
LOS ANGELES – GAC / ALAC Joint Meeting
Tuesday, October 14, 2014 – 14:00 to 15:00 PDT
ICANN – Los Angeles, USA

CHAIR DRYDEN: Good afternoon, everyone. And thank you for coming, especially to our colleagues from the ALAC, for coming and meeting with us this afternoon. We have three topics proposed for today. And they are the issue of public interest commitments in category one safeguards. The second item is the IANA stewardship transition. And then the last item is regarding outcomes from the at-large summit that was held in London. And there are some outcomes there that are particularly relevant for the GAC. And so we have a paper, I believe, that is part of our briefing materials prepared by the U.K. to help guide us in discussing that particular topic.

So, if we start with the first item. But first I will hand over or introduce Olivier Crepin-Leblond, who is the chair of the at-large advisory committee and is here with a number of his colleagues to meet with us and take us through today's agenda. So, Olivier, can I hand over to you first and then go from there?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Thank you very much, Heather. I'm Olivier Crepin-Leblond. Thank you very much for coming here. It's always a pleasure for the ALAC to come and meet with the GAC, as I would say the two organizations within ICANN, the two advisory committees within ICANN

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

that really have the public interest at heart. Of this I guess the first topic is the public interest commitments, the PICs.

And, in order to introduce this topic, we have already spoken to the GAC in the past about these. This is one of the topics that are of grave concerns to the ALAC. And I, therefore, hand the floor over to Evan Leibovitch who is on our leadership team who will be able to tell you what we're currently working on. Evan, you have the floor.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thank you very much, Olivier. Just as a small bit of history, the issue of public interest commitments is one that has been of concern to the at-large. And, as we're aware to at least many members of the GAC for some time, in Beijing it constituted a part of the communique as well as ALAC advice on the issue. It's been a source of considerable debate. We had asked for a public comment period to be initiated by ICANN on the issue. We were refused, and so the ALAC initiated its own. The results of that have been collected and summarized. The summary of the public comment process is available. The very brief version of the summary is that the responses we received from the domain industry were generally against reopening the issue of public interest commitments. And the answers we got from just about everyone else was in favor of the position that these issues -- that these were problematic and needed to be addressed and that they were serious.

As a result and as a result of a meeting that took place last night as part of the at-large new gTLD working group, which I chair, we came up with essentially two proposals, both of which I guess we're asking for the support of GAC and GAC members. One of which is we're in the process

right now of formulating a resolution for at-large to consider as advice to the board requesting an immediate freeze of all strings in category one for which safeguards 1-8 apply. It's a very small number of strings. But some of them are very, very crucial. They include things like dot university, dot pharmacy. We realize that some of these have already been signed, but we still have a significant problem with the level of end-user safeguards that exist. So we're going to be asking, if the ALAC so accepts this proposal, to actually create specific advice to the board asking for this freeze.

Now, it's one thing just to ask for something to stop. But, in order for this to be taken as a constructive and positive measure, we're also looking for creation of a small group that will try and examine the public interest commitments, try and evaluate specifically what we think is wrong with them, and proposed remedies and proposed solutions to them.

So I guess at this point, this is what we're looking to do. We're looking for some support. We understand that the GAC and GAC members have been generally supportive in most part of the idea that there's a significant deficit between what is proposed in the public interest commitments and what is generally necessary for consumer and end-user protection from these high sensitivity TLDs.

And at this point, I guess, I would send it back to Olivier if you want to open this up to questions and comments. Olivier.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you. Thank you very much, Evan, for raising this topic. Just to give you a bit of an update on where the GAC is at the moment on the issue of safeguards, you will know that we've had some back and forth with the board about the GAC's safeguards and in particular seeking clarification about the implementation of those safeguards.

And that would include the category one safeguards that you're referring to and, again, the implementation aspects of that.

So at this point, the GAC is doing some work in a small group outside of the main GAC meetings in order to consider what are those remaining issues and look at what we might do in the GAC further on that. At the same time, we're very mindful of where the program is at in terms of delivery and contracts being signed and so on, which you pointed out in introducing us to this topic.

So there's -- there's a bit of a lack of clarity about what exactly the GAC would have as possible advice coming out of this meeting. And I don't yet have a status update on the efforts of that small group to really get a better sense of things at the moment. But I do know that the implementation side of things does remain as a concern for us here in the GAC. And perhaps I can look to some colleagues in the GAC to give the ALAC an idea of the kinds of issues that we were raising when we first discussed this in Los Angeles and how that pertains to, in particular, the category one safeguards that you're wanting to draw our attention to. So I'm just looking out now at the GAC to see whether colleagues can comment further or have some further reaction to what Evan as raised with us.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Heather. Olivier Crepin-Leblond for the transcript.

The concern that we have is the fact that at the moment the ICANN allocation process and implementation process is continuing moving forward whilst there are still queries and there's still a lack of clarity as to where we're going with regard to category one applications. And the idea of a freeze is really one for us not to be in a position where domains -- top-level domains have been launched and we then have to backtrack on any of these. There's a real worry that something like that might end up being particularly messy. So that was the reason for our request.

Don't know, Evan, whether you have any other points. I think that's pretty much the gist of it. So we wondered whether there were any GAC members or whether the GAC was equally as concerned about this. We certainly are.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Olivier. European Commission?

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thank you very much. Of course, I don't know if you've been following our discussions earlier this week. Also on Saturday we did have a lot of discussions around exactly the same theme. And I think we are on the common grounds with you. I just wanted to say that clearly that we do have the same similar concerns about how category one is -- how the safeguards are really implemented.

We also got an answer on the 2nd of September from the board on a number of questions that we posed previously in both in Singapore and in London. And those answers we don't find them at all sufficient, and there are a number of points. So I think we are, hopefully, going to be able to add extra strong words now in this communique on this matter. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:
then the U.K.

Thank you very much, European Commission. I have Australia,

AUSTRALIA:

Thank you, Chair. And thanks to the European Commission. You've pretty much said what I was going to say. It will be no surprise that, for those of you who follow GAC communiques and GAC discussions anyway, that the GAC has been involved in an exchange of questions and answers on the issues of safeguards over at least a couple of meetings now.

And, as mentioned by the European Commission, we recently received the last response from the board which we've been discussing. And the GAC is very aware that, while we've been having this discussion, formed in terms of questions, seeking greater clarity, why did you do this instead of this, et cetera, how did you implement the GAC advice, contracts have been signed. So it puts us in quite a tricky position if the end point of that discussion or of those questions is that the GAC decides -- takes a view that perhaps we aren't entirely happy. It makes it much more difficult for us to then consider our next step.

So, just to put on the table, my understanding is in the category one -- in the GAC's category one and the safeguard, those safeguards, some contracts have been signed already.

So, in terms of what we'd be asking for if the ALAC asks for a pause or some GAC members or the GAC decides that a pause is worthy, we'd be stopping some strings that fall into that category and some other ones will have already been signed. Not a great starting position. But that, unfortunately, is where we're at. So I just wanted to be really clear about that. The GAC is certainly aware of it. And we certainly actively are considering the board's last responses.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Australia. U.K., please.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Yes, thank you, Chair. And I'm very much speaking in sympathy with the previous speakers and in sympathy with the proposal by the ALAC to recommend freezing these -- I think you said 28. And I presume they are spread across the health, financial, gambling, and charity areas, which are the ones that right in the early days jumped out as being highly sensitive sectors of activity which are regulated where there are very high levels of risk of fraudulent activity, misrepresentation, and consumer harm. So -- and in preparation for this meeting, you know, I was thinking how do I go back to my regulators and reassure them that the kind of safeguards that the GAC was pushing for since Beijing were actually in place? And I began to think crikey, I don't really know. If a minister called me up and said we are okay with dot Lotto or dot cash,

are we? And I would have to sort of give a rather sort of bumbling reply. Well, we have confidence in the ICANN system working and the GAC advice being followed through. But I don't think a minister would really see that as reassurance, if his -- you know, his constituents start or her constituents start getting in touch and also the regulators saying what's going on in the GAC.

So I began to develop an increasing sense of unease. And, when I hear that contracts were flying around, well, they made me extremely worried indeed.

So I'm very much with defense of this proposal. And perhaps we in the GAC will need to consider further what we might do to express support for it. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, U.K. Are there any other GAC colleagues that would like to comment on this particular matter? Clearly, these are issues where we're trying to work through while we're at the meetings here to determine next steps. And it sounds like the ALAC is in a similar state. We will have our Board/GAC exchange at the end of today. And this is something we had identified to raise with the board. So that might be of interest to you just to be aware of that we expected to raise it there. United States, were you asking to speak?

UNITED STATES:

Thank you, Madam Chair, if I could very, very briefly. I think it is quite clear that the GAC as the GAC has been speaking with one voice about the importance of these safeguards for some time. So we very much

welcome the sympathy that you are expressing for those views and for the concerns that we are seeking to be addressed.

I would have to say, though, I second a little bit of what the -- the hesitation that Australia has commented on.

Because we are in a very awkward situation of knowing that there are some parties who are already contracted and not going to be subject to the higher bar and others that would be put on pause. So I will be quite candid with you. We in capital have not adopted a position on the ALAC proposal. And I think it would require a lot of further thought for us. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, U.S. I think that's a good place to leave that topic and move to the next.

So the next topic is IANA stewardship transition. Did the ALAC want to lead us into this particular discussion?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Somewhere in the audience is Jean-Jacques Subrenat, who is one of our members on the ICG. There he is right in front of me. I must be going blind. So Jean-Jacques is one of our two members on the IANA coordination group. He will introduce this subject. What we're looking for at the moment is to take stock of what our respective positions are. The ALAC is structured -- has structured its input into the process by having a working group that devotes itself solely to feed its two representatives on the ICG, on the one hand, and also feed its

representatives on the various cross-community working groups that are being created with regards to this process. So, on the one hand, the cross-community working group relating to the naming issues, part of the IANA stewardship transition --

Thank you very much, Heather. Somewhere in the audience is Jean-Jacques Subrenat who is one of our members on the ICG. There we are, right in front of me. I must be going blind. So Jean-Jacques is one of our two members on the IANA coordination group. He will introduce this subject. What we're just looking for, really, at the moment is to take stock of what our respective positions are. The ALAC is structured -- has structured its input into the process by having a working group that devotes itself solely to feed its two representatives on the ICG on the one hand and also feed its representatives on the various cross community working groups that are being created with regards to this process. So on the one hand the cross community working group relating to the naming issues parts of the IANA stewardship transition and on the other side the accountability issues. But I'll hand the floor over to Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Thank you, Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques Subrenat, member of the ALAC and of the ICG. There has been so much discussion about the subject that I hesitate even to broach it here, but perhaps a few indications for the wider audience here today. My feeling is that there was yesterday and today some hesitation about whether it's possible to maintain the timeline which was initially put out. But I would say as simply an individual who is a member of the ICG that actually we should really do

everything possible to meet at that time. If later on in the course of our efforts it becomes patent that it's not possible, then we'll see. But at this stage I think we should consider the published timeline, and here I speak under the control of the chair of the ICG who's in the room. I think we should do every possible effort to meet that deadline.

Another thing that I would like to bring up is, again speaking as simply one of the 30 members of the ICG, I felt that there was a strong feeling on the part of the whole group that once the transition plan is set up and it is transmitted to the NTIA through the board of ICANN, then it is expected that the board of ICANN will not modify the content of that -- of that document. I say this because I had a feeling -- but here again I'm speaking purely in a private capacity -- that for some board members maybe that was not all that evident. So I bring this up because simply it might be a question in discussion in the following hours or days.

What else can I say except that to point out that we will have two main phases. We are in one phase which is very much about the internal organization. We're looking at the choice of an entity among several candidates, an entity to provide secretariat services on an independent basis for the ICG and there has been a bit of a delay in that choice because of administrative and other reasons. And, of course, we are working very closely with the procurement staff of ICANN because it will be an ICANN contract, of course. And so I suppose by the end of this month or perhaps early November at the latest we should have an independent secretariat up and running.

Now, time-wise, I think the big thing will be when the ICG receives the contributions of the communities. That will be a crucial moment when

we start looking at all of those contributions, putting them together, and giving them a shape which is more productive for the purposes of the transition itself. I'll stop there, but if there are any questions.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Yes, thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. And just to add to your points as seen from the ICG, looking at the points as seen from the ALAC, the topic itself is, of course, of great interest to our members. The U.S. government stewardship of all of these functions has been a warrant of the stability of the operations of IANA, and although it never had to step in in the recent past, or in fact ever in its history, we do have concerns that with the U.S. government now leaving that role as such there might be either a vacuum or there is no interest in actually replacing this with something else or with a process. There certainly are concerns with regards to accountability and stability.

And now that said, it's still very early on in the whole process. We haven't seen any of the proposals so far. Of course, the ALAC is taking full interest in this. So we have, as I said, a whole working group ready to feed into the proposals. There are concerns that at the moment the language says that proposals are to be received by the operational communities and then comments would be received from everyone else or input received from everyone else, but this is certainly something which we will be able to discuss further on this afternoon, actually when the ALAC meets with the ICG on the one hand and then our specific working group takes stock of this. So this is just to let you know that we are following this very closely, and we certainly have a coordinated response that feeds in from all of our At-Large structures into the

process. And therefore, the points that we do push forward are consensus points and will be consensus points. It would be interesting to hear whether there is such coordination on the GAC, and I know that the GAC is also meeting with the ICG. I'm not even sure whether they have already met with the ICG or not, and what specific points that the GAC would be looking for in the proposals.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you very much, Olivier. So in terms of the IANA coordination group, you might be aware that we have five participating from the GAC in that process. And so the -- the GAC, or at least those -- those representatives, have been participating and contributing to developing those initial documents that were so important for the coordination group to get started on its work. We've also accepted the charter and have identified a couple of GAC participants in the cross community working group on the domain name function. So we're looking at ways to support that activity. It's becoming very clear just how ambitious that timeline is for that work and what's involved and what kinds of information are needed in those early stages just simply to begin addressing those issues. So I think on the GAC side what we need to do is really be thinking about how to support our GAC colleagues in that activity, and so that's clearly another important consideration.

When we discussed this earlier in our meetings here, there was some discussion around trying to come up with high-level principles so that -- so that the GAC can have some kind of consensus or shared understanding about principles that would be guidance to us when we get to the point of having a proposal to look at or provide comment on,

then we can refer back to those principles. And again, we're really against time here because, you know, coming to agreement around those is -- takes some effort, some time on its own. And for them to be most useful the idea is that you would have them near the beginning, as I said, so that you can use them when at the other end you're looking at the proposal that comes forward. So there's a group working on the margins of this meeting to see how far they can get at these meetings with coming to agreement about those principles. And if we -- we can't quite accomplish it here, then that's an effort that could perhaps continue for a bit longer in order to support the GAC's contribution to the development of that proposal.

So that's, I guess, in general terms where we are. So Olivier, did you want to --

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much, Heather. A couple more things actually which just came to mind. Of course, the At-Large community has more ability to be more flexible in those matters, and one of the things that we have done is also to have some of our At-Large structure members who are more technically inclined or might be already present in the other fora, therefore the protocols issue and the numbers issue, to actually take part in the formulation of the proposals and in the working groups within those other communities. So not only within ICANN but also as individual At-Large structures into the other communities. And we do coordinate across all of the different proposal areas. I wondered whether there was any such intent or incline within the GAC or whether

the GAC was following specifically the naming issues and wasn't that close to the other two.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you for that particular question. As you suggested, we will be meeting with the IANA coordination group when we meet on Wednesday morning and at that time we will hear from some members of the ICG about the work underway on the protocol parameters and the numbers. And that's really for information so that people that are here in the GAC can be aware of those processes and how to participate. The GAC being situated at ICANN is really focused on the domain name function and within that especially on the country codes piece of that. So that's really the priority. And this committee is really for contributing as part of the domain name function, nevertheless, this is a good opportunity on Wednesday morning for colleagues here to receive information about those other processes and how they may or may not choose to participate. But I think there's -- the most interest is around the domain name function because that's where most of the public policy issues are for governments, you know, in terms of depth and substance. Iran.

IRAN:

Thank you Chairman. Thank you, Olivier, and other colleagues. As a member of GAC participating or a member of ICG, you touched three area of the ICG. The first one, timeline. The second one, charter. And the third one, RFP. I am a little bit surprised by -- not by what Jean-Jacques said but the interpretation of the board that they believe that they would have the right and opportunity to audit and/or edit both the

proposal from ICG. This is delivered to them to interpret what they want but the charter is quite clear. The charter says that the report will be sent to NTIA. Whether they will send as a post office to board or ICANN, that is another issue. For me as a member of the ICG, it doesn't matter. But that does not mean that there is any possibility of auditing or editing. The charter is quite clear and RFP is quite clear. And for the time being, I don't think that we need to touch upon any of those that are stable. Whether in practice we might have some difficulty to meet those, this has not been discussed in ICG. That should be discussed. But for the time being as one member of the ICG we have to stick to those principles, timelines, and procedures which are in the charter, in the RFP, and in the timeline. So we do not change it for the time being but we will see what will happen.

But this is one point.

With respect to whether or not second part, that GAC is only interested or concerned about the names, yes, as the Chair said, primarily, but names is not by itself totally isolated from numbers and from the protocol and parameters. Therefore, the GAC also, still as a one GAC member, would have some interest on those two other areas. We have to work the mechanisms, the modalities how that could be done, whether it should be from each GAC government or member individually or collectively. But these are not excluded and we are not limited only to names. Primarily, that is our main area, because it's country code and the GNSO part, but the other part also a part of the whole system. So they are not isolated. But we have not yet discussed but could not say that we are only limited to the names, no. There are

other part that we also have to have something. But we will maybe at a later stage come back.

That is my personal view as one member of the GAC, as also one member of the ICG. Timelines and procedures and all of those at this stage is solid, should be respected. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you very much, Iran.

Just to your last point, the processes being run by the operational communities for the numbers and for the protocol parameters are open processes, and I think they're more than happy to share information about what those are.

As to how governments would participate, it's in a way that's appropriate to those organizations and to those processes. They don't have a GAC, and they will engage governments in a way that really is making sense based on they're multistakeholder approach to coming up with the results.

So I think the key is really that openness and that availability should anyone, including governments, want to contribute to that.

Olivier, you have something to add, and then I have the U.K.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Yes, thank you very much, Heather.

Just to mention, the ALAC itself will not be taking part as the ALAC in the other processes that are outside of ICANN, obviously. It's just members,

member organizations that are member of the At Large community will, in their individual capacity, be taking part in the other processes.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you for that clarification.

Okay. U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thank you, Chair. And just a footnote to your reply to Olivier and also to Iran's intervention. The European GAC representatives are exchanging views with the Regional Internet Registry covering Europe, RIPE NCC, on these issues. And as far as the protocols area is concerned, in the U.K., as part of our stakeholder consultation through our advisory group on Internet governance, we are including exchanging views with members of our advisory group who are involved in the IETF and that area of functionality of IANA.

So certainly some of the GAC representatives are engaging across the board, if you like, on IANA stewardship transition.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you very much for that example, U.K. That's very helpful to us.

Are there any other comments or questions on this topic before we move to our last item?

Okay. I see none. All right.

So the last topic we have today concern the outcomes from the At-Large Summit that was held in London. This is an event that is organized by the At-Large Advisory Committee; is that correct? And there are a number of recommendations coming out of that.

We also have as part of our briefing material a paper prepared by the U.K. to help identify some of the issues, perhaps, of greatest interest to us here.

So to introduce this, can I hand back to you, Olivier, to start us off.

Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Absolutely, Heather. Thank you very much.

I believe we have a very -- well, it is a presentation that we presented to the Board earlier today. We're not going to go through the whole presentation because it's too long and we haven't got a full hour with you specifically on this topic. But just wanted to give you a quick status update as to where we were -- or where we are today.

The At-Large Summit brought 150 At-Large structures from around the world, and they worked to produce a number of recommendations, a total of 43 recommendations, of which 22, or so -- 22, 23 of them are aimed at the Board, the recommendation which is are effectively aimed at improving both ICANN, At Large, the community, et cetera, et cetera. The whole range of topics.

The process itself -- If we can go to the first slide, please.

The process itself was that of having -- and I hope you can see this on your screen because it's very faint here -- was to have five working groups, five thematic working groups, and I'll read through -- there we are. That's better. The future of multistakeholder models; globalization of ICANN; global Internet: the user perspective; ICANN transparency and accountability; and At-Large community engagement in ICANN.

Those topics were chosen by the At-Large community and the groups varied in size from having about 25 members up to I think the largest one was in the region of 50, 60 members or so. And they came up with a set of recommendations which were just then put together by a small team. You've got a word cloud in the middle with the type of topics that were touched on. And that came up with the ATLAS declaration, a copy of which I think have been sent to the GAC and GAC members have access to.

Now, as you have noticed, some of the recommendations are very -- I wouldn't say cryptic but certainly very condensed. One sentence, sometimes just a very short paragraph. And so in order to be able to follow up with this, the ALAC has established an ATLAS II Implementation Task Force. And it's work is to either -- in effect, if you're looking at cooking, for example, either cook recommendations so that they're ready to be actually served onto their destination -- being the Board, the staff, or a community -- so as to have a fuller recommendation rather than just a one-liner.

In some cases, we're dealing with have the ambiguity removed, having perhaps an expansion of the recommendation itself. In fact, some

recommendations require a lot more development and perhaps a lot more work for the ALAC to produce a fuller set of requirements and needs, and then present them to the community that it is aimed at.

If we go on to the next slide, we have -- out of all of this, the process is probably going to take quite a few months. We aim to have been going through all of the recommendations and expanding on them and refining them by the Marrakech meeting. But for the time being, we presented three recommendations which we believed were ready for Board consumption because they were pretty straightforward.

If we go to the next slide, please, the first one was recommendation number 11. As you'll see, we've got various assignees who manage to refine this recommendation and add a little bit on it.

We have several working groups that are working on this now, existing At-Large working groups. The accessibilities task force is one of them. We've got a technology task force. We have an outreach working group as well, and also a finance and budget subcommittee that works in collaboration with the other task forces in order to be able to produce costings for any of these recommendations if they actually do cost hard cash.

So the first one is here. It doesn't show very well, unfortunately, but it's that ICANN must implement a range of services to facilitate access according to various criteria (gender, cultural diversity,) and user needs, disabilities in particular.

There are links to further information. In fact, I think what we shall do is provide you with a copy of this presentation, and if your members are

interested in scoping through it in more detail and clicking on the links, and so on, that we're absolutely fine with that.

If we go to the next one. 27. The Board must implement ATRT2 recommendation 9.1 regarding formal advice from advisory committees. And that is one which I think some of you might have seen in the ATRT2 recommendations, and that's to do with the formal advice; the response, Board response, to formal advice from all advisory committees.

The next one, the next page is the ICANN Board should hold a minimum of one conference call with the At-Large community in between ICANN public meetings. And that's, of course, to enhance communications between the Board and the At-Large community.

Now, there are quantities of other recommendations. As I said, there were 22 that we went through with the Board this morning.

To give you an idea of the ones that are still far from being implemented, if we can scroll down, please, to the next -- or just take one example.

We provided progress updates. So maybe the next one. And the next one. This one.

This one is to do with policy management. It is absolutely clear from many discussions that I have had with colleagues, chairs of SOs and ACs, but also which our community has held with other community members and other supporting organizations and advisory committees that everyone is absolutely overworked with the amount of information that comes and that is just thrown at us. It's absolute information overload.

And so one of the -- This is recommendation which is has come from our At-Large Structures themselves. Imagine, they don't come to ICANN meetings. They receive all of this in their mailbox and they get absolutely flooded with it.

I remind you all, it is not their job to deal with ICANN issues. They're just volunteers, some of whom have absolutely no direct interest in the domain name industry, and then they have to go through all of this information.

So here, this is just a recommendation to put together some kind of policy management process system available for use across all of the supporting organizations and advisory committees. And that would certainly enhance knowledge management, improve cross-community specific activities, improve the effectiveness of volunteers, and I guess that's really -- that works across all of ICANN. Facilitate multilingual engagement, et cetera, et cetera.

And so this is the type of project that would take not two weeks, not two months, but we would be looking at several, perhaps one or two years to be able to implement with a high level of collaboration with the other supporting organizations, advisory committees and, of course, ICANN staff, and also putting this, as far as the strategic planning is concerned because this really would be a major shift into the way that we work.

We're not going to go through all of them, as I said. I hear that there might be some recommendations that some of your members have flagged to be of interest to the GAC and we're open to discussing them

here if we have the time to do so but I wanted to first provide you with this quick update.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Olivier.

So for the GAC, some things that have been flagged are perhaps also on the operational side so the proposal to have conference calls and do that sort of thing.

In terms of the substance, we haven't, as a GAC, really had a chance to talk about these particular recommendations, so this has helped, I think, to draw our attention towards that. So it's been useful for that purpose.

One of the things that stood out for me when you were presenting was one of the proposals around what you are calling "formal advice," and it stood out because we had actually had quite an exchange with the Board at one point where the word formal seemed to have a lot of importance for them and for the Accountability and Transparency Review Team as well. I think it would have been the first review team in that case.

And we, as a GAC, explained what constitutes advice, that it's something written. And we also implemented things to make it more clear when we're giving advice in the bylaws sense of advice. And we explain actually that the word "formal" doesn't really have meaning for us. It's advice as we have defined it or it's not advice. So it's just something that stood out in one of the recommendations that you had there.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Heather. In fact, this morning we somehow reverted attention at some point because we are discussing advice with a capital "A" or a lowercase "a." And that's, I guess, something maybe that the ALAC, as far as its own advice is concerned, will have to define and to work with the board because it probably is a slightly wider issue as well.

I know that the GAC has done some work on this, and the advice in a GAC communique is advice, I believe, with a capital "A." Not that there's any -- whatever the difference is, and so on, but there is certainly a nuance with the type of advice.

The recommendations we're giving here are not either advice with a capital "A" or a lowercase "a." These are just needs that our community has. And they come not as a thing of saying the Board do this, but more engage in this because this is what we need.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Olivier. So in our case it's the word. So the word "advice" is what we've defined. Punctuating it, uppercase, lowercase, and so on, italicizing the word. Although I think we've put it in bold, if we can, in the communique for emphasis, yes. So there are any variety of ways to give impact to the word. But for us, it's having it defined in the bylaws, ICANN's bylaws, and then we've explained or confirmed that it means for us it's something in writing. It can be in a communique it, can be in a letter, it can be in the form of principles documents, and so on.

So we have earlier work on this that put this issue to a close and in a way that I think has really been useful to us in dealing with the Board

and creating the register. I saw you were talking about a management system for documenting that, and I guess it's the same sort of idea as the register, but may go beyond what we have?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Heather, yes. No, it goes way beyond than that. It really goes down to tracking how anything really takes place.

At the moment, there's just so much information around -- oh, Evan might wish to just expand on this. Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi. In some ways we even address this as an issue of transparency. It's one thing to be able to just send out massive amounts of raw information of every meeting and every word and everything that comes out of here. But that's not necessarily transparency if the sheer volume of information becomes a barrier to people's understanding of what's going on here.

So the idea of a knowledge management system is intended to try to make some sense of the sheer volume of data, make it a little bit more accessible to people that aren't here every day into the lingo and the culture and try and make it more accessible outside.

Thanks.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you very much. Are there any comments from colleagues on these recommendations? I suspect we'll need a bit of time to digest

and reflect on what it is that you're proposing for us. I'm looking at the U.K. who prepared the paper. Is there anything that you would like to add?

UNITED KINGDOM:

Well, thank you, Chair. And thank you, Olivier and the team, for presenting on the ATLAS declaration and specific recommendations which you've had the chance to discuss with the board. That's very interesting. And I think we would certainly welcome being kept informed of progress. As we, as our chair has described, digest the declaration and, you know, perhaps formulate some views on specific recommendations that we could formally endorse. But, as the chair says, we're not ready to do that at this time.

But, overall, I would just say just -- the ATLAS summit was a very important initiative, in my view. It's an important step change perhaps for yourselves in the ALAC. And it really brought home to me as a government representative how your role in the ICANN model has really evolved and been transformed in recent months. So it's an important step you've undertaken. And the output declaration is a very important document. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you. U.K.

Okay.

Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I don't want to comment on the recommendation. But I have attended the meetings of ALAC. When the subgroup prepared that, I was in the meeting with the board. And I found that the way that ALAC was looking at the matter is quite appreciable. They're looking in the short-term, in long-term, having vision, insights that are very, very useful. They have devoted considerable time and efforts. And we found they very, very useful information. We hope that we have some time to look at that to see whether there are areas that we could either take from the notion of the recommendation or from the substance of the recommendation. But we found that quite useful. And we congratulate you having very hard work and having such a long-term vision, insight of the future that may not have immediate implications but that have long-term. And that is good. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you very much, Iran. And I think the congratulations have to go to our members around the room and those listening remotely and those that really did the work, the hard work unpaid during the London summit.

CHAIR DRYDEN: I see the United States.

UNITED STATES: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just wanted to take this opportunity to thank you again for all of the agenda items that we've been able to

review. On this very last one, I just had a question. I know we will not be able to get into it but I wanted to plant the seed.

I think my understanding is that you SO/AC chairs have managed to collaborate very, very effectively, certainly lately in particular. And that, during your recent meeting, this issue of work overload or volume was certainly raised. As you know, we feel the same way and have focused on a couple of political clusters of issues such as all of the WHOIS-related work. But I just wondered if we can stay in touch as to how you all might consider, if you were to be asked to do a priority ranking, of what you would want to tackle -- near, medium, long. Might be useful for us to compare notes on that. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, U.S. That's a welcome suggestion.

So, again, congratulations to the ALAC for your summit and all the good work that came out of that. And we have an opportunity to, as a GAC, consider further those outputs from that and comment at a future point in time.

And thank you as well for coming to meet with us again today. I know we're not able to do them perhaps as regularly as we did in the past. But that is very much related to the workload issue and all that goes along with the need to prioritize and so on. But we do value our exchanges with the ALAC. And, as you point out, we have a shared interest in the public interest.

So okay. Thank you.

[Applause]

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: If I could just say thank you. And, thus, we have gone full circle. Thank you very much, Heather. As you know I'm retiring as ALAC chair. But it's the last time I'll be sitting here. But it has been an absolute pleasure working with you, Heather, on all of the issues that are ICANN-related. So I do thank you for all the work you've done as well. On behalf of the ALAC and, of course, on my personal behalf, thank you.

[Applause]

CHAIR DRYDEN: I also need to thank you as well. It seems like we're both escaping at the same time. So -- but it has been a pleasure working with you as well. So -- wonderful.

Okay.

So now in the GAC we have a 30-minute coffee break. And then, when you come back, another election process will be run for the position of the vice chairs. And so we will reconvene as GAC to prepare for our exchange with the board at 4:00. Okay. But be back here at 3:30 to run the election process. But we will reconvene the GAC at -- yeah -- at 4:00. Okay.

[Coffee Break]

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]