
SAN JUAN – GAC Discussion: Engagement in CCWGs & PDPs
Saturday, March 10, 2018 – 16:15 to 16:45 UTC
ICANN61 | San Juan, Puerto Rico

CHAIR ISMAIL: We are now starting GAC agenda item 4 on GAC member's cross community working group the and PDP scheduled at 16:15 Saturday 10 March and the session is for 30 minutes. And this is again a reminder that when you are called upon you state your name and after affiliation for transcript purposes. So now yeah we are back to the participation part of the discussion, and Tom if you would like to take us quickly through the brief and then we can open the discussion. We can open the floor for discussion. Thank you.

TOM DALE: Thank you Manal. The topic of GAC participation and cross community processes and policy development work is one that the GAC has discussed at I think the last 3 or 4 meetings, so it continues to be a sort of standing agenda item in some ways, but it has been included here to try and provide some very basic data on GAC participation, and also to note that there do seem to be some issues or there were in the first few months of this calendar year some issues relating to the community as a whole, with a number of these cross community groups, and sub groups having to cancel meetings due to lack of a quorum, but

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.

that's not the GAC's fault, but there may be an issue to discuss with other members of the community when the GAC has those meetings later in the week, so to go through the issues as identified in the brief, firstly the concern was to seek a feedback from those GAC members who are participants in either of those types of groups, and see if you have views on what is working, what is not working with regards to how your participation as GAC members helps public policy issues advance within ICANN.

Now I should stop at this point and say that I apologize to new members here for lapsing into ICANN speak so early in the meeting yes PDP as and CCWG are part of the language and you will see and hear them a lot during this pecuniary. A PDP is a policy development process. It's an exercise run by ICANN's 2 major supporting organizations, those dealing with country codes, names at the top level, and generic names, and the PDP process is one which is led primarily by that supporting organization, but with participation from any community member interested.

The discussion that we've just been having discussing geographic names is a part of a policy development process. That's the generic name supporting process. The a CCWG is a cross community work. It does not have a specific home within ICANN's many happy family groups much it is intended as the name implies to be a genuinely open working group open to all

members of the community on issues that cut across those silo type groups, if it you like, which is a lot of issues these days.

The GAC has participants in both, but they have slightly different rules of participation, but there is a long history of GAC engagement, and I would be happy to answer more specific questions later on if you would like to talk to me about any of these apparently ARCENE terms people will be using the next few days.

Returning to what we are trying to put to you for discussion today. The second issue was to get feedback on whether the current guidelines the GAC adopted for participation for GAC participation in the cross community working groups are actually work effectively. We provided a link to the bottom of brief. The back adopted them around about 2 years ago but they have we've never looked how they are working and whether they need to be revisited and finally as I said earlier. There is an opportunity if you wish to raise some of these broader questions about numbers of participation and is the system really working across ICANN, to raise those with the GAC bilateral discussions with other supporting organizations and advisory committees.

The attachment to the brief did list current GAC participants and observers in all of the cross community groups that we could

find. A number of them appear to be out of date, and I just ask you please to have a look at the attachment in your leisure time, of which you have a reasonable amount I think during the week and where some of your former colleagues, who you know have left the GAC and I know have left the GAC and are still part of that he is groups, please advise the secretariat whether you wish them to be removed as participants or replaced by somebody else from your government, or indeed if in the unlikely event they wish to continue as a sort of a hobby in whatever their new job is in which case they would need to amend the statement of interest. There are rules concerning participation and statements of interest. The GAC secretariat can't do things unilaterally so appreciate you updating the attachment if you find names of your former colleagues who have left the GAC so please help us to update that.

As far as GAC participation we noted the guidelines that were agreed some time ago did need a look. Now the last thing that I will draw to your attention before handing back to Manal is that I did a short and very basic analysis of GAC participation in some of the major cross community groups and you see that table on the screen, and all I looked at was from September up until late February, that is before the Abu Dhabi meeting until just before this meeting, and looked at the attendance starter there that's us in numbers participating in inter sessional calls.

There is no way to measure how much or how little GAC members actually intervened but that's the basic participation for the record of that he is groups, and they show that firstly for the accountability cross community working group, which the GAC will be discussing on its agenda later in the week, there are nominally 19 GAC members of the average GAC attendance since September last year has been 5 and the plenary calls. For a couple of the sub groups the one and diversity in which a number of GAC members have been quite active. In fact, there are 8 members that have sub group which has finished its work dealing with diversity but an average of 2 attended since accepts. On the jurisdiction sub group which is of particular interest to a number of GAC members, although there are 9 GAC members the average attendance there has been 3 since September of last year.

For the policy development process work on new gTLD policies the plenary group dealing with matters should there be another applicant guide book and should there be a new round of gTLD and if so when. A fairly fundamental questions there are 7 GAC members who are recorded in that group and the average attendance on the plenary course recently has been one.

Work Track 5 which we discussed extensively. 16 members that's up to 17 now because another member recently joined. But an average of 5 have attended since the work group was

formed and the cross community work group of and new gTLD which is going to be discussed in a separate agenda item here in the GAC later in the week, that's dealing with setting up a mechanism for distributing somewhere between 2 and 300 million dollars that ICANN is currently sitting on as a result of auctions of contested strings of names from the last gTLD round. The GAC is a chartering organization that have cross community group. There are 5 GAC members but an average of 2 have been attending. So I put those out not as with any particular judgment of course but it's helpful to do that analysis from time to time, and the purpose was to put you is the system working? And if it's not how could it be improved for the benefit of not just you as GAC members but for the broader interests of the GAC and public policy? Aspects of what ICANN does? So that's the a rather long overview of the brief that we prepared Manal. So back to you.

CHAIR ISMAIL:

Thank you very much Tom for the brief for the analysis, and for compiling all those figures, and extracting all this from from the web sites so it's really compound issue so we really would like to see more GAC members volunteering to participate on those working groups.

We need those who express interest to really participate actively, and we need active participants to report back to the GAC so that the whole GAC is kept informed and is kept up to date, and is kept alerted on anything that needs to be discussed within the GAC.

So yeah, as Tom and also, to keep us posted on any replacements because as Tom mentioned, many of the GAC members who are listed as GAC participants have already left the GAC, so so we need to find a mechanism to have this working, and just to give you the other side of the discussion, because yesterday we had an SOAC chairs meeting with the CO so it's meeting between the ICANN CEO and the chairs of the supporting organizations, and advisory committees, and one of the things that was brought up was the work load and fatigue of the volunteers, and sometimes we call it the burn out of the volunteers, so this was brought up during the discussion, and I think it was mutually agreed among everyone that this needs to be considered collectively, so I mean the... said they had a scary excel sheet of everything herself to do and the ccNSO had an equally scary sheet and we are at the super scary sheet which is basically a union of everything they come up with, so there is initial agreement to look at the prioritization of issues across the organization, and across the cross community, but I, meanwhile we have to try to organize ourselves and keep our voices heard

in the discussion. So I will leave it at this, and open the floor for feedback on experience from members who participate, such sessions on how we can help from members who do not participate.

So, Olga please.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you Manal. I one comment I would have is as you said we have a super super scary list of things to review, and I have this conversations with some colleagues sometimes in the region informally just because I, I want the region to be aware of what we are doing.

Perhaps just to focus on one issue. Maybe not everyone I'm list I see the list and I am like in 3 cross community working groups, and some other thingsism couldn't I would like to but I have no time to participate in a PDP on other subsequent procedures because honestly I have no more time and I had to skip some calls. When you skip a call you can listen the recording off transcribing. Sometimes that's less time than being in the call and sometime that's useful.

My advice perhaps for new members of the GAC would be to focus on one issue that is on their interest, or more interested to that government, and try to focus there only on more on one

issue and then with the time they can get acquainted of other important things we discuss. So once they get that training that can be exported on other issues. That's some comment. Some advice I make you.

CHAIR ISMAIL:

Thank you Olga very much, and, yeah I mean we don't need more than that. If every I mean if the GAC member focuses only on one issue, but we have several members that are focussing each on just one issue, but reporting back to the GAC so that we are all well informed and on track this would be marvelous. So we are not asking for more than one issue. But yeah this is a good suggestion, and so any more comments or suggestions? So I hope you can, you can think it over, I hope you can go back to the brief, and if you have any comments, even at a later stage we can discuss it over the mailing list as well, and as Tom mentioned, are if you see colleagues who have already left the GAC, so please let us know if there is going to be a replacement, or those need to be removed from the participants list, and please consider the issues that you would like to take to be a prime contact for the GAC on this topic and we will be happy to receive expressions of interest.

So, if if there are no further requests for the floor okay, then we keep taking more breaks. So yeah, please Tom.

TOM DALE: (No audio).

CHAIR ISMAIL: So, yeah, so Tom brought to my attention a comment in the Adobe chat from Jorge so would you like to make your intervention or we can read the comment here? Yes please on geographic names. Please go ahead.

JORGE: Thank you. As it was related geo names I didn't want to raise it in the plenary. But as you give me the floor, I think that just to react to the discussion on the participation in CCWG and PDP and being one of those who try to participate somehow, sometimes as much as possible, I would say that the guidelines we have for CCWGs for our participation and CCWGs are quite useful.

I think that they have been working especially for the CCWG accountability, could be good perhaps to reinforce a little bit its effect in other CCWGs, and I think it would be also useful to extend them as much as possible, as feasible, to our participation in PDPs although the the way they work is different. At least we could organize ourselves in a similar fashion, and one example that I haven't been for instance

following too closely, but where the participation of the GAC seemed to me rather effective is in it the who is discussions. In the who is PDP? Where this effort used to be spear headedly the public safety working group, and I think that is a good model when you have a working group that is not having its discussion, its discussions on its own as a silo, but which is really directed to also participating in had the community. That gives us more efficient and streamlined way of making input into other community work, so I leave it by that. And thank you for giving me the floor.

CHAIR ISMAIL:

Thank you, Jorge, and sorry to put you on the spot but thank you for the valuable contribution and they thanks to all GAC members to participated to the GDPR discussion and the submissions we have been sending on very short notice and within a very tight time frame so this is something to be praised so we are saying both sides, so any requests or comments? Okay if not, again this concludes our GAC discussion on GAC engagement and cross community working groups and policy development processes on Saturday 10 March, and we will proceed with the following agenda item at the hour, so we are having like, 25 minutes break and then we will be back at the hour, at 5. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]