
ABU DHABI – Joint Meeting: GAC & GNSO
Sunday, October 29, 2017 – 15:15 to 16:15 GST
ICANN60 | Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon ICANN 60, October 29th, this is the joint meeting of GAC and GNSO.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Please take your seats, we have to resume for the next session. Thank you. The break is over, so please sit down.

THOMAS: Gilton and Julia, would it be possible to put the agenda on the second screen, so that we see, thank you. This is the session number 14, in our agenda, with is the meeting with the GNSO. We have 60 minutes, that means we now have 35 minutes left, no wait that can't be, 50 minutes left as it lasts until 4:15 if I read that schedule properly. Yes, so lets start knowing that not everybody is here, but we have our chair and vice chairs from the GNSO council with us, we have the current GAC liason, or GNSO liason to the GAC with us, we're having the GAC vice chairs coming in after a very short coffee break. Let's start. First of all,

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

welcome, lets agenda point number one, welcome. Let me give the floor to you to say welcome as well.

JAMES:

Thank you again and thank you to the GAC and Thomas for having us as guests once again as become our tradition. I hope that we can provide another session where we exchange views, find our areas of intersection of our common interests and talk about the things that are driving our two communities. I think what you're seeing here, and we'll get to this a little bit later, what you're seeing here is a snapshot of, let's call it an outgoing administration, we have an incoming administration as well, and I understand you're also in the process of conducting elections and I think that's the way it is at these annual general meetings. So we can get started and maybe say at the end of the session, just say our goodbyes.

THOMAS:

Yes, is my answer. I'm trying to be brief, if you're realizing. OK, let's go to the next first substantive agenda item. Which is trying to focus on Red Cross and Red Crescent on one hand and IGOs and the protection related to these two groups of institutions. I don't know whether you have an update to provide us with, with regard to what happens on the Red Cross and Red Crescent on

one hand and on the IGO processes that you're continuing to work on the other hand.

JAMES:

Thank you Thomas, and while this is just one item on our agenda, it actually represents a multi-dimensional topic. First off, let's take a look at the reconvened group that is examining the recommendations made for Red Cross and Red Crescent protections, that group had intended originally to have its recommendations ready by this meeting in Abu Dhabi, but unfortunately they're going to be a little delayed. They're working out some remaining issues associated with creating a finite list of strings that will be covered by these protections. While that work is progressing, and is developing well, it is taking a little bit more time than originally anticipated.

The expectation is that this group will have its recommendations soon, perhaps shortly after this meeting or before the end of the year, and it will present those recommendations back to the GNSO council. We should note that this has been a... all reports indicate that this has been a very collaborative effort with the reconvened working group and the participation from the Red Cross, Red Crescent, and we have been very grateful to Thomas Rickard for dusting off his chairmanship from something that happened in 2013, and resuming the leadership of this work

effort, he's been phenomenal in that regard. I think that Thomas deserves all of our thanks for that. As far as the IGOs, there's two elements to that.

The first is the continuation of a discussion that we had, that originally began in Copenhagen regarding IGOs, and how those names and acronyms will be protected. I think the resulting conclusions were, at least from the GNSO perspective, that those organizations and those strings could benefit from protections not necessarily outside of policy, but more from the function of working with ICANN, the organization, and perhaps also some existing services to develop some watch services and building out lists of names that would be guarded for abuse or potential infringement on those names, so that is something I think we can continue to discuss, but as far as I know, there have been no progressive discussions since that time.

Then the third item, which I think we can cover a little bit more fulsome, did Phil make the trip over from the... we did get an update from the group that is working the PDP working group, that's working on providing access to curative rights mechanisms to IGOs, and as you recall there were a number of issues relating to standing, things like jurisdictional immunity, arbitration, and the number of different scenarios that were worked out and I think the good news is that that group is also very close to its final recommendations. It produced its initial

report shortly before Johannesburg and opened up a public comment period, I think it received a number of comments from IGOs and INGOs, and as a result has taken those comments on board and I think those are reflected in its recommendations. That said, I don't think it is fair to say that IGOs and INGOs are going to everything they want, like a Christmas list, but it is much further along than it was this time last year, when we were meeting in Hyderabad and discussing those protections. I think they are very close to zeroing in on some conclusions. Those are the three elements that all roll up into your second bullet point in protections for Red Cross and IGOs and curative rights, and certainly we can do our best to address any questions from the GAC, but I would point out that we are still looking for Phil and some of the other experts that are much closer to the work, but I will do my best to answer any questions.

THOMAS:

Thank you James, we understand that at least the Red Cross Red Crescent parts seems to be on a good track to conclusion soon, we have a representative from the Red Cross here in case he would want to comment on this from your side, you are free to do so. We understand that the IGO protection is more complex and more difficult for various reasons, we do have also some of our observer group of IGOs present, in case you would want to make a comment, you're invited to do that. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you Thomas, yes just a comment. To affirm what has been said on record already. I would like to recall today for all involved that IGOs, which we all know are globally unique institutions created by governments, and accordingly which are granted certain privileges under international law to carry out a range of humanitarian and public service oriented missions from which citizens and governments the world over benefit from daily, have provided substantial and detailed input throughout the course of the working groups activities on a number of occasion. Indeed, and these were also counted for in the applicant guide books and objection procedures, which accommodated IGOs in creating a standalone rights protection mechanism, similar to what is presently being sought. I'd also like to refer us to the significant contributions made by IGOs and the GAC at providing feedback, and engagement if you like, to the working groups initial report.

As it's been said on a number of prior occasions, we know with concern that the IGO curative working group has called for input by IGOs and the GAC, but when such input is given, including requests by the UN Secretary General, is largely overruled in favor of commercial interests. We appreciate that some compromises have been made along the way on both sides and continue to hope the working group seriously considers the

comments and concerns of IGOs and the GAC and takes them on board for its final recommendations in a way that sufficiently accounts for GAC advice. Additionally we wish to note that observations, there may be a question or indeed concern, as to whether the working group has, until now, been operating within the parameters of section 3.2, and 3.3 of GSOs own operating procedures. We will be watching for that. Thank you.

THOMAS: Thank you, anymore questions or comments on the agenda point 2? Yes, UK.

MARK CARVELL: Yes, thank you very much Chair and thank you James for recounting the progress, in particular with respect to the Red Cross names, including the national society names that's excellent news that that is very close to finalization. It is much appreciated. There is just one further thing, the temporary protection of the initials, ICRC and IFRC, that's still on the table I think. The acronyms for the international bodies, if I'm right. Maybe you want to comment on that and correct me if I am wrong. Thank you.

HEATHER: Thanks very much Mark, Heather [Inaudible]. Just to be very clear, we have to work within the confines of the instructions that we've received from the board and while, lets say, please don't misunderstand my response, it is not to say that we have... don't interpret what I'm saying as an opinion as one way or the other, in relation to those particular acronyms, we've only been able to discuss names because that is what we've been instructed to discuss and likewise in relation to IGOs. We take on board the earlier intervention, we have not begun to discuss that at all, as it is simply not within our mandate at this time, which is absolutely not to say that it will not be discussed. Thank you.

THOMAS: Thank you Heather. I think we have to move onto the next item which is an update on current PDPs and GAC engagement in these. James.

JAMES: Thanks Thomas. So, I certainly would welcome input from the vice-chairs, the liason, or anyone else that would like to participate from the GNSO. We have a number of active PDPs that are perhaps less close to concluding, when compared to the one regarding IGO and access to curative rights. The three of those, the main ones, are the review of rights protection mechanisms and all TLDs, the next generation registry directory

services or RDS, and subsequent procedures which is for the next round of gTLDs. Let's talk about the big one first, the next generation, what we call sub pro, or subsequent procedures for new gTLDs, recently convened we're track 5, and we put out a call to all of the SOs and ACs to contribute a co-chair toward track 5 and the GAC, along with a number of other SOs and ACs provided a co-chair that will participate in that group. That is, to my understand, that track 5 subteam is just getting started, it is organizing itself to address those issues. We're not using the term charter, we are using terms of reference, I think, is what we're using as I don't think we have a defined charter beyond the working group charter, so subteams would have to come up with something else and they're using a terms of reference to establish scope for track 5.

Once that's underway, I think there's still some discussions about how that group will organize itself and how it will reach decisions. I think that some of the ideas that are being proposed by the GAC and ccNSO, by ALAC and other groups that are coming, are perfectly compatible with the PDP. Some of them may be more restrictive than the PDP, which means we can work with that. But some of them may be different or even incompatible with the PDP, and so we will have to have some discussion as well as some education because I'm sure you can appreciate the challenge of having a multi-community process

where everyone brings their rules to a different process and synchronising, and synthesising those, and harmonizing them into a single shared set of expectations is going to be very important at the outset, so that there are no misunderstanding later on down the road. That is underway with this group.

With RDS, our next generation WHOIS, as you can imagine, I think that that is spending a lot of its time looking at the question of the future of RDS and it's evolution in the era of GDPR and some of the other regulations that will be coming potentially to affect the development of that work. That group has recently received some external legal advice, and is comparing that not only to the legal advice that was received by ICANN separately, but also a recent opinion that was pinned by the council of Europe, and so taking a look at all of those, analyzing all of those documents to ensure that they're all pointing in the same direction will be critical.

THOMAS:

Just if you allow me, because we have a number of new people here and the acronyms that we've heard may not be familiar to everybody, so RDS means registry directory services, this is the database where you are supposed to be able to look up information on who runs a website, or who has registered the domain name rather. GDPR is also an acronym that has become

quite frequent, if I am not mistaken this is the European regulation on data protection, that is coming into effect May next year and that is one element that is important in this regard, because it's going to be turned into binding legislation in many European countries, just that we know what this is about. Thank you.

JAMES:

I apologise. I presumed that... it was my assumption, and forgive me for that one because GDPR is such a common topic in this weeks meeting, I made an assumption. I should have mentioned that is the forthcoming European regulation on collection of private data, and not just for companies and individuals in Europe, but for companies that are outside of Europe that are selling products and services in Europe. In effect, when you look at a global industry like the domain name industry that serves providers and their customers reach across borders, it becomes effectively a global regulation. Thank you Thomas for correcting me on that.

This group is seeking quite a bit of legal... as I mentioned trying to perform analysis on a number of different pieces of legal guidance that are coming from external to the ICANN community and trying to determine what, if any of that is relevant to the direction of their future work. The final PDP is the

review of rights protection mechanisms, this group is looking at all the rights protection mechanisms that were adopted for new gTLDs in the 2012 round, but will also take a look at existing rights protection mechanisms, like the UDRP, which is the dispute resolution policy that goes back much longer I think to 2001. This group has put out a call for data collection to ICANN and is therefore essentially designing a questionnaire or survey that will inform their work in terms of the usefulness and effectiveness, and cost associated with these new gTLDs and how effective they've been at addressing the problem of infringement online. GAC engagement, very good in sub pro, thank you very much for contributing a co-chair to work track 5, and perhaps less so in the other PDPs.

We'd certainly benefit from some contributions from GAC members, I think we do see, for example, law enforcement and public safety working group contributions to the work on the registry data systems, RDS, because that is a facility that I know law enforcement folks use very regularly. Then rights protection mechanisms is probably something that could also benefit from more GAC participation. That is what is on our plate, it's quite a bit, as it usually is and as always welcome increased participation from the GAC.

THOMAS:

Thank you and before opening the floor to comments from GAC members, let me refer to two things. One, is this work track 5 process where, as you say, you've received messages from the GAC but also from the other relevant constituencies, or ICANN SOs and ACs. We are willing to work in this framework based on some conditions that we have outlined in that response, which from what we understand are fairly similar to the conditions post by others ccNSO and ALAC, and we understand that this is a challenge to develop a simple but clear and trusted procedural framework for this discussion, but I think we have to be very focused on doing this and maybe be innovative and flexible from all our sides in the sense that given the importance and the sensitivity of this issue, and also let's say, the flexibility of our express to work within the framework of this PDP but taking into account a special need to develop an appropriate framework that gives the outcomes a chance to be accepted, I think is fundamental to the success and if we want to, we should do everything we can to not lose time in working maybe for years on a thing that in the end will be rejected, because will say actually we didn't really agree on the process. We need to take this very seriously and spend some time to intensively think of coming up with something that is clear and satisfactory and where you have the buy in of everybody to then continue to work within that framework. I think we cannot... and as I said, that doesn't mean we should create something as complicated

as possible, but actually as simple as possible but still acceptable to everyone. I think that's the challenge that we're all facing in this.

The other element is the engagement issue that this is a continued highlight, or a hot topic, whatever you call it, that is also linked to one element, is the point 6 that we have started to discuss already previously. What the other element is, the prioritization discussion that we are happy to see that the board and ICANN Org have started to give this a more strategic approach to trying to develop and better plan, strategically and financially plan ICANNs activities, knowing that resources are limited by all, and so we are seeing this as a result of awareness raising process that we've been contributing to, because it is simply, factually not feasible, it is wishful thinking to think that more, there will be more GAC participation if we don't develop different, or easier ways to work and less time consuming ways to work. While at the same time, of course, it is also clear that governments need to continue to understand the importance of these processes and we need to continue to raise awareness among ourselves and within our ministries and with other colleagues from our administrations, that we get the resources that we should get. Its, I think again, a shared responsibility to improve the engagement in this multi-stakeholder model to make it work the best possible.

I will stop here and give the floor to members of observers in case that there are observations or questions. Yes, Iran.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you very much James, and the two strong vice-chair that you've got with you, we call them [inaudible] in ICANN, very solid and so on and so forth. Enthusiastically push for the GNSO positions, we all appreciate that.

I want to echo what's said by our chair, with respect to the track 5, we have set some conditions and we understood we may be wrong, on Wednesday, maybe you considered it with the council at this situation, and would like to say this is our conditions associated with our participation and we are very much attached to that. Just for your information, we have a geographic name subgroup in the GAC, which is narrow terms, track 5 will keep to maintain that in order to make a link between that track 5 and GAC and it was requested that the chair of this group will be the same person is the co-chair in the track 5, made periodical briefing for the GAC member, or the GAC website, or any other means to make it available for the GAC to encourage them and contribute to this situations and with respect to the other PDP while we appreciate your enormous resource that you have which is not available to the government, not by resources, not by time, and expertise, you

have a lot of expertise, lawyers, and so on and so forth. We don't have that, we would like that you kindly build with us and allow us to comment if we say something which may not be correct in their language, that is our views and we need to be respected and one small point, now the workload of the [inaudible] is decreased to some extent, we would like that you reconsider the timing, some of the timing is painful for European zone, 2 o'clock in the morning is a pain for clearly, and we would like that now you change a little bit. For your information, the zone times in Europe has been changed from yesterday night and now time differs to the UTC is only one hour, not two hours. We need to give a consideration to that and there was talking of the briefing, your output of each session is transcript plus, it is perhaps too much.

I don't know whether there is a possibility to have someone, to have some short description, or short brief of that in order to allow us to better understand, because sometime you are going back and forth between the issue, [inaudible] we are not criticizing that, but I would like to know how to follow the market. Your PDP is very very complex, we would like to associate ourselves and to contribute, but we need to have the means and ways how to contribute, and we thank you very much and your colleagues for the opportunity given to us when we participate at your meetings. Thank you.

JAMES:

Thank you. Quite a number of topics in your intervention. I just wanted to respond to a couple of them. First off, time zones are a challenge, I think among the three of us, I think we span something like 14 hours on the clock, so even getting our leadership meeting coordinated is something we have some firsthand experience with, and it is something that I know that the council and some of the PDP working groups are struggling with. It is good to note that Europe has already gone off summer time, and I think the US goes off next weekend, so everyone will maybe be an hour closer, it is always these transitions, these couple of weeks where we are all transitioning on the clock that becomes a problem.

I will certainly reinforce the need to periodically revisit the composition of timezones and make sure that folks are not seeing that as a barrier to their participation. You mentioned the conditions of work track 5 and just to go to that again, is that we're trying to synthesize all of the conditions that we received from the work track 5 leadership along with the rules and procedures of the PDP, which as you mentioned is very complex. They're complex, in some cases they're complexity is a challenge but in some cases it is there for a reason and the reason is legitimacy. When we have the output of a PDP it becomes a part of a contract for a registry or a registrar, and we want to ensure

that it's sufficiently strong enough, and it was arrived at through legitimate process so that it can withstand any sort of challenges, that it's clear on ICANN staff on how to implement and enforce it. I think that's one of the reasons why we're trying to make sure that everything is compatible with the PDP. It's not a question of doing it our way, and that's the only way, we're trying to find ways that overlap and work together. I think that there was one other note there about just the participation and the resources.

I am flattered that you think that we have as many resources, we are also struggling with what I think we call community overload, and burnout and not enough volunteers available for all of the different committees and working groups that are being started. It is something that we struggle with as well, but I do like your idea of having not just a transcript, a data dump of the discussions, but actually a thoughtful executive summary of each of the calls. I think that is something we can certainly take as a suggestion for future working groups and look at that as a way of perhaps reducing the barriers to participation. Then I know, Mark, you wanted to weigh in on this, and then I don't know if Dan and Heather would like to say something as well.

MARK CARVELL: Yes, thank you James. I just wanted to weigh in with respect to the rights protection mechanism review PDP working group, and to say that we actually have a data dump tomorrow in the GAC, with Phil Cowen and Susan Pain joining us, Brian Beckham from [inaudible] and myself, in that session I think is tomorrow afternoon. Maybe the fellow representative on the GAC may follow the UK example, which was to coordinate with our intellectual property office and they have joined the working group. So, because it is quite detailed, quite technical, as I found when joining some of the sessions online, so getting our intellectual property experts from our administration involved is a great help for me, and I hope a great help for the work of the working group as it goes ahead into next year with UDRP on the agenda as you say. Thank you.

THOMAS: Thank you for the comments or questions. We have a comment or question from Mikael from the GNSO.

MIKAEL: Thanks Thomas and James and co. Mikael for the record, GNSO councillor and also co-chair of the RDS PDP, previous chair of a couple of other PDPs. This topic of how the GAC can participate better within the PDP structure is something that has come up in the past, and will probably keep coming up. I think it's good that

we're having this conversation. Mark's comments about getting the intellectual property office of the UK to engage on a particular PDP that covers a topic that is close to what they're doing. That's a perfect example of a logical rational way to deal with it. There are other PDPs where maybe the topics being covered don't mesh nicely with a particular government department, but in some cases they do. For example, when it comes to the RDS working group, there are interests there which cross over both intellectual property concerns, law enforcement, as well as data protection.

We have had some useful engagement from data protection authorities over the last few months and I am hopeful that will continue. The feeling that some people have that you need to attend and follow every single PDP religiously, probably isn't the best way to engage. Generally speaking within the GNSO you have multiple opportunities to submit comments, we have comment periods, we have draft initial reports, etc etc. Just on the resourcing point, while one or two of the registrars and registries may have dedicated policy staff, a lot of registrars and registries engage at ICANN at significant loss. We don't have dedicated staff and many of us are having to juggle multiple balls in the air and we're attending conference calls for ICANN PDP and have to interrupt ourselves from time to time as various staff members come into our offices for stuff to do with our day

jobs. So, the assumption that we're super well resourced is not exactly a reflection of reality.

THOMAS:

Thank you Mikael, I think your points are well noted and of course, it's not about a competition of who has more or less resources. I think we are sitting in the same boat, of course, some people are urging for quick progress, while others have less economic interests and less incentives to find quick solutions but rather sustainable solutions because they have costs when the solutions are not good and then basically this adds costs to all of us when we rush into too quick solutions that are not necessarily taking into account all the elements that should have taken into account. But, I fully see your point and also with regard to informing and involving, engaging other ministries, this is a very good example, one problem for instance, we have faced several times is if you are trying to get experts on other issues into ICANN processes, that they themselves are overloaded and they have no idea what ICANN is about and the time it takes you to explain them, to enable them to understand and provide you with something, with an answer that is actually more than you already know, is also a challenge. Of course, there is no easy fix for this, so we need to add up elements and involving other ministries, other experts, is of course one element that we should seriously take into account.

In sometimes as you say, it may not work, but sometimes it actually does and that should be used. Yes Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks Thomas. Donna Austin. So, you said that Phil is going to come in and provide an update on the RPM working group tomorrow, we know that over the past few meetings you've had engagement with the subsequent procedures PDP chairs, I'm just wondering is that useful engagement for the GAC, and is there somehow we can enhance that engagement so that it would assist in the understanding, just trying to understand is there anything else we can possibly do?

THOMAS:

Thank you, we just had an exchange with Cheryl and with Jeff and with some more people this morning. I personally think that it has been very useful, I hope that and they said that it has also been useful to them. So, there is one thing that we may come to when we talk about the point number 6, one thing is to be permanently part of the work which is maybe not feasible for most of us, the other thing is to have windows where you can actually come in and comment at a particular level or state of the work, but I will go into more detail when you come to the next one. Yes we need to really do our best to try and maximise exchanges, and not just exchanges in the sense of talking to

each other but also exchanges in the sense of trying to understand what we mean. So that things have an effect on solutions that are fit for everyone, but the exchange with the PDP and subsequent procedures is fairly well established, not on all subgroups of that thing, equally so there are some elements that we need improvement from our side in terms of participation, but we are doing what we can, let's put it that way. Thank you. I think we should move onto the next one which is hearing from you on the appointment of the GNSO liaison to the GAC.

JAMES:

Sorry, we did have an item number 4. But I actually would ask you if there were any remaining issues on the implementation of the recommendations from the consultation group from the GAC GNSO. I think that if you step back a little bit and look where we were a year ago, two years ago with this group that we have I think made some significant progress with the quick look mechanism, with trying to again lower barriers to GAC participation, with the liaison and with some of the materials that we provide to the GAC. I think we're open to continuing those, modifying them, reviewing them, for their effectiveness. I think the goal is not to do them just to do them, the goal is to make sure they are serving a purpose, so I would just maybe throw it to the table or to the floor if anyone has any thoughts or

opinions on those mechanisms, or how we should continue with them.

THOMAS:

Yes, thank you. The thing is that from my assessment and my experience, basically in the level of procedure, we have enough procedures if you take the quick look mechanism as something that is a good idea, the problem is you need people to actually fulfil that role and to transcend message and pass information, digest information, and then what this mechanism is for, people are there and available to signal whether there's a public policy interest, and that is often the challenge. And [inaudible] who is a person who has been working very hard for the past years to help us become more efficient and improve dialogue and communication. She also has some experience with [inaudible]. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Thank you Thomas, and thanks to James, Heather, and Donna for being here. Just to bring to colleagues attention that the report has been circulated by Tom on the mailing list with the highlights of what has been achieved and what is remaining, but again as James and Thomas highlighted, it is not just a matter of documentation and paperwork but rather implementing and continuously reviewing the process itself to make it more

efficient and enhance it. So, I hope you have the chance to look at the report, but also to experience the mechanisms that has been proposed and has been put in place. Thank you.

THOMAS:

Thank you. Other views or comments on this? I think this is also something that we may not be in a position yet to give you a full answer on what there needs to be done in order to complete, lets say, and/or when to assess this and we may need a little bit more time. The key challenge again is resources and so we need to, that is now of course upto the next leadership team in the GAC to look at these mechanisms and say, OK, do they work, if they do not work, what are the low hanging fruits that maybe we can do to make them work to the best. Mikael?

MIKAEL:

Thank, Mikael for the record. It is just a question to you as the GAC, in the past you've had a little update sessions with the chair of the registrars came into you Graham, and gave you an overview of how registrars work. Those kind of engagements, are they helpful to you? Does that help you when you're engaging here, or you interested in doing something different? Is that something that we can explore further with you.

THOMAS:

Thank you Mikael, that is a good question. Also we have the challenge that these things are normally very helpful, they help us to understand how other parts of the stakeholders function, what their conditions of, how their daily life looks like, if you want to put it simple and why they are articulating, what they are articulating and so on and so forth. Also, allows us to articulate our side of the coin, if I may call it like this. The problem then again, is that we're having so many issues to discuss in such limited time that then sometimes you have to say, sorry we have no time to talk to each other, we try to and there has been a lot of occasions where we've had to postpone interactions like this, or briefings that we get, or you try to go for a webinar type of teleconference, with Adobe connect rooms, which then again is more difficult in terms of time zone, whereas it's easier if people are physically present. To answer your question, yes this is helpful, the question is at what given moment in time we have, how many resources do we have that we don't have to spend on internal discussions, or other discussions that allow us to have these kind of exchanges. Whenever they are possible, they are normally helpful, as one of the elements that help us understand each other. UK?

MARK CARVELL:

Thank you, Mark Carvell, UK. Very much agree with what you say Thomas, it's part of valuable bridge building, really, within the

community to be able to have these information sessions, the kind that you described Mikael. Ideally, one would be help every GAC meeting, if we can, we have got a bit of a waiting list of things to do in terms of information sessions, at least once every meeting would be ideal, at least, but that's my reflection on that. Thank you.

THOMAS: Iran, we have five minutes left, because then we have another meeting with others so we should try to be on time, very briefly Iran.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, very briefly. I think due to the fact that our common point is GNSO is more than any other SO i see, I request that in future we extend the time, having more time available for discussions at GNSO. Thank you. In order to be able to communicate better. Thank you.

THOMAS: There is a scarce resource called time and we try our best to allocate it in a meaningful way.

JAMES: This is my last meeting, so I will say yes, that sounds like a great idea, we should have four hours. Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Donna Austin. This is an information, so the GNSO will have a kind of strategy session in January. What we hope to do is work out what our work plan is for the next 12 months, I don't know the extent to which the GAC does that, but I guess if you have a list of priorities we can discuss that, maybe we should do it before the next ICANN meeting, but maybe we can try to do some alignment in terms of priorities and try to make some mapping or matching or something.

THOMAS: Yes, thank you. This is a discussion that by the way we're having for quite some time now, also in the SO AC chairs and plus there are two levels, plus the constituencies, the sub constituencies, and so on, regional chairs and co-chair groups. I think there's a difference between the SOs, that define the issues define the timelines and ACs that react, it is not always like this but many times it's like this. Our priorities depend on what we are given by the ccNSO the GNSO, in terms of what they work on, in terms of priorities, in terms of timelines, and then of course of [inaudible] priorities. These are more or less clear, but we basically depend on your work and the number of PDPs and processes you have

plus the additional ICANN cross community processes and priorities that of course, we are all part of. I think we have to move onto the next one, for the sake of time. I think that's a very short one.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sure, very quickly. Thank you and just noting that one of the specific mechanisms that was discussed was the GAC liaison and our current liason is Carlos, but Carlos effective on Wednesday will be assuming a new role with the GNSO council, he has been appointed by the nominating committee to serve as the voting NomCom councillor for the contracted party house. As a result, we are actively seeking Carlos' successor. It is fair to say we have a candidate, a motion on the table to consider the candidate, it's no big surprise, it's [inaudible] and presuming no unexpected surprises in our meeting on Wednesday we would expect it [inaudible] would be the next liason to the GAC. If you don't know [inaudible], please raise your hand, he is very easy to spot in the crowd because he is tall, very distinctive looking and a very nice gentleman that you can speak to and I think has a lot of ambition and enthusiasm for taking on this role and keeping the GAC as informed as possible in the future terms. That's how we expect the liaison role to transition.

THOMAS:

Thank you very much and welcome. Also there of course, this is a good tool but it depends on how it's actually lift and used, and of course, the more resources and willingness and open mindedness that is available on both side to actually pass on information, alert about developments and help us understand and identify public policy issues in why'd you do the easier, the more efficient our work is going to be. We are looking forward and I hope on speak on behalf of the next chair and the next leadership team, looking forward to working with you and our hope would be that you will be able in the future to actively come to us and inform us and feed us with things in a way that makes it easier for us to understand issues and processes, because that's the essence of what this role is trying to perform. I'm very happy to have the next team to engage with you, or for us to engage with you until Thursday, or whenever I will be back in my committee. Iran, very briefly

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Very brief, [inaudible] Carlos for the new appointment and we welcome to the new liaison officer or contact in our experience liaison have three [inaudible]. One is to attend and briefing GAC when in session. Second, to help the leadership of the GAC, if there are points to be discussed with them. The third one, is a point of contact if you have any problem, or any question, you raise with him or her in the future, if you change in some times,

in order to be able. This should be mentioned and I think you considered kindly to put it in action, it is a different duties. Thank you.

JAMES:

Very sensible, thank you and as part of the workshop that was discussed and referenced earlier in January, one of the tasks I think will be to take a look at the role of the liaison and make adjustments and I think those can be taken on board. We did discuss lowering barriers a little bit in the specific context of PDPs, but I did want to give a bit of a AOB update on the chair elections as we mentioned will be, I'm termed out as of Wednesday afternoon, there is only one candidate standing currently to be the GNSO chair as a replacement, and that is Heather Forest. So, very much like in your situation, we have a very strong presumption that there will be a formality to adopt the election and that Heather Forest will be the next GNSO chair. We are in the process of turning over quite a bit of our leadership team, but the good news is that these are familiar faces and people who you already know and worked with so there shouldn't be a difficult period of adjustment or learning curve associated with these changes.

THOMAS:

Thank you very much for this information. I don't know if it is formally allowed to congratulate or to condone, or whatever you prefer, but thank you and of course, the GAC is looking forward to working with the new team and just maybe if you allow us one minute on lowering barriers. This is very much linked to what we discussed before, that given that everybody has limited resources some have more limited resources than others, it is of fundamental importance that issues, processes are documented and communicated as easily and accessible as possible. For instance, as I said before, if you have a process that is very intense, very detailed, there's a good tool to have which is there, which is public comment periods, but then the material provided for public comment needs to be understandable, needs to be accessible, that's one thing and that takes some resources, but it is also based on the mindset.

The example that proof that this is possible is the transition where ICANN managed to communicate a very complex thing in a way that was actually quite understandable also for non-insiders, so it is feasible, it uses a little bit of resources to distill things down to maybe supported with graphics or easy accessible other tools. It's doable and this is one of the things that would help a lot if in other important processes, like for instance the new gTLD, future arms processes, efforts will be

undertaken to communicate things in way that things are understandable.

This is just one of the elements and then the other element is that when comments come in, in a public comment period or during the process, that they fall of futile group, that those who are in charge of leading a process don't just have their own interest based filter and say well, we considered this but it is actually not fitting into what we are intending to do, so we can't really follow it, but actually try to work on things with a horizon that is seriously trying to understand and trying to engage also with those, if necessary, that have made comments to get the essence of it. Even if something is not possible to be integrated in the form that it's proposed, but maybe the essence of it is possible to integrate it and take into account in another way that solves the problems of those who have made the comments. I think there are lots of things to be done and we will try to be more concrete about this in the near future. The good thing is also it seems that the awareness is growing with ICANN Org and with the board, that there are things that can be done, some of them fairly easily, others more complex to better live up to accessibility.

The fact of accessibility of the organization to those that have less resources than others, or to non-insiders. With this, I think

from our side. Yes Iran and Pakistan, very briefly, and then we need to wrap up.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Maybe Pakistan first, because I have intervened before.

THOMAS: OK, Pakistan first.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you Thomas, I had one point with [inaudible] last accommodations about the PDP processes, that the GNSO also agreed that there is a need to create a pool of team, [inaudible] who will participate in the PDP processes, and my suggestion is that a pool of sub volunteers can be a pain from the underserved countries to obtain the valuable input on the PDP processes, and in this regard GNSO may prepare a strategy to the ICANN management to take on these underserved regions, [inaudible] on board. Thank you.

THOMAS: Thank you. Maybe a final word or two if you wish. Iran.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Excuse me, just a point for maybe medium term considerations. I understand that all the PDP will be subject to public comments, if I am right, because of the fact that PDP relating to the subsequent would be enormous in volume and magnitude, I'll have five different things. Perhaps you consider the possibility, at least for the first public comment if I'm right, not to put it all together whenever something is prepared, you put it to public comment in order to enable people at this point. Everything is gathered then for the second public comment, altogether in order to not have problems of consistencies, coherent. Just for your consideration, if you agree so. Thank you.

JAMES: Thank you [inaudible], and we should note that PDPs are subject to a minimum of two public comments, that's circumstances are appropriate there could be more and I think you make a good suggestion about not putting a mountain of materials out there for comment. If you can break it up into more manageable segments, it is more likely to receive comments. Good suggestions, we will take that to Jeff or Cheryl to see if it fits sub pro, or some of the other PDPs might benefit from that as well. I think that's the end Thomas, we're 8 minutes over our time. Thank you. Yes it is the end in more than one way, more ways than one in our experience, but thank you for having us again as

your guests, thank you for your contributions to our work and the work of the community generally, and of course we're available if we can be useful to you or if you have questions about our work. So, thank you.

THOMAS:

Thank you all as well, and looking forward to continued good cooperation with two new teams, or at least partially new teams. These are the 30 seconds for the ones who are recording the session to stop recording this session and start recording the next session, at the same time I would like to ask our colleagues from the ccTLD review team to come on stage, or whatever this is called here, so that we can jump into the next session where there are some linkages between some of the aspects of what we have just discussed which is the subsequent procedures, next rounds or future rounds.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]