
KOBE – GAC: Governance & Accountability Processes (1 of 3)

Saturday, March 09, 2019 – 17:00 to 18:45 JST

ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

OLGA CAVALLI: Hello, good afternoon. We will start with this “45 minutes” about the working group about GAC participation in NomCom and I would like to invite [inaudible] Cheryl and Lars and who else is joining. Do you want to come? It's no obligation you can stay and help from afar? Okay [inaudible] thank you, Manal, for giving us the space. Thank you very much. So I see many new faces and let me brief you a little bit why this group was created. Let's welcome our friends. Okay here.

SPEAKER: Put Tom between us. We can sandwich him.

OLGA CAVALLI: We can elbow him. Thank you, Tom, for coming and thank you Lars for doing the arrangements, and let's give a moment to the colleagues that were interested in the previous issue to leave the room. Of why we thought this issue was important for the GAC, there is a group I see many new faces in the GAC so it's perhaps good to take one moment to remember why we created this working group, there is the NomCom, I have a few slides, if Gulden or Julia okay, I don't see them. Okay so, thank you very much. So what is the NomCom. Please you are the experts and correct me if I'm wrong much the NomCom is a group, I will

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.

in a moment tell you which is the composition of the group. That has a very important role within the ICANN organization, and stakeholder groups, and supporting organizations and advisor committees. This group is responsible for selecting candidates for ICANN leadership roles. The NomCom selects half of the Board. 8 members of the Board are selected. Not at the same time, because they rotate, but they are responsible for selecting half of the Board. 3 members of the GNSO. 3 members of the ccNSO, 3 members of ALAC and I was not able to find how many members of the PTI Board you select and the NomCom select. Of can someone two. Okay thank you very much. As you can see that's a very important role within ICANN. I will show you now another slide, which of course you will not be able to read, because it's empty. No that's not well, it was it was an image that the NomCom has with the seats, but it is summarized in this slide. So the NomCom is composed by 15 voting members. Of 7 appointed by the GNSO, 5 appointed by the ALAC. One appointed by the see ccNSO and one bay ASO and one by the AB and 3 nonvoting members. One should be appointed by the GAC but it's nonvoting. One by the SSAC and one are I the RSSAC and they have a nonvoting chair. A nonvoting chair elect and the nonvoting associate chair. Assist more than ten years the GAC has not appointed any representative to this nonvoting seat. Reasons are several. It's not the purpose of this session to talk about why the GAC is not appointing a member there. This is the purpose of the working group. Those interested in this issue can join the list. The e mail list that we have for this working group. There is another new thing there has been a revision of the NomCom this was conducted by my distinguished colleagues here with me this afternoon. And can we go

to the next slide please? Slide next? Thank you very much. So this NomCom second review has some recommendations. So I have instructed 2 of them the number 9 and the number 10 that do speak about the GAC filling or not that seat in the currently structure of the NomCom. So recommendation 9 says all NomCom members should be fully participating and voting members except for NomCom leadership. All currently active members including members from Monday receiving bodies SSAC and RSSAC shall be fully participating in throughout the process not just in the final vote. The GAC seat is currently unfilled. Could be impacted by recommendation 10 which is the next recommendation. Next slide please. Thank you very much. So recommendation 10 says representation on the NomCom should be rebalanced immediately and then be reviewed every 5 years. The implementation team shall include in the re balancing exercise compassion of the unfilled GAC seat and its future role and status on the NomCom. I have no idea why the words are so horrible divided but you understand the meaning what I'm trying say. So some countries represented in this GAC believe, and this is Argentina one of them that a fully multistakeholder model within ICANN should have a fair representation of the governments within the NomCom because they select relatively important leadership of the boards. CcNSO and ALAC and I'm sorry shown you. There have reasons it's this is not happening. Of and we will not revise that now. But I will give the floor to Cheryl and Tom to let us know this not only these 2 regions are I with the consequences of the review what may happen in the future, one thing that has concerned us also before some countries in the GAC is this is unbalanced representation of the different stakeholder groups and

advisory committees. As 7 members of one supporting organization, one of the other. Owe we see that as unbalanced. Also making some divergence from a multistakeholder model I we see as more balanced focused and what would be the next steps. We saw there could be some outcomes in April. So I give the floor to you. And you're the experts and welcome to our session this afternoon.

TOM BARRETT:

Thank you very much. So we want to give you an overview of the organizational review we're doing for ICANN for the NomCom group. And I think we have some slides for that as well. So you can go ahead to the first slide. One more please. So where are we today? We've been working on this for well over a year, plus at the end of 2018 or so we submitted a feasibility and assessment, and initial implementation plan to the OEC of the ICANN Board. And I believe that's being considered this week. And that feasibility study consisted of 27 recommendations that were developed by independent evaluator and we had a feasibility group evaluate those and recommended or endorsed all those recommendations with 4 revisions to some of the recommendations. So the current status is that the feasibility study is under review by the OEC, and we expect some Board action on that this week. As Olga said 2 recommendations include an immediate re balancing of the NomCom, will determine whether or not, in fact, any changes should be desired based on representation or if it should stay the same, and, of course, that considers the unfilled GAC seat, I'll also point out that not only are the recommendations about voting membership but also one of the recommendations is that the size

should stay the same so if there's going to be a re balancing the report is still recommending the same number of members stay the same.

OLGA CAVALLI: Can I ask a clarification question? You mean the same number would be each supporting organization and advisory committee the same amount of seats or remaining what is it is now.

TOM BARRETT: So if there's 17 members even if we decide to reapportion where the members come from it will still be 17 members. It's not looking at adding 3 more or taking any one away. Okay next slide? So in terms of the process going forward, assuming Board action this week, the Board will then request for a detailed implementation plan from the working group and that is expected to take about 6 months to develop. And then that will be that will include various opportunities for the ICANN community to participate, and comment on our plans, and then we submit yet again another plan to the ICANN Board for approval. Once that is hopefully by the November time frame we will be able to start the actual implementation of the 27 recommendations. And that would be expected to take 9 to 12 months. Next slide. So as I said here is the expected time line for implementation. We plan to start planning for the implementation phase immediately after this meeting, assuming there's some approval to go ahead. Again there will be some Board action again at the in the meantime frame and we expect by October we will be able to submit a detailed implementation plan to the Board and once that plan is approved for implementation then the all

implementation itself begins. So some of the elements of the plan which will include the time line obviously for each of the 27 recommendations. Some of them can be implemented immediately. Some of them may take several years. And, of course, they may impact some of the stakeholder groups that send members to the NomCom. Obviously, a definition of desired outcomes. And idea of what the budget might be for each of those outcomes. What the cost might be. And an explanation of how that implementation of that recommendation will affect the NomCom itself. So that's our summary of our NomCom review. We're welcome to take any questions you might have.

CHERYL LANGDON ORR:

If I may go to one of Olga's questions which I'm unsure we've done justice to that yet. So I wanted to loop back. NomCom is a construct that was put into place at a particular point of time and designed to meet the certain type of structure and function that parts of ICANN had. We are clearly recognizing it is a slightly, if not very different thing now than it was when this original design was put together. But of course what one group sees as imbalance, I would, if I can channel what I've heard over the years from those groups who have different numbers sitting at the nominating committee table it's important to show you, so you can contemplate what may be considered when we move forward to looking at implementation of this re balancing recommendation. The reason that for example the large advisory committee puts 5 geographically defined people on there is that the ALAC the advisory committee, is divided and balanced geographically,

and therefore to bring in simply the skill set, the ability to reach out for local talent is advantaged by that particular model and that's something that I'm sure many in the GAC will be appreciative of for example. You know we want to be able to look at a large group of potential candidates for these vital pieces of leadership seating, so that the NomCom has a huge number. If possible of really great people who choose from because they can only a point from people who put in expressions of interest. That's important thing to remember. The reason why does the ALAC have 5 and the GNSO have 7. Was the way that then and this was pre-organizational review of GNSO number one, and we are about to get to organizational review of GNSO number 3, so we are looking at historical aspects here, was that was how the GNSO is carved up into its constituencies and it was felt that those constituencies needed a seat to bring in the particular business interests, commercial interests contracted party interests. The types of contracted parties and etcetera and that was the thing all right? That thinking could very well be valid. That's something that we still have to but what is happening now? And this was a very important pressure on the examiner when they were coming up with concept of what could and should change, and what simply really needed to change because there was something unjust about it, was that as in the new model of the bicameral house of the GNSO, right, there is an opportunity and we've already seen that for new entities to come on line, so are we to assume that now we need to find MPOY a seat and the next entity and the next entity a seat. There's critical control point we have an opportunity now to look at and a just. So yes, it appears imbalanced but there was a rationale to it in its time and day. But as I see it there's

an opportunity right now for re balancing to take into consideration two things. First of all, whilst the diversity of the nominating committee is terribly, terribly important because if we were looking for diversity in the people we a point or appoint or can appoint from having diversity in the group that is assessing them I think is the other side of that balancing. But when what many people who haven't experienced a nominating committee adventure, it's probably the nicest way we can put it isn't it Tom? the adventure of nominating committee, is when you get in that room, you no longer are representing even the best interests of the appointing body who sent you. You are looking out for the best interests of ICANN and the bodies you are sending the new members to. So there shouldn't be deep fear and loathing about, but we need a representation al otherwise the voice of small business won't be heard over the voice of you know North America or whatever. So if a nominating committee is working, diligently, account bully and it is transparently as it can within its limitations, communities should have greater trust in what they're doing and how they are doing it and we should be able to trust they are acting in the best interests to find the best possible people to fill the leadership seats. I just wanted to do justice to that. . Bring in had the history and make sure we all understood why in this re balancing there's opportunity. The only other thing I would like to just mention to you in terms of opportunity if I may Olga and this is when we now move into this implementation. The detailed implementation plan, the committee that Tom and I have been sharing and wrangling of for some time now, will have an opportunity to refresh its membership. It is looking then at a plan which has to go as Tom outlined into budget aspects. Into of what is feasible. What the

priorities are, there's lots of work to do, there's absolutely no reason why as this detailed implementation plan goes ahead, that the government advisory committee on committee involvement may not want to take some level of active role in that. It may not necessarily be limited to any opportunities for public comment. We are not a closed group. . Therefore, you could either have a watching brief or an active participatory role.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you. Before giving the floor to colleagues to make some questions, I have some comments, questions, the GAC at the time that the NomCom was established years ago, was smaller. Now it's much large are so as you rightly mentioned the GNSO had a limited number of constituencies, and now its increasing, which is good. The GAC is also larger today so that is something that we should have in mind. In this implementation phase, what could it happen that in, as the GAC is not active because of several reasons, not sending nonvoting representation, phase in a new implementation could be the case that the GAC is no longer part of the NomCom, like could that happen.

CHERYL LANGDON ORR:

Absolutely.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Which is reasonable. I would like to you to realize what may happen if we don't just use it the space that the organization give our dear advisory committee. Another question, there's some colleagues in the GAC raised concerns about the confidentiality when participating in the

NomCom. I know it maybe it's not the focus of this review team but perhaps based on your experience you could share some comments about that possible concern.

CHERYL LANGDON ORR:

If I may take that Cheryl again for the record. I'm delighted to do that. It was in the period that I was in the leadership of the nominating committee so that's a sort of a three-year period that we undertook the radical changes on the transparency aspects and that corresponding confidentiality issues in what NomCom does. The rule of thumb is now as follows, and hopefully we will always be so. That all of the actions and activities that do not include the personnel information, the details of the people who have applied, is as public and as predictable and as transparent as every other part of ICANN, if not more so. But, the confidentiality aspect clicks in with things that are to do with anyone's expression of interest, and obviously any deliberations of a personnel nature. That's just good HR policy and I'd be astonished if the GAC felt that that type of human resource activity should be a caucused action.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you. So, as you can see, there's an opportunity for us to participate, or just maybe use the space. Any comments from colleagues in the room? Okay I think it's food for thought.

TOM BARRETT:

I want to point out as part of the re balancing exercise it's not binary choice where you either have a seat or you don't have a seat. It could be that you were define a different role for the GAC, so for example today the ICANN Board provides advice to every income NomCom. There's no reason why the GAC can't take on that role as well and say we think the Board needs this type of expertise or this type of representation, so it could be that were define the role and you can have ongoing input without actually having a seat at NomCom.

CHERYL LANGDON ORR:

Cheryl for the record. Tom if I can follow on that. If we were to go down that pathway then we would also need to consider again that the norm is, and it's encouraged and vital for it to happen, that anything any part of ICANN that is a receiving body. In other words, the PTI. The ICANN Board. The ALAC the GNSO the ccNSO they all receive nominating committee appointed members. So as a receiving body, we as a nominating committee regularly and specifically interact to them to say, what are you looking for? What are the skill sets? What gap analysis have you done? What type of person are you wanting desperately? And do you not want at all? You know, have you just got too many of you know a particular type of skill set? So they are questions that we ask, now as the GAC is not a receiving body, then such an exercise as Tom just hypothesized about, you'd need to be cognizant of how, as a non-receiving body you would be making the advice, and about what. Does the GAC want to advise what the ccNSO should be receiving? Does the GAC want to advise on the type of individual skill sets that they believe the ALAC is missing in their 15 person ALAC?

Interesting if you do. I'm looking forward to the conversations if we have it, but what the GAC does have perhaps, I'm not suggesting it's necessarily the case but I could see a strong hypothesis might suggest that the GAC does have a great interest in what the Board has as skill sets, and what the Board receives, and indeed perhaps with PTI as well. So you would probably need to look at some degree of specificity of that type of additional role. Certainly open to it. Certainly possible. But you would need to look at that balancing act as a non-receiving body as to how you are advising and in what.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you Cheryl and along your comments one of the outcomes of this working group that has been going on for a while was last year GAC recommendations for the NomCom in relation with the Board selection that the GAC sees value in having some members of the Board having some governmental experience or understanding of the development of public policy, so that has been done last year, and we, we got to understand that this should be sent every year; is that correct.

CHERYL LANGDON ORR:

Thank you for the record. It's Cheryl again, for the record. Certainly something I would encourage you to repeat regularly while it's firmly held belief but one also needs to be very aware of the bylaw restricting particularly for appointments to parts of ICANN including the ICANN Board, that you are not able to be actively serving in a government role for example, so there's a fine line to be worked with, perhaps one might suggest that those in government who know of talent with government,

who are not counter to the current ICANN bylaw, should be encouraging those people to put in expressions of interest. And sort of you know bias the puddle that way. That would be fine. But we, we are as a nominating committee in any given year limited with the mission and scope that's given to the via the eye bylaws.

OLGA CAVALLI:

The bylaw restriction is totally clear to us, the only idea that we had is that perhaps some members of the Board could have or previous experience or related with a development of public policy or relationships with the government as you know, business is different governments the way of working, the timing, and the understanding of things is different, which is good, and normal. Let me ask you a question. So, this implementation phase, will there be opportunities for commenting or doing some input from for example the advisory committees like the GAC. You're smiling. What does it mean?

TOM BARRETT:

All of our meetings are published for public review. So if you're not able to attend a teleconference we do meet remotely. They are not face to face meetings but they are published on the ICANN wiki and welcome to respond to those or participate in any of the topics that we have.

CHERYL LANGDON ORR:

And why I'm smiling is what happens with the detailed implementation plan is it then once its fully fleshed out and so the opportunity to influence is during its development, right? So once it is fully developed,

then it goes to the organizational effectiveness committee. Who reviews it and recommends it or does not recommend it depending on their view of it. To the ICANN Board and then once adopted things get implemented. Right. So you've made a promise. Our he then on 6 monthly reporting. You keep to your project, in a perfect world everything works brilliantly but at no point in that process do we need to go out for public comment. Could we? Possibly. Of do we need to? No. Will we? Depends if you ask Tom or I.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much. Comments from colleagues? Questions? Okay I don't think I'm missing any question. So to follow the process, do you have any e mail list, or something that we can receive because there are so many things to review, that if I personally don't receive something then maybe I don't see it. Or I just have to visit your wiki page or.

CHERYL LANGDON ORR:

I'm going to jump in. We are about to make an executive order so I hope Lars is listening. It seems to mow that the difference between push and pull on this is not just something the GAC would be interested in. Other parts of ICANN would as well. So perhaps we could ensure that we take an action item to work with the ACSO chairs and see what modality of communication and update something going to be most appropriate for you and it may be that you want a particular push message. But I would also remind you that throughout our process, even to this point, we've published monthly dashboards and report cards and so you know, we are acting at the highest level of or perhaps it's bi monthly.

But very regularly. We are acting at the highest level of transparency on this, and so perhaps even allocating someone whose job it is to have a watching brief is another way forward but Lars is the boy that's going to make this magic happen to everyone's delight. Mine included.

OLGA CAVALLI: Great so I will be bothering Lars to let us know links, to documents, about this important implementation. Comments questions? From colleagues in the audience? Yes please go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I am very confused about this topic. As I know, we had we GAC have rights to propose one person to NomCom; is that right? But GAC can never appoint anybody to the NomCom. So my question is... the rights and what we have the rights, what is the time, and when [inaudible] the whole GAC [inaudible] these rights and why they assert this right and don't appoint any man to NomCom. I don't know. Do you know the history?

OLGA CAVALLI: If I got your question you're asking why does GAC not appoint in the nonvoting is that your question.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We have a right. We don't appoint any men. In the last 10 years. Maybe 12 years. I don't know. Why?

OLGA CAVALLI:

Well that happened before. I participated in the GAC at that time. And since I participate this seat has not been filled. There are several reasons. And you know that the GAC works under consensus so if we don't have consensus agreement on something the GAC just have decided no the to do that. As I mentioned before, there are some concerns related with confidentiality, and also, we as GAC representatives, we don't act as a personal we act in the representation of our governments. So that is the main difference from other colleagues that do participate in a NomCom because they do it on a personal basis. We come here, not on a personal basis. We come here representing on government, for some governments this nonvoting seat, not occupied is a diminish of what we consider balanced not balanced, but somehow balanced multistakeholder model within ICANN and some other colleagues from other governments consider that they are not able to do that in their own behalf, but they do as a government, so they are not able to do that in the group. Of as far as we don't have a consensus, we cannot a point anybody in the NomCom, and this is why we created this working group to try to understand what is behind this this consensus at least for the moment. I don't know if other colleagues in the room want to add yes please Manal go ahead.

MANAL ISMAIL (GAC CHAIR):

Yes, thank you, Olga. Of just to confirm what you have said because in the past we used to have someone in the NomCom I'm sure you

remember... from Sri Lanka. And unlike other liaisons or representation of the GAC he was not reporting back to the GAC regularly because of the confidentiality, so some governments were concerned that we cannot delegate some right I mean governments cannot delegate one government to speak on their behalf so there was a little bit of concern on this confidentiality issue, which Olga just mentioned. And this is how we, we stopped nominating any one until we speak and decide, but it's taking quite long, so just by way of background how we ended up here.

CHERYL LANGDON ORR:

If I may, Manal, that is important to bringing to this point as well. As I did mention earlier, in times before the last 5 or 7 years, everything, everything the nominating committee did was considered to be in a cone of silence of confidentiality. And that included the procedures and processes and aspects of how they were working, and that did not give comfort not only to the GAC. It didn't give comfort to any of the sending entities, but the GAC had particular motivation which Manal has just outlined, as to why that ought not to continue under that particular code of confidentiality. That is no longer the case. The only things that are under confidentiality are the human resource aspects. Those private and personal pieces of information that are supplied around the expressions of interest and around the deliberations of personnel and that may influence conversation amongst your fellows here in a different direction. I don't know but it is a different type of confidentiality, narrow scoped, well understood, which it was not the case when this became a problem.

OLGA CAVALLI: Lars, go ahead.

LARS HOFFMANN: If I can just add to what Cheryl just said that the representatives and correct me if I'm wrong Cheryl but the members of the NomCom once nominated by the SO/AC's do no longer act as representation or voices of those SO/AC's they act in an independent capacity so a GAC appointed nonvoting member would not be representing the GAC as such, and nor even their own government, they would just be put there because the GAC believes that there is a good person to make good choices for the position to which the NomCom appoints members. And not a representative either of the GAC or of any of the governments thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON ORR: That is the case. I would think of such a role as a trusted advisor.

OLGA CAVALLI: Yes, I agree, but as you can see, as representing governments makes a distinction so there are different views within our large group now. More comments from colleagues in the room? So I would like to thank very much Cheryl and Tom for taking your time. I know you're very busy agenda, but you took the time to come here. Very valuable for us. And see you around and thank you Manal for giving us the time. And we

have like 2 minutes before finishing this session. Thank you for your attention.

Standing by.

MANAL ISMAIL (GAC CHAIR): So, we are now back to discussing again a few administrative issues on how we can coordinate our work better regarding our providing input to other parts of the community on how to make our communicate drafting more efficient, and effective. And the GAC support stuff has very helpfully compiled a slide deck for this discussion to brainstorm on how we can do things better. So if we can have the slides on the screen? And if you allow me Rob to hand over to you?

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you very much, Manal. Good afternoon again everyone. These are the last 2 topic sessions for the remains of the day. If you looked carefully at your schedule, you see this is one day where there's this extra 15 minutes at the bottom of the schedule that sort of hangs out. My goal for all of you is to see if we can eliminate that small handle on the schedule and get you out of here by the bottom of the hour. And frankly and I should not reveal this to you but in many respects your degree of participation will govern when we get out so let's try to achieve a balance there. We've called this session title GAC standards and work processes overview because again, as one of the themes of what the leadership and many of you have asked us to do as staff, is to look at a number of the operations of the GAC, and offer a

recommendations or proposals about how we might help you achieve some efficiencies of process. This work dovetails with the departure of the ASIG independent secretariat. It's good time to take the work when we were asking you to take a closer look at what we do. Even over the last block I was observing sensitivities in areas that we need to work on as a support staff, and the purpose of this session, and the next is really to engage you, get some perspectives from you, and see what we might be able to do in terms of improvements and achievements. The next slide, Gulten. Basically reviews for you for session 3.2. This talk about standards and work process overview. What we want to achieve in the next you know 20 minutes or so. My goal is to provide you with an overview of our research, and information that we've gathered about public comment process improvements. And also, to identify for you other areas of operational improvements, work that we've been engaged in. I hope what it will achieve for us all is to spark further GAC member ideas and feedback. So I'm hopeful that some of what I share with you might prompt you to make some suggestions. Or to make some observations for us. What I'm going to review for you today is the production of GAC public comments. Also talk with you about opportunities to enable more effective participation by individual participants in the GAC, and finally to just identify for you some other operational improvement areas that we will be talking about throughout the course of this week. And I'm impressing myself by going through this without the slides changing in front of you. First off let's talk about the production of public comments. This is something that we have been very observe servant of in the past several months because there have been opportunities for the GAC to comment on a

number of substantive and operational issues. And we've observed a number of different things. That frankly can be summarized as follows. Because of the increasing work load that you experience as a committee, because of the tight time frames that are created by GAC operational matters, and by demands from the ICANN organization, we're seeing that there are some substantial but not insurmountable challenges and opportunities for how we might be able to improve the formulating of GAC input or public comment, if you will, to the ICANN organization. The 3 primary areas where we see some opportunities are, that there are complex issues that are subject to the opportunity for GAC input and comment. Basically there's issues that require more than just a very quick summary, sometimes it really requires experience or understanding of an issue, and a lot of times this requires some extensive time commitment, we've observed and recognized already, for many of you the ICANN portfolio is not your only work. So how can we create opportunities for you to come up to speed on some of these issues more quickly so you can make judgments about whether to participate either as a committee or as an individual participant? Secondly there is the timing of drafting which can be an issue that we've observed for some of you. In many cases what I've seen over the last couple of months is you're getting drafts a week, 2 weeks before the deadline, which is not really reasonable or realistic for you longer term to be able to discuss it internally within your own government or with your colleagues, let alone to you know begin to offer some substantive feedback. And so you know overall some GAC members really need more time to consider and contribute to the development of draft comments. Just so that you know Gulden I'm shortly going to be on

slide 6. So the bottom line is there are a couple of potential avenues for us to address as support for you as a committee. One is to improve the information flow, so that you get information more quickly or sooner in the process, and secondly to standardize a process that enables more input. Next slide please. So what we're looking to do from a staff perspective to improve information flow is we've already begun this process. I mentioned to you all in an e mail that Benedetta Rossi is a new member of our team, and one of Benedetta's first assignments has been to develop a draft staff template where we take information from ICANN org and basically track all the existing public comments, as well as upcoming public comments that the ICANN org is planning. Some of you may already be aware of those web pages but what we are looking to do is consolidate this information so that it's easier for you all to receive it and absorb it. So essentially what we are doing is we are developing the spreadsheet that will enable the GAC leadership to see what's coming up, and at every one of their chair vice chair meetings to be able to have the conversation potentially to reach out to all of you, and do a triage, if you will, basically to determine what's coming do you know the pike, 2, 3 months in advance, and be able to alert you about particular issues that may be of interest to the GAC. Just to do that initial sort of identification so that you can know several months in advance, whether it's worthwhile, and what you need to be thinking of prior to a public comment period opening. The other aspect that we are working on in tandem, not directly related, but somewhat related to this, is that the direction of the leadership we're developing an inventory of all of the volunteers that are participating or observing various working groups. We are developing that for the leadership to

take a look at. To again help them to identify individuals within the GAC, or within GAC delegations who might be able to contribute to this inquiry process to this forward-looking aspect of the work. Next slide please. What we recognize is that while there are useful tools for the leadership, which I mean the leadership basically meets every 2 to 3 weeks, some of the calls run beyond the 3 hours or so that many people devote to them or have scheduled for them. And so what we are looking to do is create a resource that is lighter than the leadership has to look at. So the leadership has the spreadsheet that the standoff develops. We will make it available to those of you interested but for many of you if you're looking to streamline your time, operate more efficiently, we are developing a web page for GAC member tracking that essentially is going to create a chart for you to you have coming public comment opportunities. And the goal of that page will be to essentially create an outline so that we not only are looking forward but as the GAC makes determinations over a period of months, you can then go back and track you know you'll see for example a public comment that opened yesterday, and you go well why isn't the GAC participating? The hope is you can go to the web page and see, oh, three months ago at the Kobe Japan meeting we agreed that we're not going to make that a priority comment or that the GAC is not going to participate in it. The theme is again to create some tools and resources to enable you to more quickly determine what's happened, so that there's an archive and a record of the GAC decisions and that you have very specific places where you may be interested in finding out that information. So that is in a nutshell what we are attempting to do with respect to public comments. We open that over time what that Willy eliminate for you is these very short

opportunities to react, frankly I think longer term Feng and par's working group will examine the operating principles and see what's the most advisable course of action for how the GAC does consider or make a decision about whether to participate in public comments. I know in some of the past conversations you have all had there's almost a difference in treatment of something that's policy advice versus something that might be an operating matter with respect to ICANN org, a good example of that would be something about two characters, and you know the allocation or registration of 2-character country codes versus the ICANN operating budget. Something that's a public policy issue versus something that's an ICANN operational issue. That might and area for a different process or a different means of operating. So I share that with you as something for you to be looking for from us between now and the Marrakesh meeting and hopefully will offer you opportunities before we get to Marrakesh so in ... we can be getting feedback. I will pause there Manal to see if you or any of the membership have any particular questions or observations about this topic?

MANAL ISMAIL (GAC CHAIR): So any questions or comments? So let me ask is there on line now for testing purposes even?

ROBERT HOGGARTH: No if you go on line we have created the sandbox the placement holder if you go to. There are if you go and do some of the searching we have put in some information about existing public comment periods just to

test it, it's something that we've shared with the leadership to give some examples of the work and you've all been helpful giving us feedback but we are now at the point where I hope over the next several weeks we will be able to share that so when you see a for information on your e mail that that would be something to check out and be able to give us feedback on. That process seemed to work well when we were standing up the new GAC website. We'd make an announcement a number of you would look at these new materials and give us feedback via e mail so that seems to be a successful approach.

MANAL ISMAIL (GAC CHAIR): Thank you Rob and you have answered my second question how long should we expect this to be I mean, how long does it take to have this on line, and you mentioned a few weeks right.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Correct. From a GAC leadership perspective you're going to start seeing that as a standing agenda item. Not the first meeting please. After the Kobe meeting but 2 or 3 meetings afterwards to begin to get the leadership exercising the muscles to start to begin the considerations.

MANAL ISMAIL (GAC CHAIR): Thank you again Rob. I think it's very useful to have one stop shop with all the public comments that are open for commenting with the deadline. I'm sure this will facilitate our decisions on where to put comments, where we need to submit comments, and in what sequence and prioritize even our work, so.

ROBERT HOGGARTH:

Great well now that's the tool part. The second part of this discussion where I challenge some of you to think, and you don't have to provide immediate feedback today but during the course of the week or later by e mail, would be the next slide Gulten. That's the concept of standardization. And the recognition that it would be helpful based on feedback that you've all shared with us to have a standard process so that UN understood when should we expect to see an expect request from the leadership or the staff that says these public comments are coming up. A means or mechanism to receive the feedback. A standard timetable for developing comments. I must say that ICANN org has been very helpful in terms of now generally having a minimum 40-day public comment period. Well, it's challenging for any community within ICANN but certainly for the GAC to be able to operate within that time frame. If there's going to be full opportunity for discussion and comment. So part of the concept of getting the early warning is maybe some of these considerations can begin before the 40-day clock start ticking. But when it comes to the actual then development of the public comments there are a lot of questions that we certainly have that we would like perspective from you all in terms of that work. And this is you know in the past it was very easy. In the world where you had the independent secretariat and I observed this on several occasions there would be input from a member of the community, Tom, why don't you draft up something for us? And immediately you know Tom would be able over the course of 2 or 3 weeks with his background skills, understanding of past GAC history, general interests of governments.

He could draft up something for you in a couple of days produce something, and you would be very comfortable with that work product. I'm very sensitive that perhaps someday you will reach that with ICANN staff, but there are certain structural issues with respect to developing those comments where frankly if I were sitting in your shoes, I wouldn't be entirely comfortable with that. And so you know part of the mechanisms and expectations about developing a standardized process is that you are all comfortable, that we are following a process that allows the work to move forward, but doesn't create those difficulties where you go, is this really a GAC work product? Has it been through the appropriate level of review either by the GAC as a whole or by the leadership? And so that's where really this change in circumstances creates the requirement for some standardization. I'm not going to ask you or pause for any immediate feedback but I'll just read through a couple. The major question areas here for you to consider please and give us feedback over time. When it comes to drafting a document who should hold the pen? Is that something where you believe that it should only be a GAC representative from a member country? Or observing organization? Is that something you're comfortable having a vice chair or the chair do? Or are you comfortable frankly saying okay, we're giving you the parameters of our work, staff, draft it up? But understand that we have a review process so that there's a comfort level that there's a very close check that you know Rob is not saying something in correctly or inappropriately or doesn't jive with the history expectations of the GAC. So very important questions about who should hold the pen? Who should be the qualified people for taking that sort of work? And there's recognition there are 2

phases of drafting right. There's developing the initial draft and then the process for review and comments. What happens if at the last cycle someone who hasn't participated in the process, a certain country, has a concern? What happens with the process? So having that sort of insight from all of you would be helpful. Then there's the time frame for review. We would very much appreciate feedback how many days or weeks should you have before the end of a public comment period when you would expect to see a draft? Again I don't think long term it's acceptable even when Tom was doing it to give you something that says well in 3 days if you don't object it's going to get filed. You know the goal is to make it earlier than that so again, there is a standardized process where even if you're not involved in the issue you've got a comfort level that there's been a dialogue, there's been a process that's followed and that you're comfortable that it goes in. And then you know what should be the format for those that type of input? And how formal should that be? Should it be an e mail that goes to the entire GAC? What sort of analysis or feedback period should that be? In some cases you know I was reluctant to start presenting all these issues to you. I've always been taught with a legal whack ground I should be coming to you not with the problems but with the problems and solutions. I'm perfectly comfortable taking that approach, but first stage is to alert you to what we're doing, give you an opportunity to give us some guidance, some parameters for how we might approach this. We are trying to continue the tradition of the independent secretariat by you know partnering with you to you know particularly in operational functional type areas, to be able to make recommendations to you. I have no fantasy that GAC should have any

substantive input on any aspect of what the GAC considers but when talk about functional areas I feel a level of comfort we can rec 2 weeks might work and you come back and say 2 weeks is too soon. Let's make it 3. So that's the general area we are right now on again comments, feedback, as you all think about this would be very helpful. Gulden it we can go to the brainstorming 2 slide he will show you the scope of the type of input and feedback we want. What about consensus? Do you expect there should be full GAC consensus on something that's an operational matter? On something that is with respect to the ICANN org budget for example? Those types of areas in getting feedback from you on whether there is a distinction in the type of topics or subject matter where there might be different consensus standards would be very helpful. Much again, you know, no objection can be a very acceptable standard on certain topic areas, but from a staff perspective and from a GAC participant standpoint we want to make sure you're comfortable with where we are there. And then you know, finally what's the role of GAC leadership. Manal made a reference to this earlier in the day. That there might be some things that you choose for effectiveness and efficiency purposes that you would delegate to leadership. Or that you know potentially you would delegate to staff, what would those be? Would those be for example the initial evaluation? Are you comfortable with the leadership looking forward and making some initial judgments about future public comment opportunities? How would you like that sort of process to work? Again it's all taking this back to establishing that level of comfort and process. But at the same time remaining flexible because some sometimes you have 6 months advance notice of a set of public comments, and sometimes you frankly have 6 weeks. So

there are various circumstances that come into play. And one thing I've learned in almost ten years of working with various GAC and GNSO, and SSAC and other communities is you can't plan for everything. There is always going to be some unique circumstance that comes up. I would just leave for you to consider as part of this effort, that the very first opportunity we have to begin to at least examine this or potentially utilize some suggestions is the comment period on the GNSO EPDP granted there is a process in place there but there's deadline of 17 of April. When do you all expect to see a draft for that document? When would you like to have input? Or are you comfortable as you have been to date delegating this to the small group that is responsible for the EPDP issue. Some thoughts for consideration before you head off to dinner. So that is the topic of public comment preparations. Again, I invite you to you know give some consideration to this presentation and these proposals. Please you know, throughout the course of the week if you have some ideas or some concepts there, please share them us with. It's only going to be successful if we get some good feedback. I would make an observation Manal before I ask you if you have comments on this that a good example where you all have been providing us feedback is the briefing documents that we shared. A number of you throughout the course of the last couple of weeks have been able to come back and say oh, could you label the documents differently? You know could you consider this format consideration? So there are vehicles where getting feedback from you can be very if effective, and I assure you when we do get that feedback, we consider it very heavily. So Manal do you have any comments or observations or if there's in I from the floor?

MANAL ISMAIL (GAC CHAIR): Thank you Rob. No, frankly, I don't have any immediate questions. We've been discussing this on the GAC leadership calls for some time, so maybe my question would be to GAC colleagues whether it would be helpful to share this over e mail, and expect some feedback, or share a concrete proposal for example, and expect feedback? What would make your life easier in providing us with feedback? Questions? Or an initial proposal? Or something else?

ROBERT HOGGARTH: In some of those cases when lack of feedback we then utilize you all on the leadership team, so fair warning.

MANAL ISMAIL (GAC CHAIR): So, again, we don't have to answer immediately here in this session, but I'm just brainstorming because sometimes it's easier for people to comment on a first draft thing rather than initiating something, so that's why the question. If there are no comments, I think we can move to the communicate part. Do we have anything else on this?

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Yes, we do but in the interests of time I will quickly sort of identify I made a commitment about that you know. 6:30 time frame.

MANAL ISMAIL (GAC CHAIR): No, no, I'm sorry, please, take your time, and then we can move on to the communicate. Much go ahead.

ROBERT HOGGARTH:

Great thank you. The next area is an enabling effective GAC participation. So the next slide Gulden. This is just sort of resets this part of agenda in terms of areas to alert you to and I will be much more quick on this. Of because there are some similar themes here. There are a number of opportunities that present themselves in terms of some of the work we've been doing with a number of working groups recently as well as the GAC as a whole. And I will identify a couple of those quickly. There're also some best practices that are going on right now. That we think could be expanded to other working group efforts. And then finally there are just some concepts and ideas that were already thinking about moving forward with but we will look for feedback from you. In the spirit of ultimately trying to reduce the amount of e mails and work load that you have so that you can focus more on thinking about the substantive work. So on the next slide Gulden it's just more of a sort of reminder in terms of some of the opportunities that exist. And you all face some of these opportunities every day, it's that you have limited time to deal with ICANN matters. You know very basically. And so how can you focus on give the best use of our time on that. Particularly in a case where the ICANN subject matter is required greater than average attention sometimes. Because the issues are complex. There's a need for you to coordinate your contributions. There are in the intricacies of past work that make the issue of work difficult or challenging. The slide has a little glitch in this there but there's the GAC mailing list and this is something that a number of you have mentioned to me over time, hey thanks for all those e mails I get from you, well that's one of the challenges. Is there way that is we can manage the communication flow more effectively so that you have

fewer e mails you need to look at every week? Where maybe you only check your ICANN GAC e mails every 2 weeks? Or every 3? So what type of communication would be nor effective? And then there's just the overall recognition that sort of reinforces a lot of this. Literally at every ICANN meeting the general average is we've got 20 new participants. So over a period of time, and there's not an absolute mathematical calculation here but some have observed well if the GAC has a turnover of 25% rate every year after 4 years it's a whole new group of people. We all know it's not exactly that. But if we want to have and encourage regular on foreign participation that's a consideration that we have to take into account when we are developing our work. Next slide please. So I amino essentially what that leads us to is recognizing and trying to find out what's actually working well or what things can we sort of play off that would help us? One of the things that we've seen is that on generally any issue that comes up there is a core group of GAC participants who are interested in an issue. It's not the same people every issue but when you look at it mathematically it ends up work, out to you know, ten or 20 people. Or less in some instances. So how can we leverage that core group so that they can feel like they're contributing but also not be over overburdened by the work. We've recently recognized with the GNSO EPDP there's concept of primaries and at units' alternates. Of that's an area we might consider tore future issues where you recognize okay I may be the primary. I want to have you know first chair responsibilities here. But I don't have to make every conference call or I can have a partner or a team mate who we can bounce ideas off and work together on. There's also been some success we've realized with respect to GAC briefings and webinars. And

the issue there is are there particular topics that you would find more valuable as a webinar? Are there similarly other topics that are more amenable to a briefing? Getting that feedback even if you think it's relatively you know average feedback, please give us that. You know thanks very much. That briefing worked in this instance. Next time a webinar would be much more helpful. But trying to find out how we can achieve better information flow for you there. And then of course leveraging our existing tools, we've got a relatively new website, we've been working to develop and build out activity page that is can be one stop shops for you to find information about particular issues. Well, are there ways to utilize those as more collaborative work spaces where you find yourself as a working group participant being able to be engaged that way? A warning for some of you on the GAC operating principles working group, we are going to experiment with that to try to use website as a real tool for doing that work? Is there are also aspects that we are considering in terms of providing more of a regular digest for newsletter for you, Manal may have seen this recently. ICANN org introduced that concept for the chairs of the supporting organizations and advisory committees. Of coming out with a regular communication that you can say oh good, I'm only going to get 2 e mails every month that provide a digest of everything that went on with links as opposed to there's 5 e mails from Rob and 6 from Fabien and 3 from Julie and 12 in Gulten and how many I managing these and triaging them. So give us feedback on these and by the way you might have other ideas that make sense in this record. Next slide please. So some of the concept that is we are looking at very briefly are you know labelling the e mails. Figuring out if there are some sort of communication that is come out

regularly from the chair. Or other types of areas that as I've said might revenue allege website. Next slide please. And then finally on this page, feedback on the preparation for the ICANN meeting would be very helpful, please let us know, I know we got carried away on a couple of briefings, I mean they're called briefings and so 11 pages isn't really brief. But we hope by setting up certain headers that particular issues that you are familiar with you could just skip the background and go to recent developments. Many or okay, just very quickly I need to get ready for that session much what's the GAC action for this session? So you know please give us feedback about those documents and how we might be able to improve on that process? I already recognize and it was a very you know this was a learning experience for us, some of the challenges in terms of timing of the delivery as well. We thought that if we wait add little bit longer we wouldn't have much updates and then you saw we had a number of updates. You know just yesterday, so how do we balance that better? And are there layers of updates that make more sense? Again getting that feedback from you would be very helpful. And then finally this is something that Fabien has raised with some of you who are interested in subsequent procedures. This concept that we are just trying to figure out and get some traction on in terms of your reaction. Is the concept of interest groups or groups of interest, so if you're just interested in a particular area of the DNS, is there a value almost of a bird's of a feather but a permanent birds of a feather where you know you would just all be together and know oh I might hear about some developments or this group would be able to talk about changes that might be taking place on a particular topic, so again an area of consideration there. Next slide please. So please give

us your feedback on all of those areas. They are considerations we think could benefit you as a group as well as individuals and over all the macro message we are trying to identify areas that can improve your work and we really want to be able to collaborate with you effectively in that regard. Just some quick issues spotting. There are other areas of operational improvements that we are looking at and it's not just the staff that's doing that. As Manal said the operating principles evolution working group is under way. Feng and Par are going to have a working group meeting in this plenary session at the end of this week. So we hope that you will be able to observe that and give your feedback. Of Julie and I are going to report on travel guidelines review that we have been working on. Report to you on that on Thursday. And tomorrow, the underserved regions working group is going to be talking to you about a number of things but there will be updates and the capacity building workshops assessments as well as work to leverage the ICANN learn platform. Something where we think if we can create some materials for not only GAC participants but people interested in the GAC that might be of value. So now, I'm done with the operational improvements area, and I hope that if you have in if I questions I can address those.

MANAL ISMAIL (GAC CHAIR): Thank you Rob. I think it's good you bring this to the attention of GAC colleagues and its good food for thought as well, so we can expect any feedback or suggestion or views if not here, even over e mail. So any questions before we move to the last part on the communique drafting?

ROBERT HOGGARTH:

I'd just like to intellectual Gulten no we can go to the next 4 slide and if I miss the deadline of 6:30 it will just be by a minute unless you have some input or feedback. The next topic is something that actually the leadership encouraged us to explore at this meeting. And it was from a number of comments that several of you made actually in Barcelona and a little bit afterwards. And that was the whole concept of well, what is really the process for the GAC communique? And you know are there ways that that can be improved? Again, you know under the independent secretariat, it was very comfortable Tom had the whole operation you know in his head, and could always manage it effectively. He knew what was coming up. Had haste tan standard language he could create and pop into the communique. But you know now is staff is taking on some of those responsibilities. Again there's sensitivity on our part and valid concerns from a number of you who say okay how is this going to work? And can we be confident that the process is one that works well? We understand the background for it? So what I thought I would do is walking through very briefly first sort of what is the issue here. Because what's interesting is as someone who is relatively new to supporting the GAC, and something that somewhat prompted our operating principles efforts that you've begun to engage in is when you look at the GAC operating principles they talk about advice, and a number of the whereas clauses and a number of the principles and the operating principals suite talk about GAC advice but when it comes to the ICANN communique, it doesn't even reference advice. Principle 51 of the GAC operating principle says after a private meeting has been held the chair, may issue a communique to the media. Much such communique having been approved by the GAC beforehand. And so

what's interesting is over time you've built a tradition how this works and operation. You've been very comfortable in that. And then new GAC participants come on Board and say staff, show me where the process is for that and how does that work? And you know again, I'm not suggesting that this happened. But if I look at the statistics, a number of you aren't going to be sitting in this room in 2 or 3 years and so what do we tell and what do you leave for your successors in terms of understanding what the process is? All we are trying to do at this early stage of the process we recognize that the operating principles working group will eventually reach this point, but what we hoped we would be able to do starting in had Kobe is begin to have you consider at least what your existing process is and whether it's working for you in an effective manner? A number of you note that it's a very good approach to not think about anything until you literally your plane lands and you're here. Others say do you know, we should actually be able to be talking about some of the topics. Of a couple of weeks before. We'd like to contribute some suggested language. Maybe we could even have some dialogue prior to the meeting about what that language would be. Much so it would be great. We don't have to be ordering pizza at 10 o'clock at night whereas observed waiting recognizing that the venue closes at 8 and so everybody has to scramble. So these are the types of issues that we would like you to be thinking about at this meeting, in a more deliberate manner as you're actually also doing the communicate drafting work. And I think you saw an initial sort of entree into this area by the leadership, in the e mail before the meeting took place, where the leadership courageously I think said, we're just going to propose some topics. Please think about

this. Don't be held to it. Don't be committed but please consider some topics. I don't know whether that worked. Manal you will U you and the leadership team may have a perspective but if you would please begin to consider some things to so if that's a value. Or whether you reasonably come back and say no, GAC is 10% of my portfolio. If I can only devote 3 weeks a year and the only time I want to think about you guys do here is the moment my plane lands and I stop thinking about you as the wheels go up once I fly away. Of it's just very important for you to be candid in terms of your feedback and your expectations in that regard. So with that in mind Gulten the next slide just outlines the overall time line for this week. And this is just a very brief screen shot of it. Of what we expect by Tuesday and by the way we are not making anything new. This is how it's always been so I'm just documenting it a bit for you. Tuesday early afternoon working groups provide your text as you all know within the communicate there is he working group text much this is what we talked about at the meeting. This is when our next steps are. Of it's often challenging during a GAC week because for example Feng and Par aren't going to have their meeting until theirs about your we asking them on Tuesday to share something that for the communicate draft of what they're going to discuss 2 days later. Then by the end of the day on Tuesday or right around the beginning of the time for the first session for the communicate we hope from it the GAC staff perspective and Tom always did this to have the drafted text of the non-advice sections of the communication. Of that's the ten of the 12 pages of the communicate that relate what happens here. You know that share you met with the GNSO, and you met with the NomCom, and you had a discussion about 2-character country codes ... level so that's

the type of stuff we will generate. Then heavy lifting for all of you will be actually the consensus advice portion. And at that time again and Tuesday evening, we hope that you will have begun to crystalize your thoughts about the topics. And even possible draft language. We already saw some up on the screen earlier today. So some already you know earlier contributions for the membership to consider. Of and then of course you know we hope that you'll have a very intense period on Wednesday actually working through and either Fabien and I or both of us and various times will be up here playing the Tom Dale role of trying to memorialize the information. Something that you will be able to begin to do as any GAC participant probably tomorrow morning, we hope to get out an e mail later this evening and on the next slide I will give you insight on that, this is something we started 2 meetings ago, so back in Panama, and began to put it more into place last meeting in Barcelona, we were using a Google doc platform to enable input that we can track, and that everybody can see everybody's input on a Google doc and so Fabien has an e mail he will produce this evening or tomorrow morning that gives you the link. To the framework of the communique obviously there's nothing in there really right now. And what we ask you to do is at the slide shows is feel free particularly if you have some language to contribute or if you're a working group, chair or co-chair working on your report, go in, click the suggested or suggesting mode, of the editing, so that it can track and it shows where you have made a suggestion and you can actually identify yourself on the Google doc. That way we maintain a transparency and accountability, and we can begin to populate the document ahead of time. So I mean that's really all I had to share with you all from a communique drafting

perspective. Again the proposal is not really new, it's something we've already been doing and experimenting with. The difference here is we are being explicit about you know, this is the effort that we're undertaking. At any point please give us the feedback of you're moving in the right direction or you're moving in the wrong direction or do these tweaks and we will be fine. But we certainly value your feedback, and the leadership team's direction I hope we are moving forward in a way that's going to ultimately be more productive for all you. Thank you very much Manal and happy to answer any questions from you or from the floor.

MANAL ISMAIL (GAC CHAIR): Thank you Rob very much. Any questions on the process of compiling our GAC communicate? So, good. If not, then any other questions? [Inaudible]. Okay, then this concludes the GAC agenda for today, and thanks to everyone and to our support staff, IT team and interpreters. Have a lovely evening everybody and see you tomorrow. In this room at 8:30 for the underserved regions working group meeting and then the agenda as shared this morning. But tomorrow first thing is 8:30, underserved regions working group.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]