Good morning ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the GAC meeting.

Before starting the first session let me walk you through today's plans. They are, we will start with the staff update on ongoing reviews within ICANN. We afterwards follow up with a briefing on security related issues. First will be staff briefing on ICANN's stability and resiliency initiative for about ½ hour and then that session will follow with a presentation of Steve Crocker on behalf of SSAC. We will talk about root scaling issues and the discussion will be we had a previous meeting in Seoul which was rather inconclusive.

In the afternoon at 2:00 we will start our meeting with ccNSO and after that we will go into closed session in preparation of a meeting with the Board and at 4:30 a 1 ½ hour open meeting with the Board. If this is acceptable we will move on. I would like to suggest if by any chance we have some spare time during these sessions we would take questions one by one on our agenda, which I understand was acceptable and is already adopted.

So thank you.

Without further delay we will now start our session on status of organizational reviews within ICANN. If you recall last session we discussed that there are many ongoing review processes within ICANN and the GAC members wanted to know the state of the play of all these review sessions, how they converge, what is expected outcome and the next steps in relation to implementation of recommendations of those reviews and how these reviews may fit in the framework of the Affirmation of Commitment.

Marco Lorenzoni is the Director who is in charge of all these organizational reviews and he kindly accepted to come to the GAC and do his presentation and his presentation will follow a session of questions and answers.

Marco:

Thank you Janis and good morning. I didn't kindly accept, it is my pleasure to be here to have some discussion and interaction with you on the state of organizational reviews. Before going straight to the present status of advancement of the different organization reviews, please allow me to give you some background.

As you all know, ICANN is committed to perform organizational reviews of all its key structures, meaning all the supporting organizations, all the advisory committees, and the non-com by Article 44 of our bylaws. Those organizational reviews are current and it means each supporting organizations, advisory committees, etc. is subject to a cycle of review each 5 years. The timeline has been changed recently. It was seen in the original formulation timeline of 3 years and then based on experience the Board decided to extend this timeline so it's cycle starts 5 years after the delivery of the final report to the Board.

In order to introduce the status of the organizational reviews I represented here what does become over the recent months a way of representing our processes. You will see the organizational review in ICANN is made up of 6 different phases and they are serial running one after the other, they are off a completely different time duration, a completely different source absorption and the first 3 phases or preparation, review selection and the review deal with the first moment of the organizational review. So deal with the external review.

Organizational review indeed based is beginning on the hiring of an external consultant. So first of all we define terms of reference. We go for bid so we go for public tender. A lot has been done in this area in the recent months in order to enhance transparency and accountability of the selection process of the consultant. Then we go to external review.

Once the external review is done, a report is delivered to the Structural Improvement Committee, obviously during the review phase there are several public consultation processes. At the time when the Structural Improvement Committee receives and decides to accept with reservation or to go back to the reviewers with the request for further analysis. But once the report has been accepted, a specific review working group starts a further consultation with the community in order to get to final recommendation to the Board for implementation.

The review working group, in fact, is a source, in the first phase sort of the first moment of the review acts as a sort of steering committee. So it is a sort of trustee of the ability of the reviewers to meet deadlines, to deliver the product that we entrusted them to deliver and to interact with them during the external phase. During the following phase is the entity that takes a closer look to the report of the reviewers, takes a closer look to the different recommendations that have been issued in order to make them implementable and usable within the ICANN context.

Based on lessons we've learned in this first phase of organizational reviews, the quality of the final outputs from external reviewers can be very different. Some reviews, some external reports we got were implementable and others required some more substantial work with the community in order to be usable immediately in our context.

The working group that as I say a report to the Board and then it starts the phase of implementation to improvement. So for instance, uses the term GNSO improvement to design this phase and it's the moment when all the recommendations that have been formulated during the process are put to implementation.

After implementation you see there is a very last moment which is called the assessment of effects of our reviews that have survived so far to this phase. It is the moment I wanted to include in this scheme of organizational review in order to understand whether the effects of the implementations of the recommendations are leading in the direction we were hoping when implementing them. So it is the moment basically in which the community that has undergone the process of organizational review should understand whether the expected results have been produced as a result of the organizational review.

This is just a very short preamble and if you have any questions on any moment or any specific aspect of the process don't hesitate to interrupt me. Otherwise, my plan would be to go over the different reviews with you one by one to have a look at them.

Let's start with the 2 more advanced reviews. The first is the GNSO and GNSO as you know it was the first review process that was launched several years ago before I joined the organization. It is at an advanced stage of implementation and all the information related to the ongoing activities of implementation are published on a specific website. I think you have all the links in a background document I circulated a few weeks ago.

It is GNSO which is the main actor of this implementation. Staff, policy staff is supporting this work but the GNSO is taking the lead of this activity.

ALAC, ALAC is a review that has been concluded recently. The Board has taken 2 different decisions on the final report from the ALAC review working group. With the first decision the Board asked to develop implementation plans and to present the plans for Board approval for all recommendations contained in the final report with one exception. The exception is the possibility for At Large to nominate one Board director.

The implementation plans are under way and the expected date of delivery for reconsideration and Board approval is May 2010. So ALAC in conjunction with the policy staff is prioritizing finally the action to be implemented, defining the budget needed for implementing all recommendations and we've come with the final version of this implementation plan by May.

Regarding the other recommendation, the Board adopted an in principle indication for granting to the At Large community the possibility to nominate a voting Board director to the Board. This is related with other recommendations and it should by other organization review process but equally the Board review and the non-com review there is a parallel process running here in particular, ALAC published a white paper proposing election mechanism for public consideration on the identification of the director by their community. This is up for consultation. The Structural Improvement Committee will meet today informally, so members of the Structural Improvement Committee will informally meet today with the ALAC to discuss state of implementation of both actions.

We have 3 reports that we're going to present tomorrow. So we came to the conclusion of 3 different organizational reviews. They are the non-com, the Board and the Security and Stability Advisory Committee. Different story, the non-com review was started a long time ago and then it was put on hold pending other reviews that were ongoing at that time. The process has been reutilized about 5 or 6 months ago and now it came to conclusion.

SAC, pretty quick review, strong collaboration with the community. Our report delivered and the community decided to put a poll to the attention of the working group as sort of a self review in order to provide further input for the working group work.

Board, it is a pretty specific review. First of all, the Board is not subject to organizational reviews because it is not a supporting organization or an advisory committee. But the Board itself decided to ask to be reviewed with the same methodology that we apply for the organizational reviews of all the other key structures of ICANN. A very long process, some very controversial recommendations such as the recommendation to reduce the size of the Board that was issued by external reviewers. The working group, by the way on this, changed its initial approach following consultation with the community. Other very sensitive issues such as the possibility to remunerate the Board members and other much less contentious and some of them are already under implementation like reduction of the number of the meetings, raising the number of face to face meetings and several measures to improve the effectiveness of the action of the Board.

Tomorrow we will present all the 3 reports with the very last call for further comments. But the Chair of the Structural Improvement Committee will accept the comments only if they were not previously submitted already. This is really the final version of those 3 reports. The reports are now to the attention of the SIC for issuing an implementation plan and recommendation to the Board.

We have one review which is still in the working group phase. It is the SSAC root server. The review started in 2008, the external reviewers report was delivered in March. The working group tried to have the same identical approach of the SSAC review working group. So getting to the community and asking for feedback to provide input for the working group. There have been very long delays providing this kind of input requested by the working group, which brings to the present delays of this review process.

Just yesterday…

Mark:

Sorry to butt in but you're recounting some problems that some review have encountered and also some changes of recommendations. The Board one for example you mentioned. I wondered if you're now building up some sort of experience of how best to conduct reviews as quickly as what governments would want to see avoiding long delays. And sort of a body of best practice and experience that would encourage not only us in governments but the community, once the decision is made to undertake a review there is a sort of speedy recourse to that body of best practice and lessons learned.

The GNSO review and the ALAC review are near finalization so you must have built up some knowledge of we shouldn't have done that or that was a waste of time and so on. That is my question and just interject at this point, is that kind of coming together as a separate analysis of how best to conduct reviews as quickly and efficiently and avoid problems of long delays and changes of direction. Thanks.

Marco

Thank you for this point. Can I answer you after I finish the quick run through to the last reviews? We are almost done and then we'll go to this, okay? Thank you.

As I say with the SSAC the work is restarting now and we expect the working group to deliver a report by the end of February. ccNSO is the only review that is now running with external reviewers and the external reviewers are here in order to conduct face to face interviews with different members of the community. They should deliver their report by May in order to be presented also at the ICANN meeting in June.

Finally, last 2 reviews, in order to finish the first cycle of the review we have the ASO review. The ASO is the last supporting organization that needs to undergo a process of organizational review. There has been an informal agreement with NRO to use for the review of the ASO the same mechanism as for any other organizational review. The Structural Improvement Committee has to decide the timeline but it will very likely will go for finalization of the terms by the Brussels meeting.

To conclude, TLG even if TLG is not a supporting organization, it is not an advisory committee, the Structural Improvement Committee thinks that it would be useful to have a review also of the effectiveness of the TLG as a compendium to the review of the Board of Directors.

Mark:

Sorry what is TLG?

Marco:

You're right it is the Technical Liaison Group, in order to have representation to the Board of the technical community, so it is not a community.

So this is the present status of the different reviews. I would like, first of all, to answer the question on lessons learned. When getting to ICANN my first reaction was wow it's a long process, it's long by design, let's see how we can try to make it shorter and more effective in some parts.

Something has been done, so some parts of the process have been reduced with the collaboration of SIC and the Board, we were able to introduce much more transparent processes in some key phases of the organizational reviews. But still the process that is designed is long by definition and cannot be short.

Just to give you an example, the review of the non-com lasted 33 months, the review of the Board of Directors 24 months and then the others. The process is designed and I don't think it can be shortened further unless we go on a completely different path and we think in a different way. I think this is due to community to have a sort of post mortem consideration of all the review processes in order to understand what value is added to the process by the different sub

phases that we are going through and in order to provide much quicker review processes to the community.

Mark:

Thanks and if I can respond to that, it is still staggeringly long period for these reviews. If an entity discovers that something structurally is not quite right and then to have to wait another couple of years before implementing any change it seems too perpetuate the inefficiency for far too long.

I don't know whether this is a message, an issue we would want to discuss within the GAC further but I'm quite amazed at, we are in my department we wouldn't get away with that kind of length of time. But I note what you say about the importance of involvement in the community and consultation and allowing people time to comment and so on. But it just seems like an aspect of this that still needs further consideration as to improving the timeline and deliverables. Thanks.

Marco:

As an additional remark, I'm on your side. The processes that are time consuming are the processes for public consultation but public consultation has a value. I think it will be opportune to find a balance between the need to listen to the community and the number of public consultations processes, maybe this can be a way to approach the issue. And many of the public consultation processes are in the working group phase. Usually we have one public consultation during the external review phase, which is towards the end at the moment of the delivery of the draft final report. But then the working group can decide how many public consultation phases are necessary to conclude the work of the working group. And different experiences have been made by different working groups.

This one of the elements are the most on the duration of the organizational review.

Janis:

Mark?

Mark:

Yeah I think that comes back to my original point. If there is some sort of mechanism for sharing best practice amongst these reviews. This is how we cut that leg or reduce that time period for that consultation. Is there a mechanism for ensuring that best practice or lessons learned is applied and looked at by the other reviews or reviews about to start? That's my question. Thanks.

Marco:

I think this mechanism is precisely one of the tasks of the Structural Improvement Committee. So guarantee consistency of the processes and now to look at the processes as they are drawn in order to take conclusions on how best to reform the overall process.

Bertrand:

Thanks you Marco for the presentation. At first, lessons learned from the various reviews never hire again the one that did the Board review. That was the stupidest report I've ever seen on any external review.

The second thing has to do with the term of public consultation. Like Marilyn Cade, in many cases I sound like a broken record but there is one thing I want to hammer over and over again. ICANN doesn't make the distinction enough between public consultation and community interaction. Public consultations are in the current mechanism incredibly little motivating. You are contributing online on a document that is usually very long, there are thousands of documents on various occasions. You send a comment if you took the pain of commenting into a black box and you don't know how it's going to be taken into account if ever.

You sometimes have the experience that something you said is not taken into account or even rejected. In any case there is no interaction between the community because you post a comment and somebody else posts a comment and it's just a yes or no on some other document. So there is no consensus building.

I think it is in the review processes even more important to introduce something that deals with community interaction and not only community consultation. And the reason why I say this is because and as the first point, I was listening to what Mark was saying regarding the delays we have in government when we are doing reviews on progress for instance. I would like to make a distinction between the kind of situation where, for instance, the Ministry or government is reviewing the functioning of a program that has been launched and the situation here where this is not what it is about fundamentally.

What it is about is an institutional level exercise. Again, ICANN has big difficulties making distinctions between levels. It uses the same procedures of consultation and so on for any topic. It can be for the small level of changing the registration policy of one TLD or to design the whole new GLTD program or to do the review of the institutional structure.

In this case it is inappropriate because the fact that it is attached to the Structural Improvement Committee, which is a Board committee, is making the review of the organization as if the Board like a government is basically launching reviews to see whether the GNSO does it's work correctly. This is not what it is about. It is about whether the community believes after input and evaluations that the structural functioning can be improved.

So the very concept of review as a top down approach which basically looks like the Board is by bylaws ordering reviews on the bodies whereas actually it should be about the community trying to see whether the way the bodies are structured and operational is appropriate and ideal and there are very interlocking mechanisms between functioning one entity and the other one.

So I think in an appropriate moment when you do this wrap up of the review processes, there is a fundamental assumption on what those reviews are and I would say it is all the more important in the context of another review we're undertaking, while I hope that the AOC review will basically look at ICANN the way I would like those reviews to basically look at the function. It's about the institutional functioning of the organization. Thank you.

Marco:

Thank you Bertrand. I have 2 comments, the first is about what has been changed at the micro level. In the last reviews what has been attempted and I may say in one case with real success and in the other case with problems of dialogue was precisely to involve the community in a self assessment review in order to provide the working group with further ideas for reflection and to get to the final conclusion.

It was indeed the SSAC review in which in parallel with the public comment on the final report from external reviewers, the community took in their hands the responsibility to analyze itself and to issue a paper for the working group consideration. The working group had at a certain point, in their hands, 2 key documents which were the external look provided by the external reviewers and the self assessment made by the community and based on that concluded on a set of recommendations. It was very quick and easy to get into agreement with the community and that was the model that is doable in this context.

So with these kinds of processes it is doable. It is surely the same thing we would like to see for the ccNSO which is presently ongoing in the phase of the external review and it is surely the same thing I would like to see for the ASO review for the future.

Second comment I have you are proposing something that goes in the sense of participatory evaluation. As we say in Italian, you open a door which is wide open when proposing a discussion paper on the affirmation of reviews, i.e. I specifically propose to adopt a participatory approach to evaluation in order to carry out the affirmation reviews.

Janis:

Thank you Marco. Any other questions?

Senegal:

Thank you for your presentation. When I see that you are making some review in most of ICANN constituency and groups what about the GAC? Could we have a review of the GAC? In

my opinion at this time of AOC perhaps it's time for ICANN to review the GAC. Sorry if it's a stupid question.

Janis:

Yes I think here is the fundamental difference between the GAC and the other advisory committees. It would be hardly receivable even the notion that a private led multi-stakeholder organization review a government advisory committee. So it immediately touches questions of sovereignty and we enter into a territory which is rather sensitive.

So instead as you are well aware the GAC is performing its internal review once in a while. So we are undergoing every 3 to 4 years through the process of self evaluation. I remember it was around 2004 and then there was something in 2007 and now we are again in the process of self evaluation through internal process and through the joint GAC board working group. So that would answer your question.

Marco:

If I can add, this is precisely in line with the formulation of 44 of our bylaws, at the last paragraph says the GAC has to provide its own review mechanisms. There is 2 acceptations in our reviews and the first is for the GAC, so GAC is reviewing itself with the methodology that considers the most appropriate. The other is for ASO. Based on the memorandum of understanding with NRO, you know NRO is acting as ASO so the formulation of the memorandum of understanding is such that ICANN and NRO have to agree on the mechanism for conducting a review of the ASO.

This was one of the reasons, by the way, for which we needed to get into an agreement with NRO on the mechanism to be used to perform the review of the ASO.

Janis:

Sweden Maria. No? France, Bertrand.

Bertrand:

I just wanted to make the connection between the 2 questions. In your answer Janis you said ICANN reviewing the GAC would be a problem because of the organization reviewing governments. This is exactly the point I was making for the other organization. It is not ICANN reviewing the functioning of the GNSO or the functioning of the other various SO's, it is the community and structure trying to improve its institutional framework.

In this respect, Marco was alluding to the affirmation and the participatory model and if I remember correctly you had highlighted for the AOC 3 models with a different involvement. I don't remember what the last one was which is the one with the most engagement of the community.

Marco:

The empowerment evaluation.

Bertrand:

Yes and for the moment the reviews that are conducted on the SO's are not in the participatory element, they are in the first category which I don't remember either. It is the one where there is just the external review and the community is not involved. Is it advantageous to move also those reviews, the internal reviews to the participatory or even the empowerment model?

Marco:

That is something the Structural Improvement Committee has to consider I think. As staff, we can suggest some possible solutions and surely provide a first staff paper for consideration of lessons learned and possible models for other cycle of organizational reviews.

As I said, in this context, so in this model as we have edited from the present bylaws, everything we could do to improve the participation of the community is being done. so given to the community and this was done really with the most recent reviews give them to the community the possibility to perform a self assessment to come up with their own conclusions and to concur with their conclusions to the external look that is performed by an external consultant. So this is consistent with this model.

Other changes will imply completely different review approach, which is something I think can be considered by the committee and the Board.

Bertrand:

When is the process starting? Fundamentally the outcome and to take the lesson as Mark was saying the general feeling that we get from the whole process in spite of everything that has been positively attempted is that the mechanism for review doesn't reduce the institutional discussion that is needed on the evolution of the organization. So the self modification of the organization is a process that is not functioning the way it should. So when is the moment when the discussion on the review methodology will take place? Will this just be a discussion inside the Structural Improvement Committee? Or will the community have the right to participate in that?

Marco:

I think that ideally should be scheduled at the end of the first cycle of the reviews.

Bertrand:

Which will be?

Marco:

ASO, the definition of the terms referenced for the ASO review will be done in June. So something like towards the end of this year I think it should be a good moment for scheduling this consideration. I can't speak on behalf of the Structural Improvement Committee but I'm pretty soon any committee of the Board is open to different requests and views from the community.

Senegal:

I understand that GAC has a particular (inaudible) on accounting the review. My question is, is there one way that we are part of the community and we participate through the review of the community. Is it possible to have this mechanism in the GAC review to get back to the community their opinion on what GAC can make better or not?

Janis:

What is the reaction on the question that I believe is more geared towards the GAC rather than Marco. Canada, Heather?

Heather:

I know presently what is envisioned with the joint working group in terms of a more formal process of getting feedback from other parts of the community is that an opportunity will be created for feedback on the report that is produced by the joint working group. That doesn't mean that we can't invite comments and find ways to integrate comments from the community into the work as we progress it to now.

But that is something we're doing as we go along. I think if colleagues have proposals to make regarding how we could do that recognizing that the report we need to produce is due in June. So we don't have a lot of time to complete the review so they would need to be practical arrangements. But I suspect that certain parts of the work, for example, we're looking at ways to interact with other parts of the community in ways that are enabling the policy development process to work better. So that may well be an area where you do want thoughts and comments from other parts of the community because we are all contributing to those policy development processes.

I think it's a good question Mamuna and one for us to think about. I'm happy to hear suggestions if there are ways we can do that better.

Janis:

Thank you. Sweden, Maria.

Maria:

Thank you for the presentation. Maybe because it's only my second GAC/ICANN meeting but I'm not 100% sure I understand this review process. I suppose you had a few of those review cycles before and, you haven't? Okay. I'm just a bit wondering about the outcome. Actually my question is similar to Mark's question to the methodology. I'm not 100% certain what you want to gain on this because are you trying to solve or highlight big or small issues? Also, what Senegal was saying about the GAC I don't know if it could be solved via a review process or not but of course it must be things the GAC can do to provide more information or better support to the Board or ICANN. So if that is another process that could take place. Thank you.

Marco:

So the organization reviews are 2, organizational reviews aim to understand whether each specific supporting organization or advisory committee still have power in the ICANN Structure and if so what measures can be adopted to announce this effectiveness. So it is a very much effectiveness based evaluation, assessment in an organizational context. Just to give you the frame of the organizational reviews.

On the other question, it is yet another question on the mechanism for the review of the GAC. So I think it is better that we run it by the joint working group which is working with the Board of Directors.

Janis:

Thank you Marco. Any other reactions to what Mamuna was asking about comments or engagements with other communities on GAC reviews?

Bertrand:

I think it's a very valid question. It is an interesting element when we try to consider it in this direction to understand how other structures in ICANN may feel about the intrusion of sorts of the other communities into their own functioning. This is again one of the difficulties of the consultation processes.

For instance, when the GAC will or the GAC joint working group will produce the report it will have already reached a certain level of finalization so it will invite comments that are more about reactions to what is already formulated. On the other hand, it's obvious that it is a very big responsibility for the GAC itself to ask the right questions and not be completely submitted to the comments being made by somebody else.

I'm wondering at this time as the draft outline is a very good map of the questions we're asking. Whether there is any possibility to circulate to the community as a progress report something that says the GAC and the Board are now considering the following questions, which is basically almost the term of reference that we have established and maybe pick 1 or 2 elements of the state of progress to first inform and maybe generate potential comments as early as possible.

Heather:

Thank you Bertrand I think that's a good idea. I will look at doing that with Ray the co-chair. Thank you.

Janis:

Is that realistic? If we aim at concluding our deliberations in Brussels and we have a number of points or chapters filled with raw text, are we really in a position to circulate something for comments and ask for comments? What is the added value to that?

Bertrand:

No I was probably misunderstood. The way we've worked is the terms of reference of the draft of the GAC Board joint working group was actually relatively detailed already in terms of what we were going to address. And it was actually a very interesting list of the questions. My suggestion is not to circulate the current draft and ask for comments because we are drafting and it's part of the work of the group. The suggestion was to circulate a clean version of the questions that are contained in the term of reference to inform the rest of the community of the points that we are addressing and potentially invite comments, not edits on a document, but comments if people have contributions to make or just to apprise them of the work going on.

I think it's good for people outside to say ah they're thinking about it and if I want to say something I have just one place where I can say it.

Janis:

Thank you Bertrand. I'm now checking not to say something wrong but the terms of reference is annexed as Annex B to communiqué. So that is a public document. I acknowledge we never ask any comments on it but if there would be a desired comment I would, knowing the ICANN community, I have no doubt that they would comment. But that is a public thing.

Mary:

Please pardon my ignorance. The reviews are presented are they going to form part of what the AOC has mentioned or just be an interaction to gain experience of what has happened in the community before now?

In the light of what the AOC has said about the review team, will the review team take into consideration these reviews or just work on its own? Thank you.

Marco:

Let's say the organizational reviews started 3 years ago and they were inscribed in our bylaws. By their design they provide a vertical look to the organization. So the organization is analyzed

as a series of slices. When looking at any organization with only one dimension you risk to lose the other dimension, so you risk to lose cross cutting issues, you risk to lose vision of issues related to communication, to common aspects, synergies, so on and so forth.

Recently, the Affirmation of Commitment gave the opportunity to ICANN to have this cross cutting vision by providing requests for reviews which looks at issues which are common across the whole organization. So in my view, the 2 elements integrate with the charter, they integrate very much. What will be done by the review team, the review team will be completely autonomous in setting their own working methodology. They are only bound to some specific requirements of the affirmation review on the scope of the review.

I would be very much surprised if the review team would not take into consideration what has been done so far because for them it would be extremely valuable to consider everything that has been done so far in organizational review on any kind of initiative that has been carried out by the ICANN community, by the ICANN organization in this period of time. Because there is really very little sense to start from scratch without taking advantage from the past.

Janis:

Thank you Marco. So any other questions to Marco or comments? UK Mark.

Mark:

Sorry and thanks, I just thought of something I marked to ask earlier. Is it possible to indicate what sort of key elements of the GNSO and ALAC reviews, the key elements of actions for implementation of those 2 reviews? Maybe there is material available for me to look at. Is it possible for you to signal what are going to be the major consequences of those 2 reviews that are in finalization as you said?

Marco:

Very much so for the ALAC review, a bit less for GNSO review, simply it's just to avoid situation of conflict of interest. As staff we're organized in such a way that all implementation measures are being followed by a different department of organization. A function which is external to policy which is me, carries all the previous activities. So really to the big complexity of the GNSO restructuring I'm not really the right person to give you a straight answer on that.

The GNSO is very much about the structuring of the community, it's very much about the working model of the community, it's very much about the definition of the key components of the community. So it touches up on the essence of the supporting organization itself. It involves, the implementation involves really dozens of people who are working on working groups to get to the appropriate models for them to pass to action.

ALAC, the recommendations coming from that review okay the one with the most of impact, of course, is the possibility for the At Large community of nominating a Board director. The most important recommendation are the recommendations that less impact on the structure of the advisory committee. They are very much on outreach training, publication, communication, translation policy, staffing, so measures that impact on effectiveness and communication and training of the organization.

Mark:

Thanks very much Marco that is very helpful. It sounds like the GNSO review has resulted in a major follow on from that and there are going to be quite a few major changes. As you say, of a fundamental look at the constituency and so on. That is very interesting and I look forward to seeing the full review report. Thanks.

Janis:

Thank you. Any other questions? So thank you Marco for your presentation and this exchange on your time. Are there volunteers to provide draft for GAC communiqué on this session? If none, I will ask Mary and Fiona to be volunteers and draft something for communiqué which we could look at. Thank you.

We have another 20 minutes and I would like to suggest to go through some procedural motions and formally adopt the minutes of Seoul meeting. The minutes of the Seoul meeting have been circulated to the GAC mailing list about 10 days before this meeting. Until now there hasn't been any amendments or changes proposed.

A question which I would like to put to you is whether we are in a position to endorse formally endorse the minutes of the Seoul meeting? I see Germany.

Hubert:

Sorry I have a question concerning the nature of this document. I know the document is a communiqué and normally is interpreted from our side to be an advice. What is the status of these minutes as an advice no? They're only internal GAC document that is not published? Am I right?

Janis:

Indeed that is the document for file which allows us to revisit if we want and remind ourselves what issues were discussed, what positions were taken, what points of agreement and disagreement have been happened during the meeting. So that is the meaning of the document. This is an internal document and this is normal practice to have minutes of any meeting.

Egypt:

Are those archived somewhere on the website or we just have them by email?

Janis:

I believe they are. Certainly I have all of them in my files and I intend at the end of my tenure in the office to give all my archived files to the next Chair or Secretariat.

Elizabeth:

I have 2 questions on the form of the minutes. We noted that they do not indicate actually which position was taken by whom. I seem to remember that in previous cases this was actually done so the question I would be is why this type of format was chosen?

The second question is on the formulations were in agreement with other constituencies or ICANN is noted and there the questions is whether one could not have doubts as in how far an agreement is noted? If this is an internal document and not published but then I mean the other constituencies or bodies maybe don't know we have this position that there is agreement or disagreement. Thanks.

Janis:

We had a number of discussions of the format of executive minutes and I recall a couple of meetings ago when executive minutes in reality became recollection of the transcript. They were on dozens of pages. Then a number of GAC members suggested we should revisit the format on the executive minutes and make them short taking in to account the transcripts of the actual meetings are available upon request for all GAC members.

Now when the meetings are open, the audio records of all meetings also are available on the ICANN website. So therefore already in Seoul meeting we changed the format of the minutes and provided very brief recollection of major points which have been discussed and positions which have been taken and particularly highlighting positions where convergence of views have been reached whether amongst ourselves or with other constituencies. But equally indicating points where common views we were not able to reach.

So since the Seoul meeting minutes were adopted without comments I took that new format was acceptable and this time the minutes followed the same format.

Belgium:

Is there any reason why these minutes are not made public, since they are generic in nature?

Janis:

The answer is it has never been proposed to make them public.

Joseph:

I think that that is something that we could give some thought to but I have a concern that if we were to publish the minutes they may serve to inhibit action. In the end, we do publish an official communiqué at the end of the meeting, so I'm not too sure about that. Thanks.

Janis:

Thank you. Any other thoughts or comments?

Elizabeth:

Just to continue the thought from Belgium and to come back to the question that I had asked before, if we stayed convergence of views or lack thereof in the minutes would it then not make sense to check with those constituencies in one way or the other whether they have the same perception of that?

Janis:

Maybe I don't know. No opinion on this. I think if we consider this is factually correct and none of us raise objection then I assume the perception is correct. If somebody has doubts about the validity of propose formulation then one of the ways to verify whether the propose formulation is factually correct is to go to the relevant constituency and ask whether they understand it in the same way and whether they accept given formulation. But that is a rather theoretical debate.

Heather:

I would like to propose an edit, may I do that now?

Janis:

Please do.

Heather:

Under the header IDN CCTLD principles there is a list of points of convergence amongst GAC members. The first bullet, it's a small change but a meaningful one I believe, that the use of the ISO 3166-1 list is **the** starting point rather than **a** starting point. And I believe the agreement at that meeting was that the 3166 would be our point of reference.

Janis:

Thank you that's noted.

Elizabeth:

The 3166 list is something we would like to add that this is understood as the list word that the US added on that word list. There is there depictions of that list and we would make sure that it is understood that this is the one the you is on. Thank you.

Janis:

Thank you, Egypt.

Egypt:

I have a question on bullet 4, I was not at the Seoul meeting and I really cannot understand what the bullet is saying. Sorry, possible amendments to the way in which information on non-Latin script is represented in the ISO 316-1 could possibly be the subject of briefing in Nairobi. I'm just seeking clarification what is meant by this bullet.

Janis:

I need to go back to the transcripts. I don't recall exactly and maybe someone can help me. Who recalls the conversation we had? I think if I recall correctly we had discussion on what would be the best way to deal with the reference table in IDN CCTLD space. As you know ISO 3166-1 doesn't provide any codes but in Latin. So the question is do we think this would be needed to extend the table of ISO 3166-1 with other columns which would provide different country names or strings in other scripts.

I think that was that one. This is a part of ongoing PDP, this is a question which will be addressed in ongoing PDP. I recall we had this discussion during the meeting. Does that answer your questions or do you have reservations on this point?

Egypt:

No, no I don't have any reservation.

Janis:

Thank you. On European Commission's proposal I will check the exact formulation of ISO 3166 and European Union. I will apply it in the final version which I will send out exactly the same way. And I will check with you before publishing it.

With these amendments may I take that we are in the position to endorse the minutes of the Seoul meeting? Thank you that's decided.

So we have 8 minutes remaining and the next question which I would like to suggest before our meeting with ccNSO is on the GAC principles and IDN CCTLD's. You recall in Seoul we postponed the adoption of those principles pending the discussion with the ccNSO. Intercessionally, I received a letter, in fact, in Seoul we received a letter or request from the

ccNSO to engage in dialogue and intercessionally we had a conference call with the ccNSO. During that conference call and based on the letter which Chris DeSpain sent to me indicating the points which ccNSO consider being prejudice to the outcome of ccNSO policy development process on the question.

We agreed during the call that we would not rush with adoption of principles but we would call them interim, GAC IDN CCTLD interim principles. We would submit them as input to ongoing PDP and we would follow the debate and application of those interim principles during the process. And once the process is finished we would then turn them from interim to GAC principles.

So that was agreement we reached on the conference call. Of course, conference call had limited participation of the GAC members and therefore before the meeting I would like to see what we can confirm this agreement made during the conference call.

Egypt:

If I just may add to this that I think it's only fair to call it interim as far as the process is still ongoing and not final. But I think it's also important that we make sure we all agree on whatever principles are within the document and that this is sort of fine at giving the information at hand to date.

The other thing is we can still reference this as the interim GAC principles. I mean we don't just ignore it or stop here. I think we should be referencing this as far as we don't have any more versions or a final one. Thank you.

Janis:

Thank you and I think we agreed on those principles already. That is agreed text and we only postponed the formal adoption of pending the discussion with ccNSO. In the meantime, we received a request and during the call we sort of agreed to call them interim. But the text itself is agreed and certainly we will reference them on any occasion when this will be relevant.

Sri Lanka:

I only want to echo Egypt's sentiments in this. Thank you .

Norway:

I also want to reiterate what you said and call them interim. But just for clarification for my understanding and you also said something that I was going to ask, the exact test is agreed in an interim but of course then you might have to look at those specific comments from the ccNSO so that sort of questioned a couple of items in the draft, well interim, so that is something we'll probably have to work on from now and onwards I suppose. So if you could just confirm that, thank you.

Janis:

Yeah we will have a meeting with the ccNSO today and the issue is on the agenda. So my intention thinking how to run this once we come to this particular agenda item would sort of reiterate that there was some concerns expressed with them and open the debate to have some exchange on this and then decide how to proceed.

As you know, there is a working group on the subject. Manal and myself are members of that working group and so we will be monitoring very carefully this text is used during the deliberations for sure. I will keep you informed.

And the text of interim principles is attached to the Seoul communiqué and is Annex A.

May I take then that we agree as a preliminary to call these documents interim principles? That we formally send them to the working group, to the ccNSO working group as input to the ongoing PDP and we engage in discussion with the ccNSO today during the meeting.

If that is decided? Thank you.

I just circulated maybe slightly late the final text of amended Article 9. We are approaching the coffee break and I just want to make sure that you know that the text is on the GAC list and the hard copy, the Secretariat will distribute to you so that you have an opportunity to take a final look.

All comments which have been made during the intercessional debate have been taken into account. My intention is and we need to adopt these amendments during this meeting so that they would be applicable for the next round of election of the Chair, which technically will start in Brussels meeting if adopted. So we will visit this question tomorrow during our morning meeting.

So by saying this, this part of the meeting is closed.