ICANN San Francisco Meeting
Joint GAC/GNSO Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION
Sunday 13 March 2011 at 17:30 local

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is   incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is   posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Stephane Van Gelder: A question, really, which is, would a group of GAAC and GNSO
Council volunteer to discuss issues that might be of common interest to both
of the groups be a good idea?

And there are two other topics, but let's try and take this one in first and
please just raise your hands if you want to discuss this topic in order to start
us off.

Heather Dryden: Thank you, Stephane. I do think this question does relate to a degree to the
second one you're asking us about - about the liaison and whether having
liaisons between the organizations would be beneficial. So we have not
discussed at the GAAC what our answers might be, but I will look around the
room to get colleagues to see whether they have an initial reaction to this
idea.

I know that we are quite interested in finding ways to connect better with the
GNSO. There certainly are issues of common interest and in relation to the
third question you proposed, we place great importance on the ATRT
recommendations, and in particular those aspects relating to the policy
development process.

It's really an autonomy question for us in that we have had some frustration with being able to get GAAC advice reflected early on in the process. We think that's best - beneficial to all and to ensure that the PDB process is working well, it's really fundamental to this model.

And so I think it's a welcome question for us and some of these issues are quite interrelated for us. So I'm looking around and I don't see - oh, I see a hand. I can't see who the hand belongs to. U.S., please.

Woman: Well, thank you, Heather, and I think you did already make an observation that I was intending to make. I think the first two are actually directly related. And again, just thinking this is purely a sort of visceral reaction off the top of my head to engage in a dialogue.

Well, first is to thank you again and to perhaps suggest that we might be arriving at a similar sort of point as the GAAC and the Board arrived at in Cartagena where we recognized that a one hour exchange three times a year may not really advance a broader understanding of each others' perspectives.

So that would be the first thing that I, for one, as a GAAC member, would ask us to reconsider how in fact we interact. And just throw out a couple of ideas, because I don't think we're going to come to any conclusions today. But perhaps ask you to consider, instead of a GAAC liaison, having served as one, perhaps you could offer us liaisons from the different constituencies.

Because I will confess, as mysterious as you might find the GAAC and I do hear from some of you sometimes that we should consider offering GAAC 101 sessions from time to time - I think we're happy to do that.

We of course think we're crystal clear because we're quite familiar with interacting with one another. But we're certainly quite open to the idea that you might like to have a better handle as to how it is we actually do what we

do, so I think we're all happy to do that, but again, an hour would not be sufficient.

But as mysterious as you might think we are, I will confess to you that all of the acronyms and all of the constituencies, I think we can master the concept of constituencies, we're not that thick.

But you have invented a whole slew of new acronyms that relate to policy, processes, and working groups and etcetera and I'm not going to do them justice. And I don't mean to be flippant here, I'm actually trying to convey that we find it quite mysterious, and so it's very hard for us to understand.

So we would benefit, I think, from the reverse liaison approach. If you could all identify people that we could then go to from a particular constituency and say, "Could you please explain this?"

And that might help us sort of structure agendas for a longer meeting - for a different kind of exchange, because I think we would all benefit from that. All of the issues we cover and that the GNSO is interested and the GAAC are fairly broad ranging. I mean they touch on a number of different areas, whether it's law enforcement, it's, you know, you name it.

So I think we would really benefit from just a one country's perspective on the working group ideas. I did personally find the Rec6 working group approach an impossible working group for me to participate in, and I think a lot of my colleagues had the same challenges.

The pace of the exchange was something that we certainly respected, the sincerity of the effort and the intentions and the willingness of everybody to engage in that effort.

We are hampered a little bit more than you might be because we're not able to participate in our personal capacities. So as we participate representing our governments we are obliged to have clear positions.

So it's not very easy to have a clear position when the (tax) or the proposals are flying fast and furious, which is, you know, a wonderful thing to see, I mean, it's something to admire, it's just very challenging for a government bureaucrat to be able to chime in and then to quickly be able to amend a position. So I just want to offer that up.

There may be other ways, however, that we could explore as to how - a different alternative rather than have GAAC come into GNSO working group's structure a way that we can have some sort of an interim GAAC/GNSO agreed - even on an experimental basis method of asking for GAAC advice, trying to integrate it and trying to work that out together.

If you would find it helpful I think we would be more than happy to brief you at a subsequent meeting as to our experiences in working with the CCNSO. So we have had a very positive experience in actually collaborating on a policy that was a - you know, the idea in (fast track), quite candidly.

Now, it's a different structure, it may have made life a little bit easier, but I think it's worth exploring. So I want to thank you for your interest in sort of finding better ways and a certainly welcome that. Thank you.

Heather Dryden: Thank you for that, U.S. and Stephane, you wanted to respond?

Stephane Van Gelder: Not respond, but ask a clarifying question to a suggestion that I think is very interesting, which is a kind of reverse liaison. I'm just wondering if it would be more efficient to have one person take on that role or if you would find it more useful to have what you suggested was to have one person from each group. Is that correct?

So each group would nominate someone and that person - the GAAC could then go to that person to - thank you very much for that suggestion.

Heather Dryden: Okay, thank you. So I see an arm. Tim?

Tim Ruiz: Tim Ruiz with the Registrar's Constituency. Just thinking about, you know, how we can move forward, I think those are excellent suggestions. But again, you know, I would hate to see us, you know, try to solidify how we're going to move forward on them ICANN meeting by ICANN meeting because that would be a very slow move forward.

So would it make sense for both the GAAC and for the GNSO to perhaps assign a small group of individuals who can work together as a committee to try to keep this morning forward so that we can find, you know, a way that we can work together or get some of these suggestions actually implemented?

Heather Dryden: Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. Jeff Neuman with the Registry Stakeholder Group. I'm also the Chair, just to throw out some more abbreviations; I'm the Chair of the PPSC and the PDPWT.

Woman: I rest my case.

Jeff Neuman: That's the Policy Development Process Work Team and we've talked a considerable amount about how to get input from the advisory committees, not just the GAAC but ALAC and SSAC and others, and one of the ideas kind of just drawing upon the notion of early warning that you all introduced as far as for new TLDs.

It's not so much that we are asking for GAAC advice early on in the process, advice in terms of how you all - or we understand you think of it and, you know, we're not experts in that by any means. But more as far as, you know,

what are the sensitive issues in a particular policy development process that we should be cognizant of?

So if there were a way early on in the process to say - just to identify the issue spot or identify those issues that may be issues of public interest that you all could let us know early on in the process, then when we do get together to discuss that in a group within a particular policy development process we're aware of that and then have the means to reach out to you, to get some thoughts, not advice, but to get some thoughts as to what is sensitive and why those are sensitive issues.

Heather Dryden: Thank you, Jeff. I could see how that's useful. Zahid, you're next.

Zahid Jamil: Thank you. I really like the idea of having reverse liaisons. Just a quick question for clarification purposes. Would you expect the liaisons to be present in the closed GAAC meetings as well and not just - is it appropriate or not? I just wanted to ask. To answer questions is the point (I mean).

Heather Dryden: U.S., did you want to respond?

Woman: Well, we're getting a little giddy over here. It's sort of the end of a long day. He shall go nameless, but my colleague has suggested well, then it wouldn't be closed, would it? No, sorry, it really would depend on the issue. This week I think perhaps is a real departure, and I'm saying things that I'm sure our Chairman is itching to say.

This is a pretty big departure from what the GAAC normally does, as you all know, have become quite familiar most of our sessions are open and we're actually gratified that there's so much interest in coming in to listen to us.

What I think a lot of us around this table, and again, I'm not speaking for colleagues, I encourage them all to speak. This is just a very superficial

preliminary response to your very interesting proposal, is that maybe moving on to a different form of interaction.

Instead of scheduling these one hour sessions, which are far too abbreviated to get into any detail, that we actually do try to collaborate and find, you know, a more constructive way of engaging.

So since you asked us for a single point of contact, a liaison, but you are a multi interest constituency body, I just wanted to offer that out that we might find it easier to understand you better if each of your constituencies could field somebody to interact with us.

And all of this is just experimental. I mean, whatever it is we agree to I would think would not need to be cast in stone from the outset, we experiment with different methods and if it doesn't work you reject it and move on.

Heather Dryden: Thank you, (Suzanne), I think that's the merit of the proposal you're making. There are a number of constituencies in the GNSO and I don't want to ask how many working groups, but I know there are numerous. So that's quite daunting for us.

I think Stephane wanted to make a point on that particular topic before I go back to the speaking order. Brazil, you're next. Okay, Stephane?

Stephane Van Gelder: Thank you very much. I just wanted to say that if we do go down that road then I think it has to be clear that the people you'll be speaking to are representing their groups and not the full GNSO council. That was the sense of my question earlier on about having one person or one person per group.

So I think it's an interesting proposal to work on but we will need to refine it in terms of understanding the role that the people are taking on. Thank you.

Heather Dryden: Thank you for that, Stephane. I think it's clear that each of the parts of ICANN has quite different working methods and there are good reasons for that. But then we need to find ways to connect and to make it workable when we're working across the community.

Okay, so I have Brazil, and the European Commission, and I saw a couple more hands go up. So we'll continue through the speaking order. Brazil?

Man: Thank you. I think that two speakers earlier was the statement was made by Jeff when he said important stuff talking between GNSO and all their advisory groups regarding specific details of the gTLD process, for example.

And as we've seen - as we've experiencing last few years GAAC has provided a lot of guidelines, general principals, but when we come to the details of how to make them operational it's important to have a dialogue with GNSO. And I think we have to go further in that experience. So I fully agree with Jeff in that the richness of this interaction could help their (mood) stakeholder environment as a whole.

And a concrete proposal on these things, I'd like to make reference to the seminar that took place on last Friday. It was convened by NCUC and it was called Internet Governance and the Global Public Interest Policy. It was a seminar made during the whole Friday. It was made with specific questions around two or three speakers debating specific topics. And maybe this is a much more interesting interaction and we can get concrete outputs in that we could use.

So in a sense we could try to exercise seminars like these with (region) inputs from both sides and (region) outputs from seminars like this. And also, finally, I'd like to congratulate the organizers of NCUC for such a very good seminar that I had the pleasure to attend through remote participation. Thank you.

Heather Dryden: Thank you, Brazil. European Commission?

Man: Thank you, I just want to say because we didn't have time to really have a discussion amongst ourselves before you arrived, actually. We've been busy with other stuff as you can imagine.

So I just want to take the opportunity to, one, I want to thank you very much for coming here today, and two, to say I agreed with the response given by my U.S. colleague. I think she captured very well some of the ideas I was going to float.

I think we all know that the current level of interaction between us is not sufficient. It's not effective because we're dealing very often with the same issues. This is a multi stakeholder organization, I'm sure. So, you know, we should be interacting better. We have to find some way.

I think the bad news for you is that we've already had many offers of marriage already today. ALAC were in here earlier on and they want to work much more closely with us on (intersessiony). There's a review team for WHOIS that also want to work very closely with us. I think there's a delegation, re-delegation working group that we'll have to take part in.

There's also Jeff's group, I think. So we're very popular, which is very nice, actually, because we weren't that popular about ten days ago with certain parts of the ICANN community.

But there's a serious point here, I think, actually is just to tell you that it's not that we're negative all the time about interaction, it's just that it's a really hectic level of activity, and that comes with the multi stakeholder model, we know that actually, and we're willing to participate in that.

But I sometimes think when we have these discussions with other constituencies there's a more generic problem, if you'll excuse the expression, here with the organization. I think we need to have a better

overview about how all of the constituencies interact because I think as somebody who's been coming for years, there's always a lot of goodwill here. There's always a desire for people to talk and interact better, and then we go away, and then we repeat the same thing three months later, four months later.

So - and it's not a lack of goodwill, but I think maybe, you know, as an organization we need to stand back and see how all of the constituencies interact and how they can make best use of the time that's available, which is always limited, actually, and prioritize it because nobody wants to say, "No, we don't have time, you're not a priority, we're doing something else." That isn't the message we want to give.

But practically we're squeezed, and you're squeezed, and everybody else is squeezed. So I think we need to take the goodwill and try and make sure that we're not repeating this conversation in four months time in Singapore. Thank you.

Heather Dryden: Thank you for that, Commission. I have Adrian, Jaime, and then I have France.

Adrian Kinderis: Thank you, Adrian Kinderis, Registrar Stakeholder Group. Excuse me. I learnt in - we just met with the ICANN Board and I learnt at that meeting that every month a summary of the GSO policy work is prepared for the Board and presented to them.

I was just wondering whether that might be a valuable document for the GAAC to get a hold of on a monthly basis. I know it's just more for you to read but I assume it's probably summarized and distilled and may be a good starting point. That's number one.

Number two, I think the gentleman from the European Commission, I absolutely agree with the sentiment but I think in summary it has to be

interaction smarter rather than longer or more of. So, you know, I think we've just come out of a session where we've complained to the Board about how busy we are. To then overlay another set of interaction with the GAAC; albeit it valuable, I think - and I agree that as a whole we need to be smarter about the way we interact, not necessarily just think that more is better.

And with that, I think that we also should not necessarily assume that GAAC want to input on everything. And so to build junctures at every turn for the GAAC I think is potentially laborious. And I think it's more about sometimes visibility than it is necessarily about input. And a lot of the time we understand that the GAAC are unable to input because of the position as individuals or whatever, depending on how the information comes across. Thank you.

Heather Dryden: Thank you, Adrian. To pick up on your last point I think if we can find a way to increase the richness of the exchange and do it in such a way that we are able to identify priorities, I know from speaking with Stephane that there is a concern within your community around, you know, the fatigue and the amount of work that volunteers have to conduct on a wide variety of issues.

And certainly from my perspective, from a GAAC perspective, we really do need to prioritize, and we need not only to be doing this within our communities but finding a way to manage this as an organization.

We're always trying to do a lot of things all at the same time, and so we really need to actively and deliberately find ways to prioritize. And so if we can signal across communities what we're working on and what matters to us at that moment then that would help, I think, determine, you know, where we need to focus our collaborative efforts.

Okay, all right, so I have Jaime, France and then Jonathan.

Jaime Wagner: So I'm Jaime Wagner, I'm with the Council, with (BISBCP) constituency. And I would like to comment on the suggestion of liaisons for each constituency.

And this reminded me of the story - the (lovey) story of the elephant and the blind man. So if you don't understand the elephant as a whole, taking parts of it I think it could be worse.

And because the constituencies and (houses) and stakeholder groups and GNSO. So they represent different sectors and different interests that are much more alike a government is not a monolith, GNSO is not a monolith also. So there are different opinions and different interests represented.

But when it comes to the other part of the soup of acronyms that is the working groups and working teams, these are thematic. And I think this is where the early involvement of GAC, not to give formal advice or a formal opinion from a position but as Jeff put, to give an informant - information as to where potential future problems that some policy that is in the making can change after. This could be avoided by this early involvement.

And I think it would be better for us all to try to face the problems that the cross-community working groups are having and to go to - through this path of thematic involvement. And I think the liaison approach is proved not the best way in the past. And I think we should try to lapidate - I would say to elaborate the cross-community working groups to improve their work. Thank you.

Heather Dryden: Thank you, (Jamie). I have France, Jonathan, U.K. and Kristina.

Man: Thank you there. So first, sorry for this satisfactory statement but I'm really happy to see that the French is presiding on the GNSO. Just a quick round in French to say ((French Spoken)). Thank you to be here and just congrats a second time in French so ((French Spoken)).

So I just - we have some kind of French momentum because of Bertrand and Sebastien are on the board now so sorry for this coterie compliment but I could not resist.

So just to be more serious, just putting an idea of the table, what do you think of the possible when it's necessary to have a common communiqué because either joint working group - working matters are really fruitful? Do you think it could be useful to write them down and ask them on communiqués because I think we have a lot to learn about what is happening with the new gTLD process? And the lack of dialogue of has been the main problem these past years between the constituencies and groups.

So another idea could be to fix something like 1/3 of our time should be to talk to other people. Let's say this. One third of our time to - because it's really important for the future of this organization as (Bill) said, for the new stakeholder process. Thank you.

Heather Dryden: Thank you for that. Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Hi. I'm Jonathan Robinson, Registry Stakeholder Group representative on the council. And I suppose I'm casting back a little bit to some of the opening remarks and every - I'm relatively new on the council and every sympathy with the sort of complexity and depth and scale of the acronyms because I think they could fool even a - or challenge even a hardened, experienced person with some elements of this industry.

And I suppose one thing I did have was I've had very helpful conversations. And I could mention at least Chuck as - from VeriSign as one person who spoke through with me some of the historical issues. And certainly it makes a big difference trying - rather than trying to wade through websites and documents. So I guess I'm speaking to the positive interaction of talking with people via liaison or whatever other method rather than simply having to wade through.

We tend to say oh it's on this website or this wiki or in this (CMLJ). And then actually it's a daunting process with everything else that's on the place.

I suppose the other point I wanted to make was a question and just to - and I'm not sure there was a willingness to open. But I did hear some - an example of positive interaction with the ccNSO historically or perhaps even more recently. And if anyone was prepared to or able to point out to one or more ways in which that it worked that may be helpful in guiding us.

Heather Dryden: Thank you. U.K.?

Man: Yes. Thank you, Chair. And I really appreciate this opportunity to hear from the GNSO council - councilors. And I endorse the comments of others that it's very important that we do have these opportunities. And so let's move forward to develop some sort of tangible mechanism for constructive engagement policy issues of mutual concern.

I just wanted to come in and support Adrian's proposal about fielding a document for GAC, similar if not the same as the one that's provided to the board. I think that is a very welcome suggestion, a single document that captures both the progress on established issues but also crucially emerging issues, things that are being flagged up in terms of what the GNSO is about to embark on or the initial stages of GNSO work. That's going to be very informative for the GAC.

And perhaps the - I think Adrian explained that this was a monthly report. Maybe the one that issues in the month before the GAC meets could help establish the agenda for the GNSO and the GAC's meeting. And that would serve to help us jointly identify where best the GAC should start actively to engage in the policy development process which I think is a joint ambition and consistent with the affirmation of commitments, recommendations on the GAC getting engaged in the early stages of policy development.

So I quite like that idea. And I hope we can take that forward. Thanks.

Heather Dryden: Thank you, U.K. Kristina?

Kristina Rosette: Kristina Rosette, Intellectual Property Constituency. Thank you.

I strongly actually suspect that most of the information and communication that could be best utilized to facilitate I guess cross-pollination for lack of a better word already exists. And it's really just a matter for example of identifying what we may already have that either in its current form and perhaps a slight adaptation would be helpful to you and more specifically determining what would be the most efficient and effective way to do that.

And just picking up on the example of the report that Adrian gave, I guess the caveat/disclaimer I'd like to offer on that is that we don't see it so we don't know what it actually says which I think is probably an important thing to keep in mind to the extent it might be something that you would want to rely on for an update of what we're doing.

But a perhaps more useful example would be that in the policy development process the first - under the current process the first step in that is a request for an issues report which is a motion. And the staff is then charged with writing a report that identifies what the issue is, what the scope of it is, whether it's within the scope of ICANN bylaws.

And that report which will then form the basis of a motion to either go forward with a PDP or not, that report or its executive summary for example might be a useful flagging device for the GAC to use in terms of here is something that is on the GNSO's calendar, they have not yet formally decided to move forward with a PDP but they are likely to vote in the next one or two meetings. Based on the executive summary this might be something that we would want to get a more detailed briefing about. And something like that for example could be something that I think we could generate very easily.

And I really think the key is to try and figure out what practically will work best for both of us. And I would be more than happy to work on a group within the GNSO or a cross-group with representatives from the GAC to do that.

Heather Dryden: Thank you, Kristina. That's a helpful insight. Actually I don't think GAC members are aware that that's how you begin your processes within the GNSO so thank you.

All right. I have Denmark next.

Woman: Thank you all for coming here. This is really helpful to get information of how you work and I think we should continue this. It's important.

I also believe that it's important that the GAC and the GNSO are engaged in their - in dialogue early in the process of the policy development and to send out - would also welcome a (unintelligible) document which would be very helpful to us in our work in prioritizing also the subjects for discussions further on. And I think we could easily find some format for such a document. Thank you.

Heather Dryden: Thank you very much, Denmark. Okay. So Stephane, you're next.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thank you, Heather. I just wanted to come back to the report because to be frank we're not exactly clear what we're talking about.

It's something that has come up in the past hour during our discussion with the board. And asking around we're not sure whether it's a report that the GAC gets or doesn't get. Some members seem to think that they do get a report on what the GNSO Council is doing. And it's not clear whether that report just goes to the board or not.

So one of the things that we're going to go away and look at is exactly what that report is and perhaps if the GNSO Council can actually have a look at it

before it gets sent to either the board or the GAC because it definitely sounds like it's a useful document for us all to get on the same page.

Heather Dryden: Thank you, Stephane. Okay. We have a request from Adrian. Yes.

Adrian Kinderis: Nice work. Adrian Kinderis again. I just wanted to follow up. Tim Ruiz opened the session with a suggestion about a committee to get together to actually try and get some momentum in answering some of these interaction questions.

Was there an opinion or any further movement there? Or do we want to talk about that because that, to me, sounded like a good idea and to stop stalling, to appoint a couple of people and say okay, go away and work out how we're going to interact and how we can do it (unintelligible)? And we could take a couple of councilors and a couple of GAC people and maybe some staff to see what that could too maybe informally at least as a start just to try to at least keep some momentum here and not walk away and come back in three months with nothing happened.

Heather Dryden: Thank you for that suggestion, Adrian. I think the GAC can take this proposal away and have a discussion about whether we would seek volunteers to participate in such a group. So we can certainly do that as a next step on our part.

Okay. I have the United States.

Woman: Sorry. Excuse me. Thank you. This is the rude reach in front of the registry operator. But that's okay. He doesn't mind.

Just wanted to pick up on a couple of the suggestions that were made. I think there were probably, you know, several of us around the room who would be more than happy to volunteer to brainstorm. And I think we'd all need to come back to our respective communities to then run those ideas up the flagpole.

So brainstorming is one thing. The - I - we would nail down something concrete and firm just amongst a handful of people.

And again this goes to GAC working methods. We are truly a consensus-based, you know, we can have leads, we can have volunteers but we always come back to our community for a signoff.

So please don't be frustrated with us from the outside. It's just a more deliberative way of going forward. But I think the ideas...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: You're proposing is not a bad one.

Kristina, I think you offered some very, very concrete suggestions that sounded really practical. And again maybe what we also need from you -- I didn't mean to cut you off (unintelligible), but my light is on -- I think what we need from you is a GNSO 101, I mean quite candidly. We don't understand all the acronyms and we don't necessarily - and apologies for that; I'm sure it's written down somewhere.

But juggling the things we're juggling because we - all of us around this table handle everything related to ICANN and beyond. But it's not just gTLD-related policies. It's everything. So we're juggling just a lot of things.

As (Bill) was saying, a whole lot of people want to dance. And so we're happy to have multiple dance partners. It just has to work, you know, productively so it's constructive for both sides. So that was a very concrete suggestion.

Stephane, I think you may be right that we're all - we may be talking about all sorts of different documents. And so we may be talking past one another.

I know that we get pushed out -- I think it's posted on the ICANN site -- sort of a monthly policy update. I see somebody nodding over there.

What I think we have noticed about it is actually a remarkable absence of any reference to the GAC ever, ever, ever, ever if I may say. So we are not visible to the rest of the community.

So maybe we need to look to staff to get some ideas from staff as to how perhaps some of this can be better packaged so that the documentation is more helpful to everybody because what I'm picking up from you is that you don't necessarily find that - I don't want to use the wrong word. So staff, my apologies, not trying to be impolite here or impolitic. Maybe you don't find that illuminating or useful. I don't know.

But maybe that's a brainstorming session: what is going to be useful for people, how do you get the quick updates out there so that we know what are your looming priorities, where do you think you might find it useful for a quick - it could be a quick glance. You think there are any horrible, you know, alligators lurking below the water that are going to leap up and bite us, please let us know now although, you know, and I think most of us would be more than willing to do that.

It may not be as casual as Jeff would like. So again having a couple of people just drop in and out of working groups may not be what you want either.

So, you know, we have to kind of compare notes on our respective working methods and see, you know, sort of where - how we can bring this staff in. There is this whole policy staff. We find it interesting that we deal with public policy and yet we don't know them. So if I may say there is, you know, there is some room to maybe tweak and improve and reject maybe some existing mechanisms and methodology and to, even on an experimental, try new ones.

And some of us I think would be happy to answer your question -- I think it's the gentlemen straight in front of me and I apologize, I can't remember your name; you're looking at your screen, Jonathan, sorry, sorry -- about the GAC ccNSO. If not today we can certainly sort of in the hallways give you a sense of how that works. The most - in the IDN fast track that was actually a joint activity from the get-go if that helps.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you.

Heather Dryden: Thank you very much for that, U.S. We can certainly look at ways to work with the GNSO policy staff. We can request briefings from them on issues or how the GNSO works. And I think that would be quite useful. Yes.

I think I see a hand from the GNSO policy staff. Am I guessing correctly? We need a microphone. Marika, please.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika from ICANN staff. Just to clarify on the policy update, that's actually a document that's developed by the policy staff to the policy staff supporting the different organizations. And I think that's why the GAC currently is not covered as we don't have policy staff supporting GAC.

I'm sure there's a, you know, we are open to exploring, you know, the GAC's support - submitting topics that they would like to see covered because I think it would be interesting for the broader community to read about that as well. So perhaps consider there's not a conspiracy to include information from the GAC. So I just wanted to clarify that.

Heather Dryden: Thank you, Marika. Zahid, please.

Zahid Jamil: Hi. (Unintelligible) Council and the GNSO. I - since there's very little time left I just wanted to ask a question and see what GAC members thought of this.

The GNSO is going to be considering a resolution related to WHOIS studies this week - later this week. And we saw in Brussels that the GAC took a very constructive role and expressed its concerns quite well with regard to GAC advice being taken and taken into account by the board. In fact it went so far as to say in the scorecard that respective governments are fully taken into account in ICANN five or six (unintelligible) stakeholder model that ICANN represents. And this is an important point that the GAC made.

So my question basically is the - and it relates to a similar request for recommendations just like you did for the new TLDs. And this request for recommendations was made by the GAC three years ago. I'm talking about 2008 letter for recommendations for WHOIS studies.

And we're in 2011. Those studies haven't taken place. And I just wanted to highlight that point and ask the question: does the GAC have similar concerns with respect to the delay in having the WHOIS studies done and if so - because that's important for us in the GNSO because we'll be voting on it this week? I just wondered if anybody had any comments on that.

Heather Dryden: Well with regard to the delay I think the simple answer is yes. It has been a frustration I believe for the GAC. And one of the things that we have raised with the board in the past is that with our role in advising formally the board that we requested these WHOIS studies but then it wasn't immediately clear to us what happened to that request.

We did understand that it had been referred to the GNSO. But in terms of process what that meant and so on was not clear for GAC members.

And I believe at the time it was considered to be a real priority to go about the WHOIS issue in a fact-based manner. So in that sense it was really a fundamental issue for governments. So if you're going to formulate a policy what are the facts?

And so that was the longer answer, short answer yes. All right.

So I don't see any requests for the floor. Does anyone wish to make any further comments or question? Okay.

Well we're fairly close to the end of our allotted time. So if you're comfortable with closing the session, Stephane, I propose we do. Okay.

So thank you again for meeting with us today. Thank you, GNSO. And let's, you know, do what we can to take away the spirit of this exchange and find ways to practically realize them and work together to improve and collaborate. So thank you, everyone.

END