely not simply taking the UDRP and URS or assuming that those procedures will be ideal. We are looking at those -- You know, we are very open to the idea -- open to the point that -- and understanding of the point that they are not simply the same. Okay?

Just to....

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, everyone, for those comments about the processes under way to look at IGO and INGO, or international NGO, names and acronyms and the protection mechanisms that are being proposed in relation to them.

Okay. So at this point, I think we've covered the main items that we anticipated for today.

If there are any questions or comments that colleagues would like to make about the proposed topics for today or related things for our exchange with the GNSO, now is the time to raise them. Otherwise, I think we can finish a bit earlier if, in fact, there are not further comments or questions. But I see Spain.

SPAIN:

Thank you, Chair.

Allow me to go back to the issue of the GNSO liaison to the GAC. I missed the slot to make a comment, and I am grateful that you give me the floor again on this issue.

I want to say that we, as GAC, are really thankful for the work of the GAC and GNSO consultation group. I have been in part of that working group but not as an active member, and as such, I know that you have had weekly conference calls and that the effort that GAC and GNSO members of that working group has been very tough and conscientious. And I think we must be very grateful for your ideas, suggestions, and, above all, for having been able to put forward and carry out the idea of appointing a GNSO liaison to the GAC.

This is one of the ideas that was included in the GAC Working Methods Working Group, and I'm glad that it's already in place as a pilot. And as such, and I am very happy that we can count on Mason Cole to fulfill that role.

But at the same time, I would like to express that we, as the GAC, have also expectations as regards the work of the GNSO liaison to the GAC. We would like that the GNSO liaison devotes as much time of his

available time to this role because that would allow him to really get to know the GAC, our working methods, and the difficulties we face in following the work of the GNSO, and that can be replicated as regards other supporting organizations in the GAC.

So it's important that he can devote as much time as possible to this role.

Then I would like to say that it is foreseen that the GNSO liaison can attend GAC closed meetings that touch upon issues that affects PDPs initiated by the GNSO. We would like in this respect that information that comes from these closed meetings in the GAC is treated carefully by the GNSO liaison to the GAC and that it's conveyed neutrally and as completely as possible to the GNSO council.

So these are more or less the standards that we would like the liaison to comply with. We would be fully satisfied if Mason can live up to these standards that may sound a little bit demanding. I hope it is not the case.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Spain.

Perhaps we could make a couple of clarifications in relation to your comments.

I will say that Mason is a volunteer and is committed to giving his utmost to this role, but he's also, I think, brave because it's potentially, you know, quite a significant role. And we do need to be careful about

not placing too much pressure or having our expectations be too high about what one person can achieve. But we are very grateful for Mason volunteering, for coming forward to work with us and making that commitment of time and effort.

Jonathan, is there anything you wanted to add?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Yes, thank you. Likewise, following on. Thank you, Spain, and thank you, Heather, for that clarification.

I suppose there was one other point I wanted to make, and that was that a key take-away for us from this meeting is to have a mutual and common understanding of the role of the liaison. Spain has helped with those comments, and I think then Heather helps to clarify that Mason is, indeed, a volunteer so there will ultimately be limits to what he can do. But also, significantly, he is a GNSO liaison to the GAC. So his job, in our mind in specifying his role, is to be on hand to provide information and provide clarification. It is much less, although it's not envisaged that he won't do this at all, but it's much less to envisage that he will take GAC positions back to the GNSO. For that, we need to find other mechanisms.

His primary purpose is to assist you in filtering, managing, and giving you firsthand personal information of the work that's going on to assist you in doing your role, but much less so to take your positions back, although there's no reason why he can't report back in a considered way on discussions that have taken place.

Thank you.

INDISCERNABLE:

Just two more very brief comments on the liaison role. One is please be aware that understanding everything that is going on within GNSO policy processes is quite difficult for the members of the GNSO as well. And Mason does need to take some time out of his schedule in order to do that. And the other is also, of course, while this is a role that bridges between two -- you know, it primarily bridges between the two instructions and institutions of the GNSO, we are hoping that they will also be sort of useful at a more micro level and you will have someone who you will know who may not know the answer but you'll know who to talk to. Then we'll gradually expand the level of interaction between GAC reps. Knowing who to talk to within the GNSO can, again, can be complicated for us as well. So, hopefully, Mason will be able to help you with that.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

U.K., you had a comment? Yes, thanks. Comment on two issues. Firstly, on the role of the liaison. I think there's something we ought to underline also that the liaison has a valuable functionality in ensuring that GNSO members are alert to public policy issues and potential areas for the GAC to be interested in. I think one of the benefits of this functional bonding of the GNSO and the GAC, which Jonathan was describing, is that there's greater sensitivity, if you like, within the GNSO. So it's -- there is a two-way thing here. It's not just sort of providing the GAC with the opportunity to weigh in on the potential area of public interest, but also to keep the GNSO activities open to, ah, light bulbs being illuminated. There's potentially public policy interest here. Maybe we should check with the GAC.

So, you know, I think that's all part of the sort of coming together of our two constituencies within ICANN, which is very much to the positive. And it really is a step change for the GAC. I hope colleagues here will really understand that. And I hope you may be able to join -- I'm a member of the consultation group. Sorry. I should have explained in the beginning. I have helped out with the joint consultation work.

I hope as many of you as possible can come along to the meeting later today. Because we really need to start gravitating towards deliverables on mechanics, on modalities, the kind of things we've been talking about here. Is the working group process one route we can experiment with in addition to concise, precise flow of information about PDPs and train and the work of the liaison and the liaison reporting to the GAC on a preliminary report, whatever?

So there's various processes here which need to be managed and ensure that we can address all of this activity, this joint activity as efficiently and as lightly noted for us as possible. So that was my first point.

My second point is I was wondering if Jonathan could provide an update for protection on national Red Cross and Red Crescent entities. We noted that you had written to the -- to the NGPC for direction on the way forth for this on -- I think it was the 7th of October.

Have you any update for us on how you see that particular issue being resolved where the GAC had taken a different approach in its advice to the board from the GNSO? Red Cross and Red Crescent protection of national entities in the six U.N. languages? Is it possible for you to give us a quick update? Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: I'm afraid, Mark, I'm not equipped to do that. We haven't had a response. And that's almost as much as I can give you at this stage. I'm not well-equipped or briefed to give you a proper update at this stage. I'll be more than happy to work with colleagues who are working on that or come back to you in a written form. I don't want to avoid the question. I'm just not -- I just don't have additional information for you now. So I apologize to not be able to give you a more full response on that.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Okay. Are there any more questions or comments? Okay.

So, at this point, let's finish this session a little bit early and thank our colleagues from the GNSO for coming to meet with us. Welcome again, Mason. We look forward to continuing to work with you in your new role.

And thank you, Manal, as well for your continued work within the GAC/GNSO consultation group. And we look forward to further updates on that work as it continues.

So thank you, everyone. The GAC will be reconvening here at 5:00. So enjoy your coffee break. And then we will have our last session on accountability and transparency. Thank you.

(Break)

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]