LONDON – GAC/GNSO Joint Session
Sunday, June 22, 2014 – 15:00 to 16:00
ICANN – London, England

CHAIR DRYDEN:	Okay. So for the GAC, we now need to move directly into our next session. We're running a bit behind.
	But this is our session with the GNSO, the Generic Names Supporting Organization. So if I can ask our GNSO colleagues to come and please be seated. And I hope that Jonathan Robinson is here. Please come in and take a seat.
	And this session will be led by our colleague, Manal Ismail from Egypt along with Jonathan from the GNSO Council.
	Let's get started.
MANAL ISMAIL:	So we still have an hour?
>>	45 minutes.
CHAIR DRYDEN:	Okay. So let's get started. I think we can move a bit into the coffee break. So we'll take 45 minutes for this session.

So this is the only time this week that the GAC will be meeting with the Generic Names Supporting Organization.

And the focus of the discussion in this session is a group that was formed called the GAC-GNSO Consultation Group. And this was to look at one of the specific Accountability and Transparency Review Team recommendations from the first review team, and that was to allow for a better, earlier engagement between the GAC and the GNSO to influence those processes and have good communications back and forth. So the consultation group has been working very hard and will take us through some of the proposals that have come out of their exchanges.

And I will just note that there is one issue in particular that came up in our meetings yesterday afternoon that we think would be good fodder for this exchange, and that relates to the IGO and INGO and Red Cross/Red Crescent issue as the GAC has conceived of it. I don't want us to get into the substance of that now but we did flag that as being the kind of issue where we think we can work collaboratively and cooperatively with the GNSO and the GAC.

So, please, over to you, Jonathan and Manal.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you very much, Heather. It's a pleasure to be with you, GAC colleagues, and I should say that this working group, or consultation group as we've called it, is co-chaired by myself and Manal on my left. So the two of us have worked together with a number of your GAC

colleagues and members of the GNSO Council, including vice chair of the council, David Cake on my right.

So amongst you here are various members of the GNSO Council; indeed, the GNSO as a whole.

My role as chair of the GNSO Council, and then co-chair with Manal in running this consultation group.

Our first slide talks, I'll go straight to that, to the work of this. It is, as Heather said, the GAC-GNSO Consultation Group. We deliberately didn't call it a working group because there's particular processes and structures and mechanics and implications of a working group within the GNSO and we were aware this was, in a sense, a fresh start; an opportunity to collaborate and work together with the GAC and explore mechanisms by which we might better involve the GAC in the early stages of the GNSO's policy development work. In particular, with a focus in mind of where that policy work might have public-policy implications.

So the objective was to address GAC engagement in GNSO policy development process; in particular, because this had been identified both by the previous Accountability and Transparency Review Team, so-called, in ICANN speak, ATRT1, but also later, the most ATRT, so-called ATRT2. And you see before you the recommendations that were made. There are references to them.

The group commenced work earlier this year and recognized that it made sense to split the work into two particular tracks. And we then ended up with team leads on those two tracks. Myself and Manal are

working on the one work track, and U.S.A. GAC representative together with one of the GNSO Councillors is working on leading the second work track.

We'll walk through those in a little bit more detail as we go through this.

Next slide, please.

So here we start with work track 1. And I think this is an opportunity, perhaps, for Manal, my colleague and co-team lead on that work track, to talk you through that particular work track.

Over to you, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Jonathan.

This work track was looking into mechanisms to enhance the day-to-day cooperation between both the GAC and the GNSO.

First we identified six potential opportunities to enhance this ongoing cooperation. And then we got deeper or more thoroughly investigated three of those options to have those discussed here in London, and the three remaining maybe later at L.A.

The identified opportunities were the GNSO liaison to the GAC; GAC chairs and GNSO chairs regular interaction, how this may go; and also topic leads, which is basically to have the topic leads from both the GNSO and the GAC have, like, a team to facilitate the discussions. And also rethinking the joint meeting, how we can better utilize those

meetings and maximize the benefit from them and whether to have conference calls on specific topics, if needed.

Also how to further develop early warnings and notifications and got those better utilized and alerting for opportunities of further engagement.

And finally, utilizing the existing GNSO Council PDP liaisons in having interactions with the GAC.

So the highlighted options are those that we have investigated further and those that we are going to focus our discussion on within this working group. This work track. I'm sorry.

If we go to the next slide, please.

Then the GNSO liaison to the GAC basically is supposed to be appointed by the GNSO Council, of course. This has to be someone who has the expertise and, at the same time, has the time to participate to the GAC meetings because everything runs in parallel. So probably it's going to be an outgoing councillor or a recently stepping-down councillor who can spare the time for the GAC meetings.

We have agreed to have this implemented as a pilot and evaluated after one year. We have already gone through the funding process. We have filled the funding request, and we had this approved for fiscal year '15. And this means that we can have this already starting next meeting in L.A.

If we go to the next slide, please.

So the basic responsibilities for the GNSO liaison to the GAC -- and I have to say, we have like a two-page document laying out the responsibilities as well as the selection process that should take place within the GNSO. But we thought to highlight the responsibilities and how would this work, in practice, with the GAC here during the meeting. But again, the full details is available, and we would appreciate the feedback. So the main responsibilities for the liaison, as discussed by the consultation group, are to attend and participate in GAC meetings, of course; represent and communicate the GNSO policy work, and goes without saying that he or she would work closely with the GNSO chair and vice chairs; would liaise with ICANN policy staff in preparations of briefing material and responding to questions or comments that may arise within the GAC; liaise with relevant working groups and utilizing the GNSO Council liaison where required. Also provide regular updates to the GNSO Council.   And most importantly, guide the GAC in opportunities for early engagement, and keep the GAC updated on how its early input was considered when provided to the GNSO. And finally, assisting in facilitating GAC-GNSO discussions in cases where the views provided by the GAC were not in line with what the GNSO had in mind.

So if we go to the next slide, please, then we'll have a proposal -- yes -- a proposal on how this may work in practice; again, subject to feedback from GAC colleagues.

I already have circulated this over email, but I do appreciate the huge load and too many documents that were circulated recently before the meeting.

So it is proposed that the liaison attend all GAC open meetings and, consequently, be allowed to request the floor, of course. And attend the GAC closed meetings that are going to discuss GNSO-related topics, and, again, may be -- will be allowed to request the floor.

With regards to the conference calls, we were thinking that maybe this could be by invitation. So if we see there is a need for the GNSO liaison to be on a specific conference call, then this would be communicated to him or her, and they would participate and, again, be allowed to request the floor.

As for the GAC working groups, again this would work by invitation.

And finally, we did not see a need to have the liaison on the GAC mailing list, but, again, if something need to be conveyed to the whole GAC membership, this would be done through the help of the secretariat.

So, again, this is what the consultation group is proposing. And if we can go to the next slide, please. We will have what exactly we need from the GAC and the GNSO at this point in time is approval to proceed with this option starting the next ICANN meeting in Los Angeles. And approval of the detailed specification from which we had just highlighted the responsibilities and how it would work in practice, but there is a little bit more in the full document for anyone interested.

So I think we -- I'm interested to have quick reactions, maybe, at this point in time, whether we will be proceeding. We need some green light to proceed with this. Everything is ready in place, and we just need some green light to have this at the L.A. meeting. So....

Jonathan, please.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks.   So essentially, as it is probably self-evident, but just to be crystal clear, this is an offer of a resource who has expertise and qualifications in recent current and ongoing GNSO policy work, that we would like to make available to the GAC in order that you are in a position, then, to question, obtain updates, and be well informed such that you are able to have a particular resource available to you.

And as Manal said, we'd love your all reactions to this. Even if you just say it sounds great, just to give any guidance or thoughts you have on this would be wonderful.

Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes, Australia, please.

AUSTRALIA: Thank you to you both. It sounds great.

MANAL ISMAIL: U.K., please.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, well, this is really a leap forward for the GAC because so often we're focused on our own work. We don't really know what's going on at the core of policy development in ICANN. So this liaison and the specification for it, I think, fits the bill perfectly. I would really endorse

going ahead with this proposal. We really appreciate the GNSO's commitment and ability to resource it in this way and to identify somebody to do it.

And just a final thought. I mean, the whole object of this is to avoid the situation that policies -- sorry, policy development steams ahead and then the GAC says -- and wakes up cranky, what's going on here, we're not sure about this. This is what we're trying to avoid. And it's -- as I say, I endorse it. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: So I have Denmark next, please.

DENMARK: Yes, thank you very much. I would like to thank you for having worked so hard on this proposal and I think it's very timely. And as Mark said, I think it's very important that we actually get to -- to be part of the discussions in the -- I mean, to know what's happening in the GNSO. And so I think we are happy to go ahead with this, and this is a one-year try-out period and then we can assess -- I mean, assess it and go from there. Thank you very much.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay, this is encouraging and I have to say we had very early discussions on this that came from within the GAC from the JWG working group also. So we would still welcome any other feedback when you have a thorough look into the detailed document.

EN

And now can we go to the next slide, please? So this is a second complementary opportunity that would complement the work of the GNSO liaison. And this is how to utilize the GNSO council PDP liaisons that already exist within the GNSO. Those are a group of existing GNSO PDP liaisons, typically participate in the GNSO working group deliberations and are also on the council, so they know how things work from a council point of view but also know the details of the work itself from a working point of view.

As I said, this is a complementary opportunity that would work hand-in-hand with the GNSO liaison to the GAC, and in special cases may interact directly with the GAC, if necessary or requested.

So if we go to the next slide, please. Again, this is a proposal on how this may work in practice. We can have a mailing list of the GNSO council PDP working group liaisons that could flag certain items that should be brought to the attention of the GAC. There may be regular calls that could be scheduled between the GNSO council liaisons and the liaison to the GAC. So basically the GNSO liaison to the GAC is the focal point and will be interfacing through the council liaisons where needed and with the GNSO chair and vice chairs from one side but also with the GAC by attending the meetings and getting to know how the GAC discussions go and what exactly needs to be conveyed both ways.

Can we go to the next slide, please? And here we would like also to get some preliminary reaction to also move forward with this option that as mentioned would be complementary to the GNSO liaison to the GAC. So -- and I would pause here for a moment to see if we have reactions to this. Sorry. Yes, please, Heather, go ahead.

CHAIR DRYDEN: It seems to me that on action 1, which was the GAC liaison, that we had some very positive feedback, so let's take that as a decision to proceed with that. And then let's see about this second action and whether we can proceed with item number 2 that you have presented. But I didn't see anyone really expressing hesitation or a concern about that, so let's take that decision and then build on that by asking whether there is feedback on action 2 or whether we can proceed with this as well.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes, thank you, Heather. And again, as Jonathan has mentioned, those are resources that are being made available to help with the GAC early engagement, so let's hopefully see how this would enhance things forward.

So can we go to the next slide, please? And this has to do with the early awareness and notifications. Of course currently there are notifications that are being received -- sent by the GNSO Secretariat, either to the GAC Secretariat or directly to the GAC Chair. After such notifications, documents are posted on the Web sites and GAC members are notified. Although this sounds quite reasonable, but again with the multitude of email sent to the GAC every day, those seems to be lost or not really streamlined within the GAC work so -- and this is where we need to see how we can make things work better. So we're exploring alternatives to go beyond the simple for the info or heads up emails that are being sent and overlooked probably. So further feedback or input from the GAC is also -- would be very helpful, particularly to investigate how we can

enhance this option. And for this we have worked a very short survey that is already online.

Can we go to the next slide, please? So there is a very short survey that's been posted online and the URL is already provided within the slides for GAC members to give us input. We're proposing the 12th of July. It's a really short -- a really, really short survey. Just to inform GAC members of existing opportunities of engagement to the GNSO PDP and understand from GAC members how this existing mechanism -- how they are aware of this existing mechanism, do they know it is -- it exists in place? Are they taking full utilization of this, just to know what exactly needs to be enhanced. This is going to inform the work of the consultation group, so we can make this notifications and early awarenesses work better. So I -- I hope as many GAC members as we can could fill the survey by the 12th of July, if possible, and you will find that -- a very short survey that basically seeks views on things are currently working. So Jonathan, please, yes.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Just a brief point, just to really encourage you, we would love to have as many of your input as possible because it would clearly guide the work of this working group and this was the idea. So if we could -- I think the next slide simply, if you could just -- yeah, so the next slide is our third action. We wanted your go-ahead on the liaison. We wanted you to support us with the support for that liaison. And this third one is really to get a little bit of input from you so we can -- to inform our current and future work as this consultation group because if we know what is or isn't working for you, it will make us so much better equipped to be

able to design better mechanisms to inform you. Clearly the liaison is one, but anything else. So we would love to have -- I know it's a big ask, everyone has a lot going on, but we would love to have 100 inputs to this survey. So perhaps that can be your target, and we would love to have your input, please.

MANAL ISMAIL: So thank you, Jonathan. And Iran, please.

IRAN: Thank you very much. I don't think we could reject that. Thank you very much. But what is the 12th of July? It is very critical, you could say feedback or -- you said desirable. During the presentation you said it's helpful. It is encouraged preferably by 12 July. But what is the 12 July? Very busy period, yeah. So maybe preferably before July 12, but after that, do you reject if any feedback comes? Thank you. Put it preferably before 12 July. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you. And yes, definitely it's preferably before the 12th of July. So if we don't have further reactions to this, I think it's the right point to hand over to Jonathan to walk us through the work track to activities, and again, we see this early warning notification thing as a cross cutting opportunity between day-to-day as well as the PDP work track itself. So over to you, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Manal. So we have got clearly those three different items coming out of the work track that involves day-to-day engagement. The second work track focus specifically on how and -- when, how, and what the implication of GAC early engagement in the PDP process will be. So the first thing to do is to recognize the structure of the PDP process as it stands at the moment, and there are six distinct phases that we -- work we go through during a PDP process. Now, clearly, by definition, if it's an early engagement, the most constructive way to think about early engagement is in the early phases. So we chose to pick out those two early phases and start to think very carefully about how -- having done a broad look over the six phases, how we might work with you in those initial two phases.

So next slide, please. Can you advance the slide, please? So the objective clearly of this is to ensure that the GAC is aware of all existing mechanisms and therefore to then enable you to be able to provide input in a timely and meaningful way to both parties. And significantly here, once you have made that input, what are our common expectations of that? What do we think might happen once that's happened? Because it's all very well getting the input in early, but does that stop the process? Is that a veto? Is that an opinion? How do we react to that in a way that won't cause us collectively future problems when what we're trying to solve is future problems? Because if you'll recall, the current situation is the GNSO does its PDP work, we make recommendations to the board, the GAC is in a position to give advice to the board. And clearly, this causes dissatisfaction because it comes late in the process, and the whole purpose of our work is to cascade down when it's less effort gone in, we've gone less far down particular

tracks, and we're in a position to constructively engage and discuss how that might work.

So the potential impact is very, very important. And I should emphasize here, there's a conflicting point here. We in the GNSO are under some pressure to produce policies in a timely fashion. We have our own conflict there because we argue in part to those that advocate speed that good policies are designed thoroughly at a cautious speed. But that tension exists. Some want policies to keep coming through. Others are saying well, for goodness sake do them carefully. And now we've got the GAC coming in as well. So there's a really delicate balance here to try to manage all of our expectations as to what this might be. And that's what we're working to try and do, so that we develop a manageable and sustainable mechanism for taking and recognizing the number of PDPs.

Now, one key point here might be that -- and it almost certainly is the case, that you don't need to have specific involvement in every single PDP. One of the key points is to flush out which particular ones are relevant, as we've said before in particular that have potential public policy implications.

Next slide, please. So this is just a simple graphic illustrating the different phases in graphical terms as were outlined in the previous slide. And if you go to the next slide -- thank you -- we're clearly focused -- you can see the red block focuses around what we call the issue scoping, that document which defines the scope of the work that's going to be done in the Policy Development Process and the initiation of that work.

So typically this includes a request for a publication of a preliminary issue report and then the GNSO council decision as to whether or not to initiate a PDP. Just because the -- the threshold to producing an issue report is necessarily quite low and thereafter the decision to develop policy on the back of that issue report needs to be taken. And it may be that it just stops at the issue report stage and further policy doesn't need to be developed, but this is nevertheless a point where your involvement might be to say we really want you to develop policy or we have no further interest or just to understand and then the implications of that.

Next slide, please. So here's an important point, and I think this may or may not have been lost over some time. Any advisory committee can request an issue report, and that is in addition to the board or the council issuing an -- initiating an issue report. So therefore, the GAC could itself request an issue report. If you had a concern over a particular policy and wanted to initiate policy development work within the GNSO, it is within the scope of the -- the procedures under which we all collectively operate at present for you to do that. Thereafter the preliminary issue report is drafted and published for public comment. So -- an existing opportunity for involvement. And a summary report of the public comment is produced thereafter.

Finally, a final issue report is submitted to the council, and typically within 30 days of close of the public comment forum, and on that basis the decision is taken to undertake policy development work or not.

Next, please. So your opportunities for current engagement -- and in a way this speaks to the survey because we're sort of talking about what

is possible at present and what you might say well, I never realized that and having had this flag now it may influence what you say in the survey or not. But if a PDP is not initiated on an issue requested by an advisory committee, you -- you could -- your recall is to request a reconsideration. But to date, that hasn't happened, and that mechanism hasn't been required to be used.

Once this is initiated by the council, the consideration is usually at the first meeting after an issue -- after the issue report, and at that point what we're currently doing as part of our attempt to make more efficient, make faster the PDP process, is typically as a default we're starting to look at putting the charter, the scope of the work that's defined by the charter, into the issue report and accepting staff writing that initial charter for the working group.

However, it is an opportunity for the council to reject that charter and say, hang on, we would like to develop the charter ourselves. So it may or may not be a charter team that writes the charter for the scope of the working group. But, in any event, that leads to a working group which is open to anyone to participate, including GAC members. And I'm respectful here of discussions we've had in the past where it may not be feasible or realistic for GAC members to participate, but it is important to recognize that these are open to anyone. Next slide, please.

So what we're looking at here is clearly we've highlighted the survey. We'll look at what the implications for existing communication mechanisms are on the back of that. And these are some very initial ideas. This is probably the most sketchy of our work to date. These are

really ideas for you to consider. You may have opinions. You might have views on this. We haven't even necessarily honed in on these and said these are absolutely where it's at. But thoughts are along a quick look, you know, some sort of initial executive summary which enables a determination of public policy implications, some additional support for the GAC in this work, ensuring that any GAC positions or advice are in some way included or woven into the preliminary issue report. In other words, that they're not coming right at the end of that policy development process but at that very first stage, GAC positions or advice could be taken into concern. And also mindful of the volume -- and one of the issues that we face across the ICANN community is concern of the volume -- the consideration within the GAC, perhaps, of some form of triage or other committee to manage volume of work. So those are, typically, the kind of ideas that are being explored. And I am mindful of the time now that we have about 10 minutes of what we have agreed available to us. But just pause a moment in case there are any reactions or comments you'd like to make. USA first and then U.K.

UNITED STATES: Thank you, Jonathan. I just wanted to sort of chime in behind you and to second your sort of urging that the GAC members around the table, Manal as well, to respond to the survey. Having worked very closely now in this consultation group with colleagues on the GNSO and colleagues in the GAC, I think we're at a very, very interesting point where the GAC would actually begin to pay more attention to the issue scoping issue identification phase of a PDP. And that would permit us at a much, much earlier stage to at least signal whether we think there is a public policy issue or issues. And I don't think we've ever felt able to do

that. And it's not because we've been prevented, per se. It's simply the deluge of work and the methods of notification and information awareness haven't -- quite candidly, they haven't done the trick.

So we're really looking for feedback here from colleagues. What would it take? What kind of a notification? What kind of detail do you need in a notification for us as GAC to know whether we need to coalesce and develop a GAC consensus position to at least identify maybe just flagging issues to say heads up, GNSO, you want to go down this road? That's great. We're interested. Here are the little pieces we think where there's a parallel interest in the GAC and we need to probably collaborate.

So I just wanted to kind of reinforce that we're at a pretty interesting moment here. But we desperately need feedback from colleagues around the GAC table as to what kind of notification, what kind of information is it that we think we actually need to trigger our deliberations online or face-to-face as to whether we think there are public policy elements of a particular issue that the GNSO is considering initiating a PDP on. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: So thank you, Suzanne. And U.K. next, please.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thanks very much, Manal and Jonathan and the team. My thinking was very much along similar lines. I'm not aware of the GAC ever having considered requesting an issue report. I guess it's just a mechanism or opportunity that's been lost from sight over the years. And actually, I'll

be interested to know if other advisory committees actually took advantage of that on security and stability. Have there been such requests would indicate how joined up ICANN is in terms of policy development or whether other advisory committees -- SSAC, RSSAC or whoever, ALAC -- will be in the same situation as ours coming in much later in this whole sphere of policy development.

So any comment you'd like to make on that would be very, very important to provide some background context. And so the survey, it's not possible actually to put it up, is it? Or indicate how many questions there are. It would be useful in stimulating a positive --

JONATHAN ROBINSON: I'm sorry. We could put the survey up. It's just a quick link online. But -- I mean, it's available to -- literally, you could click from your computer and say -- it's not complicated. If I may, just to try and respond to your other point on -- I think there was a question on initiation and -- I mean, typically, as you might expect, PDPs are initiated either by the board or the GNSO. But it was important to flag that opportunity exists to initiate them from other ACs. And, in addition, the council provides for liaisons, which is something again in the midst of time the GAC did take partial advantage of a liaison to the council, which is where we got into this discussion that that doesn't necessarily work for you. But ALAC, for example, does take advantage of that. And we discussed in relatively recent time SSAC tends to take advantage of that. So there are other mechanisms that we're coming on to here, so I hope that answers your question.

EN

MANAL ISMAIL: Iran, please.

IRAN: Thank you very much. Just one clarification and one question. The clarification is that the sort of comments and feedback that you expect, is it helpful or desirable or encourage? Do you think in form of the consensus by GAC or comments from the GAC membership or members? Do you want always come to the GAC and -- because I heard from the United States they're talking of consensus. I don't think that the purpose of this exercise is to have a consensus on the formal feedback. Feedback is feedback from the GAC members. It helped you how you could proceed. So I don't think that -- unless I misunderstood the situation of consensus. And second is -- I didn't quite follow -- what do you mean by triage committee to do what? Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: So, first of all, yes. We need some feedback from the GAC how the current mechanisms work.   Again, the 12th of July deadline was, basically, to make sure we get the majority of the feedback by then. As you said, if we get some feedback afterwards, again, we can consider this, of course. But we don't want to get just one feedback before July and then the majority afterwards. This is -- and we are not seeking consensus. We are -- we're just probing how things are currently working from GAC members' perspective. And, actually, this is what we are going to analyze.   So there is no consensus in this.   It's pure individual views on how the current mechanism is working. And so that we can figure out where exactly we can enhance the process.

Actually, I was going to ask for the floor when Jonathan mentioned the triage committee. Because, as a non-native speaker, I personally looked up the word to know what exactly it means before proposing it. And I stand to be corrected, of course, from all native speakers.

But it's a committee that looks into things and prioritize the activities that needs to be taken according to the resources at hand. So they get to prioritize all -- a bunch of activities so that they are like to best utilize the resources at hand. So it's -- but, again, I leave it to native speakers to maybe better explain this. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Okay. I'm mindful of your time. I'm mindful of your collective time, so we'll move on. But I think perhaps the triage is perhaps from a medical situation that refers to an emergency processing pace.   And, when you've got a lot of problems, limited resources, how do you rapidly prioritize and organize to get things through?   So that's where that comes from. But I think it would be good for us to just try to complete this last couple slides and perhaps briefly touch on the point that Heather wanted to do where there's another important issue that some of you would like to hear a little bit of feedback on.

So, if we could have the next slide, please.

So we're going to receive the previous slide -- going to receive the input we take in London. We propose to implement the pilot subject to approval, which I believe we have from you. And we'll put through the GNSO Council meeting on Wednesday. We'd love to review the survey

results. By the way, the survey is only four questions. So it really is brief.

And then we'll work on further developments between now and L.A.

Now, importantly, on the next slide, please, there are links available to all of our work. So, to the extent that any of you have an interest in any more detail than we've given you, it is all available and transparent via our Wiki. And we can give you specific links. Can I see that next slide, please? Yeah.

So here is a set -- this talks about a charter, the workplan, the work tracks, the survey, and so on.

So next slide, please.

And this final slide really acknowledges so you can see the members from approximately equal numbers of members from both sides. And I think we acknowledge here, of course, the specific staff support we receive from the GAC staff in the form of Olof Nordling and the GNSO staff in the form of Marika Konings. Thank you much for that. I think it's very useful to have discussed that with you and have gotten your feedback.

Heather, I know you'd like to hear a little bit on the IGO/INGO thing to close things off. So I'm happy to make a couple of brief points before we finish the meeting.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you. So, before we move to that item, there may be a couple things we can do to tie up this session. And thank you to both of you for

all the work that's gone on in the consultation group. It's clearly very much at the core of making our work processes work for us rather than against us as it can sometimes feel like. So there is an emphasis here on communications in general between the two, the GNSO and the GAC. And staff support are clearly an important part of making those processes work.

And, in looking at some of those suggestions, it's good to know that we can turn to staff support to help enable those. And I think it also relates to this wider discussion occurring about the amount of workload in the community and the fact that, really, it's a general sense across the SOs and ACs that there's really a lot of work to do. There isn't enough time to give the proper analysis of prioritization to them to enable comments to be given in time and so on and so forth.

So I think this fits in nicely with that larger theme of how are we, in fact, managing the workload that's going on in the community and all the different tracks of work. And that includes those that relate to the generic side and the role of the GNSO in this.

So, regarding the actions that you outlined under work track I -- so there was action I, II, and III. So I would take it as agreed from the GAC to proceed with those. So I don't know whether you need to go now and get agreement from the GNSO. So please do take that as agreement and move ahead with confidence in trying those liaison mechanisms. And I would encourage colleagues to respond to the survey which has been circulated to the GAC email list. So you can have a quick look at what's there while it's fresh in your mind.

The last point was in relation to protections for intergovernmental organizations, in particular, acronyms because that is the main piece that the GAC has been focused on recently as well as protections for the Red Cross and Red Crescent.

So yesterday we had an opportunity to have some discussion in the GAC. It was focused on the letter that was communicated from the NGPC to the GNSO. And out of that it was clear that there were some issues to clarify and points to raise with the board. And we meet with them at the end of Tuesday.

But I think that the general sense was really that the advice that the GAC has given, the GAC still very much continues to reinforce that advice and support the mechanisms that have been pursued by the board new gTLD program committee in relation to that. As well we took note of the wider implications in terms of being able to conclude on this in a timely way and offer some assurances to intergovernmental organizations that -- as part of their efforts to engage here, that they have been able to make progress and get a result with their efforts with the GAC and other parts of the community as it has been a process underway for some time.

So those are the key things that I would communicate to you. But, of course, in that discussion, it was also noted that this is something where we should offer to the GNSO to work with you because the letter was clearly asking you to look at some of the areas of difference in view between the GNSO and the GAC and the GNSO and the NGPC. And so we wanted to assure you that we are here and available and wanting to

engage with you as we identify what the next steps are. So, if that's helpful to you, then --

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Heather. I think that is very helpful. And I think we can give you some mutual assurance as well. We discussed the NGPC letter during our weekend sessions. And the NGPC letter will be further dealt with in our public meeting on Wednesday. We very much welcome the NGPC's initiative to try to reconcile the differences between the GAC advice and the GNSO policy recommendations. And, of course -- and utilizing the existing procedures available. Because don't forget this clearly predates all of our current work. So this comes prior to the work of this consultation group.

And one option is for the council -- one clear option, which is essentially being suggested, is the council could ask the working group to reconvene. And we would be open to anyone joining that reconvene group, including the IGO coalition, to assist with those deliberations.

So -- and then I should also highlight, I guess, the recently initiated PDP on the curative mechanisms such as the UDRP and URS to be proposed to or to be reviewed as potentially available to IGOs and INGOs.

And so this PDP has been recently initiated. So it's important to draw that to your attention and that that was adopted with the other IGO/INGO related recommendations. So this might be maybe an opportunity to start to operationalize some of these things that we've talked about in the consultation group. Because it's the first PDP to be initiated after this work. So I think there's generally a constructive view,

EN

and we are attempting to navigate this issue. And we really appreciate the work that the NGPC has done to write to us. And we're going to try and work with all parties to get something done here.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you very much. So, just to clarify, the options you are considering is reconvening the working group that you had in the GNSO to look at policy recommendations for IGOs and NGOs. And there's also a working group effort to look at the curative mechanisms? Or how does that --

JONATHAN ROBINSON: That's a separate and new working group to look at the curative mechanism. So it is very unusual for us to reconvene a working group. But, in response to the letter from the NGPC, we are now actively considering reconvening that working group to -- in particular to look at modifying the recommendations of that working group such that new mechanism, new recommendations could be made. And, in addition, an entirely -- well, not entirely. But in addition there is a separate working group to look at mechanisms which follows directly from a previous recommendation.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Okay. So, once we have clarity on the approach, then we would be able to identify how to participate or contribute or -- yeah. Okay. That seems like a good way forward.

David, you wanted --

DAVID CAKE: I just wanted to make one clarification. Because I read in the transcripts of the earlier GAC session that were suggesting using the URS and UDRP and so on that we were equating these names with trademarks. Specifically, the charter for that working group specifically does not. It suggests that one option may be that we need to create new mechanisms that are separate differences between trademarks and so on. We are very aware that we can't simply treat these names as trademarks and so on. And that working group for the curative mechanisms is quite open in its -- what its outcomes will be. So I would definitely suggest those who have expertise in specific legal handling of these sort of names to get involved in that working group, it would be very helpful. At least it is quite at early stage at this stage.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Okay. Great.

Thank you very much for letting us spend a few minutes on that last issue. And thank you to both Jonathan and Manal and David for coming to brief us on the consultation group. And I think you have good support to proceed with your work. And I hope other colleagues will engage and provide the feedback that they are seeking to help put in place the processes that we need to enable our work.

Jonathan, one last comment?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: One last thing. After a successful social engagement with you at the previous ICANN meeting, we've set up a cocktail and opportunity to come together at 6:00 this evening. Between 6:00 and 7:00 at I think

it's the Whiskey -- called the Whiskey Bar. Whiskey Lounge on the ground floor. So we hope that any of you coming along to meet with GNSO colleagues and talk about some of these matters informally as well as we have done so in this meeting. So 6:00 today in the Whiskey Lounge. Thank you very much.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you.

And for the GAC, we now have our break. So, if we can be back in the room at 10 to 5:00, 10 to 5:00. So it's about 20, 25 minutes now we have for a break. And then we will continue with our sessions. Thank you.

(Break)