

---

SINGAPORE – GAC-GNSO Joint Meeting  
Sunday, March 23<sup>rd</sup> 2014 – 15:00 to 16:00  
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

EGYPT: Okay. So good afternoon, everyone. And welcome to the GNSO-GAC meeting. We have a main agenda item today, which is reporting back to you and giving you an update on the progress of the GAC-GNSO consultation group on GAC early engagement in GNSO PDP.

So we've been having regular biweekly meetings. And I believe we've done a good progress. I won't delay us further as we are already a bit late. We have prepared a few slides just to brief you on the progress that have been done intersessionally between Buenos Aires and Singapore. So -- okay.

So I think, meanwhile, I can recognize the efforts of the whole working group. We have the U.S., Portugal, Suzanne and Ana, and Gema from Spain. And there is no gender discrimination intended here. We also had Mark from U.K., but he couldn't make it to this meeting. And we also have members of the GNSO working group. Of course, the working group is cochaired by Jonathan and myself. So would you like to -- sure.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Manal. Thank you, GAC colleagues. We appreciate the opportunity to be here with you. My name is Jonathan Robinson. I'm chair of the GNSO council. I'm joined, as Manal said, by David Cake and Volker Greimann, vice chairs of the council, together with Mikey

---

O'Connor, who has been a very active member and one of the team leads in the working group.

We have very much enjoyed the progress we've made to date with our GAC colleagues. It's been a great opportunity. And, as you'll hear from Manal in a moment or two, there's very good background and reason for this work. But, notwithstanding that, it, frankly, makes common sense for us to work with you as part of this multistakeholder model. So we really appreciate the opportunity to do so with our GAC colleagues. And it's been a good start. And we look forward to, in the next few minutes, demonstrating to the progress we have made so far.

So do we have the slides loaded up?

So I won't remember all the names on the group. But the group from GNSO perspective is comprised of myself, the vice chairs, Mikey, and a couple of other GNSO Council colleagues. And it's -- and then there is my co-chair, obviously, Manal; United States; and others on the GAC side of things. And we've -- collectively make up an approximately balanced team representing almost equal numbers. And you'll hear in a little more detail about the work streams and the team leads within those work streams.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Okay. The slides -- I hope you can see the slides, because I cannot. But that's okay. The issue, as you may know, has been identified by the GAC-board joint working group, the ATRT1 accountability and transparency review team, the BGRI working group, of course, as well as ATRT2. So it has been an outstanding recommendation that I'm sure



---

the community is looking forward as well as we are to having this implemented and the, hopefully, positive impact it would result in.

We saw many values for this early engagement, which I believe on the second slide -- yes, please.

So we believe it would help in having more efficient PDPs as the process won't get delayed when the board, easier decisions at the board level as this, obviously, would give a better chance and more probability for the GAC and the GNSO to converge views and find an agreed way forward, benefiting from the multistakeholder nature of the ICANN as early as possible and directly between the different stakeholders rather than later and through the board. And, finally, of course, implementing the ATRT recommendations.

So, having said that, we have identified the goal of our consultation group to be GAC early engagement in GNSO PDP projects and closer functional coordination between the GAC and the GNSO organizations.

The objectives, as also listed in our charter, are an agreed process for an ongoing, smooth, and timely information exchange. And an agreed and smooth early engagement of the GAC in GNSO PDP. An agreed procedure for how to proceed in cases where GAC early input is in conflict with the GNSO and a mutual agreement could not be reached because we hope this early engagement would open opportunities for discussing and resolving early conflicts. And, finally, proposal for accommodating the different working methods between the GAC and the GNSO. All this is listed in our charter, which is already available online. And was also circulated to -- on the mailing list that we hope, of course, to have some feedback on this and, hopefully, have it signed off



---

our work that we've been doing. The charter from the consultation group point of view have been completed. So we completed our work on it. And we look forward to your feedback, if any.

Also, the feedback from the GAC and GNSO, which is what we are seeking here today. Approval by the GAC and the GNSO. I know the GNSO probably has some way of having this approved. And I don't think we have the same thing at the GAC. But I believe we would sense this from the feedback. Whether we have to receive feedback, then we will have it reflected. If not, then we would consider this approved.

And as it appears, we are targeting our meeting here today and the Singapore meeting in general.

So would you like, Jonathan, to intervene? Yes, please.

DAVID CAKE:

I'll just clarify. The GNSO -- currently this is on the agenda for our formal meeting on Wednesday. So if the GAC can give us any feedback about the charter, we still probably have time to incorporate it. But if it isn't done by Wednesday, we will have to postpone it to a future time.

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

Thank you, Manal, for taking us through the slides. Thank you, David, for those comments.

I think it's worth pausing for a moment and letting you know that one of the initial discussions we had, in a sense, and a first challenge was to talk about a way in which we might work together.



---

We entered into working together in a very constructive and positive spirit, but, frankly, the GAC has unique ways of working and the GNSO has unique and possibly -- well, I think it's probably true to say we've built over a sustained period of time. We are a policy development organization by virtue of the bylaws of ICANN. We are born to be a policy development organization. And as such, we have developed and evolved over a number of years very structured ways of working. Yet our objective in this group in coming together was to find a commonality of working.

And so a couple of key things that we agreed. One, that we would set off the course of the work based on a charter. So we had a common statement of work, if you like, or baseline from which we were working. And we also agreed to work with an open mailing list, and a Wiki, an online store of information. So all of our work is available to you should you be interested to come and look at that in detail. It's available for you to peruse and engage in in whatever depth you might like to do so.

But as far as the work of the working group is concerned, that's defined and set out in this charter. And as David pointed out, that charter is formally, in terms of our processes, set up for approval at the GNSO Council meeting on Wednesday. As part of our weekend sessions we review all of the motions that are on the -- on the table for voting on on Wednesday, and so we've both pre-discussed it in person at this meeting but also over our mailing lists.

So looking, then, in a little more detail in the next slide on the way in which we're working, what we've done is we've broken it down, the



---

work, into two -- and our early key concept is to break the work down into these two tracks.

One is in many ways the substance of the group, and that is to find ways in which -- at what point in this very structured process by which policy is developed in the GNSO, what we call the PDP process, the policy development process, and to find both mechanical points of interaction as well as the method and -- method by which we interact, and the understanding of what -- of what might come from those interactions.

So, actually, there are a number of things that go on, as we've discussed in prior meetings, already. We send you messages and things -- emails go flying around, notifications and so on. But for whatever reason, it hasn't turned out to be -- without apportioning responsibility for that at all, it hasn't turned out to be as effective as it could be. And so that is what the goal of this second and lower work track is. The early engagement is to really find points where, in the structured program of work, where we can actually work effectively together.

In addition, there is a second work track, and you'll see the names on the slide indicate that your U.S. representative Suzanne and Mikey are the team leads that we've allocated to that particular work stream, and then Egypt, Manal, and myself are working on the day-to-day cooperation track which is a second track of work, and really looking at mechanisms by which we might interact effectively on a more continuous and day-to-day basis, rather than waiting for big junction points.



---

Now, none of this is cast in stone. There are a number of detail questions. And it is the work of this group to explore and develop and dig into that in detail and make sure that we cover that.

Why don't I pause for a moment just in case there's something important that I've missed that one of the other team leads, that's Manal or Suzanne or Mikey, would like to add. It's not necessarily the case that you would like to, but if you would, let me make sure. You're okay, Mikey? Good.

Manal.

EGYPT:

Just to indicate those are the alternatives we're looking at. Some of them may be mutually exclusive. Some of them may be complementary. Some of them may be just alternatives.

So we are still to work on each.

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

Yeah, that's a really good point, Manal. We are supposing to you both the charter, which you should have seen, and now digging into these two different work streams of work. And it is very much work in progress. So I would hate for anyone to go away from this meeting thinking this is something that is -- this is a done deal.

This is about an active working team in this consultation group who are figuring out how we will work together in future. And we expect to circle back to you on a regular basis, and, of course, to the GNSO and



---

the GAC, our respective groups, and make sure that we remain, you know, with a mandate, shall we say.

If we could go on to the next slide, then, please.

So this next slide is -- might look at first like a rather complex graphic, but it is really intended to try and simplify the process by which the -- the structured process by which policy is developed within the GNSO through the policy development process. And you'll see it's been neatly divided by our competent slide designer and team member Mikey into four quadrants which really capture an issue identification phase, a method by which consensus is developed around the work, a refinement phase, and, finally, an improvement and implementation phase. And within each of those quadrants, then, there are smaller points.

Now, one of the issues we face at the moment is if you trace going around that circle of activity clockwise, and whether you look at it as four major quadrants of activity or 12 detailed points of activity, the issue we face is that there's been a lot of work and potentially a lot of energy, emotional and practical, put into the development of policy as one works around that circle. And the current problem we face is that there is a risk that the GAC's involvement is in and around quadrant four. And of course the entire purpose of this conversation and this group is to bring that in earlier.

So if I could go to the next slide, which is essentially the same slide but with some lozenges on it indicating the optimum points for involvement. And clearly any involvement in the process which leads to constructive engagement is attractive. But the earlier the better for so





---

many reasons. Because, clearly, early, it allows to better shape and identify and work at that identification phase, but it's also -- so there's an opportunity to shape the work of the policy development process, but also there is much less momentum behind any particular decision, much less that's already been taken off the table or got specific momentum behind it.

So that's really just a graphic to really try and capture. And of course if anyone is interested, there is lots of material available to dig in much more detail into the policy development process. And probably -- Well, I'll come to that later. But certainly there's plenty we could talk about in more detail, but I think this captures it symbolically well.

There are four symbolic phases, 12 detail, and the earlier the involvement, the better.

So coming on, then, to the ongoing work, for each of a series of options we're considering, we're currently making sure we've got it very well described, make sure we understand how the objectives are agreed, picking out in detail what potential issues or questions need to be answered. So any particular potential point of early engagement, what issues does that throw up, what questions need to be addressed, and how might that actually work in practice, and what are the expectations that might come from -- from that. And, indeed, whether that's possible to trial and take some form of overall assessment of that.

I'll pause again and make sure I've expressed that clearly. Is that -- Mikey, are you satisfied? Manal, have I left something out?

---

EGYPT:

Maybe it's worth noting also that the point on funding, and the interim -  
- the possible implementation of any of those alternatives as a pilot. So  
we didn't want to wait till the very end when the working group feel  
they've finished their work in order to feel that we are progressing. And  
we try to test those alternatives as we go. So one option was -- which  
has been repeatedly discussed, was the GNSO liaison to the GAC. And  
because there was a deadline for any funding requests for ICANN fiscal  
year, which was, I believe, 7th March, we coordinated with the GAC  
chair and we proceeded with this funding request. Yet it's worth noting  
that this should not prejudice or preempt the consultation group  
discussions for other alternatives. And also for this specific alternative  
as the GNSO liaison.

So should the consultation group or should a decision be taken that we  
don't want to pursue this very specific alternative, then this funding  
request may be withdrawn anytime.

We just felt to meet the deadline, we proceeded with this request. And  
also to maybe have a GNSO liaison to the GAC start in London meeting,  
if possible, to have this pilot thing tested.

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

Yeah. So thank you, Manal. That's a very good point.

One prospective solution, one possible solution for effective  
involvement was the use of an individual -- an individual or individuals,  
in fact, to be a liaison from the GNSO to the GAC. And what we didn't  
want to do is recognize and come to that as a solution and then say  
there's no mechanism by which that can be funded.



---

And just to be very clear what we mean by funding in this particular example, we don't mean a salaried, employed position. We mean the capacity to fund travel and subsistence to face-to-face ICANN meetings.

Sorry?

Travel support. What in ICANN speak is known as travel support. That's good. Thank you, David. Thanks for reminding me. So that's essentially accommodation and travel and what goes with that.

So that's the essence of it.

I think it would be useful, and our next slide gives us the opportunity to do that, is to just take some questions and just hear from you some thoughts. How do you react to this? Is it clear what we're doing? Does it feel like the right approach?

I know we haven't given you all of the detail, although you will have some materials, I think, in your packet on the questions. Are we overlooking anything? And any comments or feedback.

So let's pause and see if there are any comments or feedback.

Please, go ahead.

EGYPT:

So maybe I can start by answering an unasked question, because this was the immediate reaction of the GAC members of the working group. Why do we need to fund a GNSO liaison since this is a person who normally would be attending the GNSO meeting, so he's already going to be there.



---

But I understand that you were looking into a councilor member who has stepped down so he had the depth of the knowledge needed as well as the time to participate to the GAC meetings, because things normally run in parallel.

So that's why funds are needed. So -- Just because we all had this question at the very beginning.

So do we have any further questions? Are there things we have overlooked or we need to be alerted to?

Is the approach we have followed sounds fine to the -- to everyone?

So, Sweden, please.

SWEDEN:

Thank you. Thank you, Manal, and thank you to this group for giving this presentation. It sounds really good.

I think -- I don't think you should take the lack of questions as a lack of interest. Everybody thinks this is very important, but it's also more work for GAC. We are very much relying on Manal for this work so far, and we're -- many of us are following it.

And I don't have any specific comments. I can't say that you have missed out anything. But I'm looking forward to continue to following this work.

Thank you.



---

EGYPT: Sorry. Heather, please.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you. So just to reinforce what my colleague from Sweden has said, clearly a lot of effort has already gone into thinking about how to structure this consultation group and how to address the issues that many of us are very familiar with, but until now, we really didn't have a mechanism for really addressing it and coming up with concrete actions.

I think it's clear from your presentation that we are really talking about a substantial undertaking. This is going to be a fair bit of work, but that's really positive because it's a real opportunity to address these things. And I think, you know, we've all felt a bit frustrated before now and are very much focused on making things work better.

And it's really, really central to the workings of ICANN and the bottom-up process that we're all part of. So I just wanted to acknowledge the work that's been done so far and to strongly support its continuation. And I'm very grateful to both Manal and Jonathan for taking this on.

Thank you.

EGYPT: Thank you.

Iran, please.

IRAN: Thank you, Manal. I think sometimes silence means satisfaction for the time being, and also means reflections. We have to reflect on the



---

matter, and maybe at the next time I would have some question to raise.

So we thank you very much. Thanks, GNSO, for the effort you put collaboratively and collectively together. That is something we have raised. That is something we have asked for. So we have to see what is the outcome, and then maybe at next stage we will come with some questions and bothering you.

Thank you.

EGYPT: So this -- Okay. Spain, please.

SPAIN: Thank you, Manal, for your presentation.

I would like to thank the group as a whole for the work they have been doing. I know it's a small group, and the persons that have been contributing to them are doing a -- doing a very hard job. And I was so proud that you have enriched the guidelines or the proposals we came up in the GAC working methods working groups that we fed into your process, because we certainly identified the need to engage GAC earlier in policy development process. Not just in the Generic Names Supporting Organization but this can be a test bed for other supporting organizations.

And we encourage the exploration of the liaison function. You have included that in your work. Furthermore, you have an extra grant or a fellowship for one former council to become a liaison.



---

I think that we as GAC members could need from the GNSO or other supporting organizations developing policies. It's -- I note that highlights the policy -- public-policy issues arising from the work that it started at supporting organizations.

We now the one-pagers, I think they are updated monthly. We also have Wikis. But sometimes it's too much information to process.

So what could be very helpful, it's just some kind of information, very focused on not all the points of policy development process but just those that reveal more public interest policy. And I also think the liaison to the GAC can be really helpful in that -- in that function, and I hope I will be able to contribute further to your work.

Thank you.

EGYPT:

Thank you, Spain, and thank you for contributing to the work of the consultation group and also for our close coordination regarding the Working Methods Working Group.

Just before handing back the floor to Jonathan, I would like to just make sure -- we don't have a concrete deliverable at the end. It's more of a process that we have to keep iterating, and it would mostly depend on the feedback we receive from both the GAC and the GNSO to keep this process enhanced all the time.

So, Jonathan, if you want.



---

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Manal. I wouldn't mind just doing a time check. I'm not sure when your excuse me says the next meeting. Are we on that time point now or can somebody help me to know just where we are? Because the schedule we were working to was coming here potentially for as much as another 30 minutes but I suspect that's not the same for you.

EGYPT: We're supposed to have a 30-minute coffee break and then the BGRI Working Group meeting. So --

JONATHAN ROBINSON: So we're going into the coffee break now and we're not going to take your coffee break. That I can see is important.

What I would, then, like to bring to your attention is that this group, which includes Mikey, Volker, myself, David, obviously, the GAC colleagues and others who aren't at this table is going to meet somewhat informally this afternoon at six o'clock because we haven't really had a chance to meet face to face, and we all know from these meetings that there is value in meeting together face to face and just relaxing a little bit together. And I don't want to make this the sole reason why you might participate, but I suspect there will be some liquid refreshments there when we meet at six o'clock. But if anyone is particularly interested, any of our GAC colleagues or GNSO colleagues is interested to talk to us about this work, give us your opinions, ask us your questions, or just informally engage with us, we'd very much welcome you at six o'clock today in the room which is called Butterworth, and we will all be there and we'd welcome sharing a glass





---

of wine or a beer or something with you, or something nonalcoholic if that's your preference. But please do come along and talk with us.

Okay. So we just have a couple more slides, we just want to make sure. And really what this does, having highlighted that opportunity, there's a couple more points we'd like to make. And I think I'll let Mikey talk to this. Frankly, Mikey prepared these slides for us, so let's be honest about this. It's his hard work we're riding on the shoulders of and I think it would just be useful if he could talk to you about an illustrative next slide and some indications of the queue, and then we'll wrap things up at that point.

MIKEY O'CONNOR:

Thanks, Jonathan. My name is Mikey O'Connor. I'm a GNSO councillor. I come from the Internet service provider constituency of the GNSO.

And Suzanne Radell and I are co-chairs of this piece of the work. Without Suzanne, we would not be here, so many thanks.

One of the things that I wanted to convey to you, my main interest in ICANN is in the working groups themselves. I've participated in a lot of them, and for the last few years, I've chaired a lot of them. And so I want to make one point, if no other point, which is from a chair of a working group to the GAC, you are welcome at anytime to participate. I can't stress that enough. And as Jonathan and Manal have said, the earlier the better, because it's easier to accommodate -- you know, working groups are designed to reconcile opposing differences of opinion. That's what we do. And I just want to make that invitation



---

clear. I'm sure that I speak to many. And Jonathan is giving me his usual either move it forward, Mikey, or -- oh, go.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Just one quick point, Mikey. I think one of the points we've had in the past is it is not always possible for whatever reason for GAC members to participate, because of workload or perhaps the remit they're working on, in the working groups. But nevertheless, Mikey makes the point and it's a very valid point. That doesn't mean you are not welcome. All of our working groups are open, and to the extent you are permitted to, by whatever circumstances, you are always welcome. And that is in addition to anything that this group does.

So I just wanted to make that absolutely clear.

MIKEY O'CONNOR: Thanks, Jonathan.

Iran, go ahead.

IRAN: Yes, thank you, Jonathan. Yes. I had the opportunity yesterday morning, the entire morning attending your meeting, and this morning immediately after the GAC, we finished a little bit early at 12:00, I came to your meeting and spent up to the end that you finished your morning meeting. I really enjoyed the discussions. Very rich discussions, very well structured, and very disciplined group.



---

It does not mean that I am not -- I'm commenting on the other, but I have seen your meeting. I really enjoyed the way you conduct the meeting, the distinguished colleagues, (saying name) and others, raising the question sometimes. Criticizing is good. Constructive criticism is good and is progress, and I really enjoyed. As soon as or anytime I have the opportunity I can escape from here, I could attend your meeting and other meeting as well.

Your discussion was very rich and was very constructive. Thank you.

DAVID CAKE:

I also just wanted to say, I understand it can be difficult for GAC members to join working groups and participate in that way, but part of this diagram is also to indicate that we have multiple opportunities for public comment and input that way during the process, and public comment early in the process from GAC members will be taken -- very welcome and taken very seriously by any GNSO working group.

MIKEY O'CONNOR:

Thank you, David, and I now will pay you your \$50 for that after the meeting because that's the point of this slide. This is what Suzanne and I have been working on most recently, which is what we're trying to symbolize here is that the PDP engine down at the bottom does its work in a whole bunch of ways, and we're going to explore lots of that. And what we want to build and understand is a way that we can send triggers to the GAC that say here we are at this stage in the process and here is the sort of information that we have developed so far, and here are some of the preliminary points of view of view, and put that in a



---

queue for you to manage and evaluate whether this is an issue that's important to the GAC, and then, to Jonathan's point, the best way for the GAC to respond. In many cases, it will probably work better for the GAC to respond in the form of a public comment or a written document of some sort. In other cases, and this is back to my invitation, to the extent that people can either participate officially as representatives of either the GAC or their governments or as individuals, actually participate in the working groups, that would be terrific. But another thing that I think that especially Suzanne and I are working on is other ways besides those two. The more creative thinking we can come up with, the more alternatives.

I think the message is we want to include your input in any way that works well for you. But the thing that we thought was important to highlight is this notion that there is sort of a queue. There is sort of, at any given time, we should be telling you here are the issues that are running in this engine. Here's the stage of the discussion, early, middle, late. Here's the kind of information that we could use from you and sort of tighten up this conversation between the GAC and the GNSO.

And I am sensitive to being between you and coffee, so let me maybe hand off quickly to my colleague Suzanne and then I'll do that last slide and then I'm done.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Mikey. And thank you all for coming in and sharing with our colleagues.



---

I did just want to sort of comment to colleagues that this is, as several of you have already noted, it is representing sort of a new phase in our lives together, GAC and GNSO. And I think it's a really, really critical first step.

So, yes, I'm glad you've noted that it is work ahead much us because it will take a lot more input and a lot of us to sort of turn this corner.

And again, I think we're very grateful to be reminded that the current process is quite tightly structured, does permit and is open to participation, working groups. But I also think that our joint effort here has now helped reinforce our concern with you that that is not necessarily a very constructive mechanism for us to use.

So our whole point here is to try to find the appropriate places and times for a pause so that we can reflect on what you are about to do, whether it's at the issues report stage, and then start to try to weigh in to provide whatever guidance we can to the extent there are public-policy issues that we can identify at that early stage.

So I just wanted to sort of plant that seed.

Thank you, though.

MIKEY O'CONNOR:

You were leaning forward, esteemed chair. Did you have a comment?



---

JONATHAN ROBINSON: I was leaning forward in positive response to Suzanne's remarks. I get it, and I think I was appreciative of what she was saying. So nothing more than that.

MIKEY O'CONNOR: Okay.

The last slide, then, is an example, and this is not a fictional example, this is a real example, of what we're thinking about in terms of the queue. One of the things that we are thinking would be helpful, and it would be great to hear back from you as to whether this really is helpful, is to sort of let you know the issues that are in that policy-making process now, but arranged by those phases of the work so that earlier phases are at the top and later ones are at the bottom, with the understanding that the earlier in the work we are, the easier it is to accommodate new and diverse points of view. And what we would like to do is figure out a mechanism where we can present that queue to you in a way that's constructive and helpful, provide you the information in a form that, again, is helpful for you to digest and help you then figure out the best way to respond to any given issue on the list.

Some of those are going to be issues that you will find completely uninteresting. Others, we will put on the list and we will be surprised at how interested you are. And that's a very good surprise, to come back and say, oh, my goodness, how fortunate it has been that we discovered this interest early, rather than discovering it too late. That's the whole goal.



---

So this was just a live example of the kind of thing that Suzanne and I are working on in that half of the work. And with that, I'll hand it back to Jonathan, unless there are questions. If there are questions, I'm happy to take those.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you very much, Mikey. I think we're all set.

I'll just take one moment to say thank you to the colleagues from both the GAC and the GNSO in this consultation group, the work to date. And recognize the one thing we probably haven't said is we have a target of coming back to you at each of the next couple of meetings with further progress to report. So we would expect to be coming back to you with detail on further progress at future meetings.

But that's enough for the moment. Thank you from all of us.

EGYPT: And thank you, and thank the whole consultation group. It has been a very constructive process intersessionally and it has been a learning process also, at least from our side. And I thank you also for giving us half the coffee break. And I would appreciate being -- GAC members being back at the room at 4:30 because we are going to have the BGRI Working Group meeting and of course GNSO guests are most welcome to attend. Again, it's a most relevant meeting should you have the time.

Thank you.

[ COFFEE BREAK ]

