

**Transcription ICANN Los Angeles  
GAC Consultation Group meeting  
Sunday 12 October 2014**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#oct>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

(Mano): We had on our agenda some talk taking on where we are on the two work tracks and where is the – is this from the Consultation Group Charter.

And we also need to agree on when are we going to reconvene our conference calls again so we can start with the easy one. When do we want to reconvene?

So Avri you mentioned the planning pot when – w- when does this and exactly?

Avri Doria: It ends November 7.

(Mano): November 7.

Avri Doria: I mean don't wait obviously. I just won't be there.

(Mano): So Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Just to know that I think our cash still feels like it's very far away but it's actually pretty near. And I think the publication deadline for that meeting is already somewhere in January. So if there's anything we want to put out, you know, for broader input or consultation.

So I know there's a lot of going on or, you know, maybe otherwise we can make a commitment to do certain things on the mailing list.

But I know we had the same issue of over summer where I think, you know, we did meet for quite some time and it meant as well that we didn't make that much progress or at least not as much I think as we had hoped to.

So I'm just wondering if I know of course if it applies to everyone and no one can make it, you know, there's no reason to schedule a meeting.

But if it's, you know, maybe only Avri and I know Avri's very good at looking at the mailing list and providing input and writing as well.

So I don't know so again I don't know if it's a general concern or where a lot of people are going to be absent or whether the fact only, you know, one or two people which means we can maybe start moving forward and just put a lot of things out on the mailing list for people to put input, provide input on as well.

(Mano): Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes if I mean if I'm the only one that's going off there I guess then of course you should have the meeting. I was thinking that more of you might be going to that insanity.

In terms of though moving forward now that, you know, we've sort of taken that first step how much do we want to get done on the second phase before I think is the thing to be determined? What is there that we really hope to get

done before Marrakesh that sort of determines? And I don't know that answer.

(Mano): Marika, yes?

Marika Konings: Well this is Marika if I can express my opinion on that. I think, you know, some of the things I think we really need to start out but I think, you know, again Mason may play a big role in that as well on how or what kind of information we should be providing to the GAC I mean, you know, following outcome of the survey.

And also that the early engagement aspect is their indeed something that we can move forward on ensuring, you know, that early participation of the GAC or input.

And, you know, we spoke about the triage option. We also spoke about the, you know, the quick look mechanism on the preliminary issue report.

So it may be worth working out some of those proposals in further detail and then see if there is, you know, one or two of those that we can actually maybe start piloting or at least trying out because I think that's probably the only way in which we can find out whether something works or not, you know, whether it does meet the means of the GAC as well as the GNSO and based on that experience make more final recommendations.

And again, you know, some of those may have an impact on some of the timing or even, you know, how GNSO PDP manual for example the requirements there. So that would be at least my assessment at this stage.

(Mano): (UK) and then (Olive).

(UK): Yes thank you (Mano). I really think we need to keep the momentum going. And, you know, from this meeting from the discussion today in the GAC.

And my suggestion is that we do actually have a go at defining some options on modalities for engaging as (Monica) just described really.

We actually kept that in a set of options which we then put to the GAC before - way before Marrakesh. And then perhaps at Marrakesh we can actually initiate a pilot of one or two after having had some responses from the GAC.

But that may be reluctant to agree to anything before a face to face meeting of the GAC but I think we, you know, we try to move forward now based on the discussion today with defining options. And that's my suggestion. Thank you.

(Mano): Yes (Olive)?

(Olive): Thank you. And in the same vein I would say that well in a way we've got two tracks. But now in practice we've got a third because we've got Mason on board.

And we should use the sort of this pilot period to try out things. And it's almost like okay let's see what and I think that Mason can come up with some interesting suggestions.

And there's also the matter of how can we support you in that role? And to that end I would like to introduce (Karen). Where are you (Karen)?

(Karen): Here.

(Olive): Oh you're there. Yes (Karen Passe) who is recently as of yesterday joined the ICANN Support Team for the GAC and has eminent experience from supporting the board of ICANN as well as ten years with the OSCD.

So I think I would see that this could be a very, very useful addition in our work around this development and in particular see what kind of trial attempt we can make in conjunction to support Mason and his role as GNSO liaison to the GAC.

(Mano): Thank you (Olive). So first regarding the conference calls before we leave this may be we can do the normal poll that we do giving people a preference of maybe to Tuesdays.

And excuse my ignorance on this the planning pot. When exactly does it start? Is it overlapping with the ICANN meetings or...

Avri Doria: No. It starts next week and then goes for three weeks so yes I'm skipping the first week. I have a family member having surgery so I get to skip the first week.

(Mano): So maybe we can do a poll on Tuesday 28th and Tuesday 4th. We can leave the first Tuesday which is immediately after the GAC meetings and then try to see how much attendance we can get on the following to Tuesdays. Would this make sense?

Because I'm also mindful that we don't have everyone here so we cannot really conclude so...

Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes so this is Marika. So we can get out a Doodle poll for those two Tuesdays and we can see if indeed one of those can be a starting point and then I guess we would normally go back to our usual cycle of meeting every two weeks.

And maybe in the interim I can work with (Olive) and (Karen) as well and as we discuss maybe looking back at the charter to see as well what our

complete deliverables were from the charter and maybe already, you know, prepare kind of draft work plan between here and Marrakesh to see if we can outline maybe some of the themes that at least from our perspective think are still outstanding and that could maybe serve as a starting point for discussions during the first meeting.

(Mano): So let's go with the poll. But again I think we need to consult with (Jonathan) before proposing the dates finally on the mailing list just to make sure that it's convenient with both Tuesdays.

Regarding the deliverables I tried to check now the charter and its states two deliverables. The first is a documented process between brackets, tables, flowcharts, et cetera for ongoing smooth and timely information exchange between the GAC and then GNSO organizations again between brackets, GNSO liaisons with the GAC permanent liaison, consultant of group, et cetera.

And the second deliverable is an agreed documented process table flowchart, et cetera for ongoing early engagement of GAC and GNSO PDP projects along with an agreed documented process to be followed where GAC early input is in conflict with a GNSO proposal and a mutual agreement could not be reached.

So I think we're pretty on track but we did not discuss what is the GAC input is in conflict with GNSO views and how are we going to have like a consultation period and then how are we going to conclude this we did not discuss.

But at least we're within the two tracks that we have already identified so this is I think it's a good sign.

So and now as we also have the GNSO liaison I think we would keep this again into the loop of feeding back into the process and where does this whether it needs some fine-tuning or whatever.

I believe the target is that by Marrakesh we have like Marika and (Olive) and (Mark) some detailed proposal that if we can share early on with a GAC on the mailing list it it's good they have a look into it early so that we can really target some conclusion by the face to face meeting.

It's hard to conclude online but again it would be hard to conclude during the face to face meeting if they see the proposals for the first time during the meeting.

So if we can plan something that can be circulated early enough before the Marrakesh and Marika like you said we don't have really much time. We have the Christmas vacations and so it's not that far away.

And I think we've already touched on what we're working on right now in terms of the recurring, the joint meetings, the interaction between the chairs.

So we just have to document this in a written proposal and then get this shared with the GNSO as well as the GAC.

And I think with (Suzanne)'s comments in mind again I think ultimately we will be handing this mechanism over to some Joint Working Group or whatever that would get into substance then. So do we have any comments and Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. One question in relation to the documents and information produced but I don't know if for example if that's something that Mason is planning to take up in conversations with the GAC.

I think we still have indeed the question of, you know, what is it that would be, you know, (unintelligible) for the GAC or what is the kind of format that would like to receive information on.

And is that, you know, maybe now with Mason there it will become more clear or I don't know if that's something we need to further explore or discuss or experiment with things and I don't know if Mason you have any specific ideas on whether there's anything we can do from staff side at this stage or its more, you know, following your conversations or experience you may be able to provide us with some guidance on, you know, what works and what doesn't?

Mason Cole: This is Mason. No I don't have a suggestion at this point. I would I think the first thing I'd like to know from the group or from the broader GAC is at this stage they're being deluged with information what is the -- hi (Jonathan). What is the preference on the part of the GAC for receiving information?

I mean I'm happy to take the existing structure of information as it's flowing from the community into the GAC and help refined that. But it's a matter of how the GAC prefers I think to receive its information.

It's (Olive) here and I think that's very worthwhile trial to start looking at what are the options of it because what it's all about is sort of streamlining and prioritizing.

But prioritizing may be a little bit difficult. But streamlining in some sense what the various flows are and to think about options that we how we can pursue that and I certainly it's like squaring a circle or like maybe not a number. It's P.

But in this case well some creative use of the mailing list in the meantime in coming up with what could the options be of making what is already very,



very succinct information on whether one pagers and so on and the various others inputs that are coming from the GNSO.

How can they be well both condensed and highlighted in a way that makes sense to the (GACers)?

And I think it typically one of the areas where - what the whole consultation group and in particular we who are working on the soft side from the GAC side could be served as useful partners in initial discussions.

So I would suggest that we try to exchange some views on that on a mailing list - well already before we meet the next time or rather have the next conference call.

(Mano): (UK), I mean (Mark), sorry.

(Mark): Yes. Thank you. I mean just a general reminder really that most government reps on the GAC are not able to tap into flows of information from the GNSO or other parts of ICANN. We just don't do it.

I mean we're just not able to secure the time to do it. We don't most of us do not do only ICANN. We do many, many other things within our portfolios of responsibilities.

And the desirable solution is a single track of information managed by you Mason I think ideally which will, you know, as (Olive) is saying in a concise and precise way provide the signals what, you know, what is happening in the GNSO in terms of policy issues and potentially where the GAC needs to intersect with that and also how the GAC can help the GNSO pretty much do anything which is what I was trying to say earlier on.

Most GAC reps will only read stuff from the GAC secretariat. I'm sure that's how they work because that's realistically the only way in which we can operate.

It's just because of the loadings of civil servants especially in these times with austerity and cutbacks and so on it's a fact of life.

So anything you can do to help streamline the flow of information on which we can act and react and act is going to be a tremendous boost to this whole project, the whole ICANN project in fact. Thanks.

(Jonathan): Yes so hi. Sorry it's (Jonathan) speaking. Sorry I'm late. I got noveled as I came out of promptly at 6:30 out of the previous meeting I was in and grabbed into another one. So I was acutely aware of this going on but it's great. And it's relatively high participation. I'm pleasantly surprised.

(Suzanne) did say to me earlier that she was going to be unable to make it. I don't know if she conveyed that to any of you.

(Mark) I take your point. I think that's well understood at least elements of it.

One of the things that struck me is that we've - what we haven't talked about it and we will need to figure out is the inter-relationship between the liaison and the GAC as well as the secretariat because that seems to me to be a key pivot point to make sure that works effectively.

I do think we've - we are not sure we try to solve the problems of the Working Group Now. I don't know quite where we are in the agenda. But certainly that's one of the bigger issues that struck me is how we make sure that you the GAC make best use of your secretariat and especially if as you say there's likely to be a sit up and listen or read things coming through the secretariat.

But certainly it's becoming clear from the survey and all our discussions that this sort of pumping out of information and what feels like a deluge.

We all suffer from it to some extent. And but nevertheless it's recognized that that's what the GAC's saying and that's what we need to work with.

So, you know, I think that's clear that that's where we got to find some sort of change.

But I suppose my one other but is we also need to get a mechanism by which the GAC perhaps delegates some receiving function there over and above or in addition to the secretariat. And that's this triage working group type mechanism.

Because even if it all comes in through the secretariat all the secretariat's going to do is say boom out to the whole GAC and it just needs something.

I think where you're getting some resistance from a GNSO perspective is we can't - we can perhaps assist but we certainly can't determine when and if something has implications from a GAC point of view.

We might even be able to say look we have an idea it's here or we can - but that - it's sort of that it feels like we've got to present you the information in a structured, organized and filtered way.

And one of those filters might be and we think this is a public policy implication but I think we've got to be very, very careful about pushing that back onto the GNSO because that's not our business. You know, that's not where we're experts.

(Mano): Just very briefly before handing to (Olive). I have to note also an apology. I overlooked this at the beginning of the meeting. But (Anna) also has apologized and I promised her to note her apology here.

And I would like to stress what (Jonathan) said regarding the liaisons secretariat relationship specifically that a GNSO liaison is not on the GAC mailing list.

So unless there is some channel to relate the GNSO liaison to the GAC work I think he would be isolated from what the GAC is discussing so (Olive)?

(Olive): Yes thank you (Olive) on for the record. And just continue along the thought pattern from (Jonathan) it's certainly so that well the first step would be sort of finding a way of streamlining.

And the second and much more difficult or well at least potentially sensitive aspect is to do the prioritization and highlighting the public policy aspects because yes I fully understand that right the GNSO can, up with well we think this may have public policy implications or we're pretty sure about it.

And well the secretariat or ICANN staff can be working with a GAC. You know, we can come up with all right we believe this would be some kind of priority.

But that's exactly what we can use a trial period for to say that all right is this correct? We can try to do that. Of course it's really something which has much higher importance and really called for GAC members involvement to make that kind of final judgment.

But well maybe we could start trying some various ways of well putting it forward and see if it makes sense or if it's absolutely useless to the GAC. So that's just a thought.

But I just want to make use of the situation where we have a trial period and to make the best use of the situation as possible.

(Carlos): I have been an observer of GAC for some time and now I'm a new observer of the council. I think that this idea of a trial period is okay.

I think discussing issues if it's public policy relevant or not cannot be done under the responsibility of the GNSO Council but maybe it can be tried with a small working group.

I certainly think it is the GAC's responsibility to decide if there's public interest or not. And this is the responsibility that cannot be shifted to anybody.

So when we start to discussing this it was I thought it was a great opportunity that if the GAC becomes aware of the early stages of the policy development process they could easily do a cross check of public interest period and take a decision if they follow it or not.

Having said that it seems to be that the policy development process are not independent of each other and there are one's that belong to a previous one at (Sidra).

So it could be very useful that new participants in the GAC understand that these processes of processes have been there for a long time and they are related to each other.

And they learn to choose though right moment to get in and check if there was a chance. So if you develop this idea of a trial period then put it into a working group and recognize that it is the responsibility of government to check for public interest I think, I think it could be developed.

But putting the responsibility on a few people to throw an idea into the lions place of the GAC I think it's dangerous. Thank you.

(Mano): Thank you (Carlos). I think we have (Jonathan) then Avri.

(Jonathan): Yes minds a little bit of a sort of administrative point. I mean I'm conscious it's 20 past 7:00 and we've all had a long day. And I just think - I'm not sure because I came in late for which I apologize again. I'm not 100% sure where we're on the agenda.

One practical point I would like to have by either dealt with here or soon we need to think about participation in this group and make sure we, you know, if we've lost - and I think here's an opportunity at this meeting to go back to the GAC perhaps and look for one or two more members to come in to backfill for those that have gone and maybe to look on the GNSO side as well.

I mean I've spoken to Volker for example. He's a participant nominally because he's a vice chair. But frankly he isn't participating and we know why. He's got a legitimate reason because our meeting time clashes.

So we've either got to adjust our meeting times or replace him as a participant. So certainly that's that.

So I guess my suggestion is that we get the last contribution and just try and wrap this up with a couple of practical points around the agenda given the time.

(Mano): Avri?

Avri Doria: I – my contribution is one of confusion. And I'm sitting here not really knowing what we can do because if people aren't going to read the documents, can't read the documents because unlike everyone else in that it's not outside work it's - it has to be done inside work.

I don't understand how we solve the problem because how do you have a view on public policy aspects of policy recommendations if you don't actually read this stuff?

So I'm really confused as to how, you know, and perhaps it's obviously no longer something we can stop. But as I've been sitting here listening to this ever since (Mark) spoke and we've been going it's just sort of I don't envy you because I - it seems, you know, it seems impossible.

(Mano): So I think it's a matter of streamlining things but ultimately people would have to read everything. But again prioritizing and streamlining the stuff and hopefully at the end GAC members would read everything. So go ahead please and if you can introduce yourself.

Anne Aikman-Scalise: Yes. My name is - is this turned on? I don't okay Ann Aikman-Scalise with Lewis Roca Rothberger. And I'm IPC member delegate to the SCI, Standing Committee on Improvement Implementation. And I also work on the Policy and Implementation Working Group.

And I think a tool that comes from the corporate world would be extremely helpful here. and that is something called the executive summary.

And I know that ICANN does this as well. And I, you know, first I wanted to say the work that you guys are doing -- and I did hear the presentation of the GAC -- is really, really important.

It's an absolute linchpin on the effectiveness of the organization going forward and how we're viewed by the rest of the world including the UN and ITU and the effectiveness. The organizational effectiveness absolutely depends on the work you are doing.

And despite, you know, the poor attendance of this meeting -- this happens to be at the end of the day -- I think it's really wonderful work and it's going to make a huge difference in how ICANN operates.

But the executive summary of GNSO work that could come from Mason, you know, everybody who works in the environment of managing a lot of people,

managing a lot of information, information overload relies on the okay boil that down to, you know, a paragraph.

And then if there's a method where the executive summary of the issues raised at each GNSO council meeting can be distributed to GAC members and say, you know, we ask that you read this executive summary, it's one or two pages long this is the monthly meeting executive summary of issues discussed and actions taken then you have a much better chance of issue spotting so that there is public policy issue awareness.

And then the second thing I would have to say is that I think it's incumbent on GNSO Council members themselves to increase their sensitivity to public policy issues and GAC issues in the sense that for example there was a board meeting, a GNSO meeting and a discussion about what we used to call Whois is now called Registry Directory Services.

And there was a lengthy discussion about the huge, you know, privacy implications and about the conflicting national laws with respect to privacy. And very frankly the GAC wasn't mentioned.

It should be in my mind. And points like the point that (Suzanne) made about government issues around people needing to know who they're doing business with and how you balance those interests because admittedly it's not one side or the other it's a balancing act.

But GNSO Council needs to be more aware of when they need to and their sessions, raise issues. And it would be helpful for people like (Carlos) being on the GNSO council raises issues and say, "Hey, shouldn't we be talking to the GAC about this and keep that in mind when having GNSO council meetings."

Thank you. But you guys this is so critical. And I congratulate you on your work so far.



(Mano): And (David)?

(David): Yes. I mean sort of thought what we were talking about is trying to, you know, see if we can funnel some sort of executive summary through.

But I don't - there are huge number of issues raised by that in terms of prior, you know, the GNSO making its judgment of about what issues the GAC will be interested in quite possibly incorrectly and so on.

So I think I mean, the sort of what we want to do but it is – but it's also very sometimes very I mean there's certainly the GNSO discusses some things that are not of interest to the GAC.

I mean certainly occasionally the GNSO discusses things that are not of much interest to even most of its members. So but any - almost any issue can seem to have some public policy aspect if, you know, it's very hard to tell.

I mean (unintelligible) security issue could easily be seen as having a public policy issue aspect. That may not necessarily mean that is something the GAC wants to hear about because they, you know, they may quite happily feel the public policy aspects of that are adequately addressed by other things.

So these are very difficult. It's almost impossible I think for the - to really judge what - except you can get an intuition for it but you can never be sure.

So I think we - all we can really do is provide some tools to help the GAC navigate and sort of have a disclaimer about well we've tried but this may always be, you know, really if you want to be sure you have to go – do have to go back and look at this deluge of information.

There's not really anyway around it. I think we can only provide a useful tool with the disclaimer that it may - that it's not - it will never be perfect I think is all we can try.

And as the process of how we provide those summaries I think is worth further discussion. But it would be a worthwhile thing for - well for all of us really to have some things.

But I mean I certainly find the briefings that staff prepared for the GNSO very useful. I just don't expect the GAC to read them.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes. Let me just say though that for example all the GNSO constituencies and stakeholder groups their representatives provide executive summaries for the members of those groups and admittedly they may have a bent that is towards the interest of that particular group.

But without using executive summary as a tool you have no chance of actually - I mean information overload for these GAC members is, you know, it's enormous.

Without using some kind of abstracting or shorter tool you have no chance of active, you know, coordination or consultation or because nobody is going to go and read unless they see something the triggers and interest with them that I need to go and read all the background on or this we really should be, you know, briefed in depth and undertake this in a - well what (Suzanne) called a Working Group although that's a confusing term.

I guess I would have urged the GAC to pick a different term because Working Group is a particular term that's used within GNSO as far as I know, you know, WG with.

But without a shorter summary of what's going on in GNSO Council I don't see how it's practical for, you know, the consultation to work.

(Mano): So we have Marika and I think then we have to wrap up as (Jonathan) said.  
Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Just for the record we do provide one pagers to the GAC on every PDP that are updated on a monthly basis that really try to do that, indeed provide an executive summary, highlight when the next opportunity for GAC input is and have, you know, a concrete timeline there.

So I just want to make sure that that's on the record that we already do provide that to the GAC for the information. And I believe it's even translated in the six UN languages if I'm not mistaken.

Anne Aikman-Salese: But sure, you know, I'm sure that's true Marika. Staff and I mean you guys do such a fantastic job. That's very different from the new role that Mason has and what happens at each, you know, GNSO Council meeting and there's a different level of probable even of attention it's going to be paid to that.

Because now you've launched something, GNSO has launched something in relation to Mason's role. And that's different from the staff role.

(Mano): So I think if we don't have further requests then we can wrap up. (Jonathan) you were suggesting to have our next conference call held within Tuesday?

We are going to skip the Tuesday immediately after the ICANN meetings and have a poll I'm sorry on Tuesday I think 28th.

(Jonathan): Yes the 28th.

(Mano): Twenty-eighth and 4th just to poll members and to see where we can get better attendance to get started. We were trying to override the planning pot but then it turned to be like we're going to push things like one month.

So it was suggested that we keep the momentum. So unless you have any concerns with the proposed dates Marika (unintelligible) would...

(Jonathan): I mean thanks (Mano). Yes I think even if I do I think we should just get on with it. I mean I think we need the rolling two weekly schedule that we get on with and we'll get some momentum going again.

Certainly we need to think a little bit about getting more or refreshing the participation in the group. That's key. And I think the other thing I would really appreciate help from the GAC colleagues about is getting plugged into the new GAC leadership so we can start that and make sure that that element works as well.

And if we can get those - this working I think we're in good shape to make some productive progress, so yes.

(Mano): Yes. Very quickly the other two things getting new members and trying to get some of the vice chairs for example here into our Joint Coordination Group.

Again as mentioned we're in transitional stage. We're having our elections Tuesday and Wednesday. So maybe after this week we can try to see how we can inject executive leadership from the GAC site into this working group.

And finally on our work plan we have also looked very quickly into the charter. The two deliverables we've committed to our pretty much within the work that we are currently going. So we can have this on our next conference call.

The only thing that we will we did not discuss here is when the GAC provides input to the GNSO that is in conflict with the GNSO how we can process this?

Are we going to go through a consultation period and then how - I mean how we can conclude the situation? So this is the only missing thing and I think we can take this into the agenda of our next conference call.

So (Jonathan) if you want, okay. Okay then thank you and thank you for staying that late. Thank you.

END