**A MECHANISM FOR DAY-TO-DAY ONGOING CO-OPERATION**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Steps** | **GAC** | **GNSO** |
| 1. Confirm whether these are the objectives & expectations and/or whether any additions / revisions are needed | Potential objectives & expectations:   * Obtain updates & alerts beyond what is already provided by staff? I’m assuming the answer would be “yes”; in this regard, it might be helpful to ask the GAC for feedback as to the value/utility of the monthly updates as they are currently prepared * Better understanding of GNSO working methods * Create greater sensitivity within the GNSO regarding what may constitute public policy concerns and would/could require GAC input * Mechanisms to raise issues that would require GNSO policy consideration * Obtain responses to questions and be able to convey questions / requires for further information * Mechanism for finding common grounds in case of conflicting views | Potential objectives & expectations:   * Encourage timely GAC input into GNSO Policy Development Activities (do we want/need to add the suggestion that the current timelines for PDPs might need to be amended, pending the outcome of these discussions?) * Provide a mechanism to flag upcoming GNSO policy issues / answer / relay GAC questions * Better understanding of GAC working methods * Mechanism for ongoing dialogue * Mechanism for finding common grounds in case of conflicting views |
| 1. What are the options to be considered to achieve these objectives? Any additional ones? | * GNSO Liaison(s) to the GAC * Group of existing GNSO Council PDP liaisons interacting with the GAC * GAC Chairs / GNSO Chairs regular interaction * Topic Leads / Buddy System * Rethinking recurring joint meetings / conference calls * Further develop / expand early awareness & notification notices | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **A. GNSO Liaison(s) to the GAC** | |
| **Describe option in detail** | The GNSO Council would appoint a representative(s) to the GAC to serve as liaison. The liaison, contingent on GAC agreement, would participate in GAC meetings in between and during ICANN meetings as observer, with right to ask for the floor [Closed meetings? Conference calls? Mailing list? Working Groups?], provide updates to the GAC on GNSO policy activities upon request [and maybe also suggesting opportunities for GAC early engagement .. this could be coordinated through the GAC chair and secretariat in advance of the meetings ][if all agree, should this section clarify that this should be the primary purpose of the reverse liaison function?], provide status updates to the GNSO Council after GAC meetings and communicate questions / requests from the GNSO to the GAC and vice versa. | |
| **How does this mechanism achieve the objectives?** | This mechanism could potentially achieve all goals, provided that a proper flow of information occurs via the liaison(s) to the GAC and the GNSO. My hesitation with this statement is that it seems to impose a rather heavy burden on the liaison function; should we amend this to indicate our assessment that this is one near-term means of improving channels of communication between the GAC and the GNSO? | |
| **What are the potential issues / complications / questions to be addressed?** | * Is the liaison one or more individuals?   I believe one .. as he/she needs funding, will be spared attending the GNSO meetings, and we're still to examine how effective this will be ..   * Who would appoint the liaison and what would be the process for doing so?   I believe the GNSO should appoint the liaison .. Someone from the GNSO will definitely be more capable to explain/suggest the process for doing this ..   * Clear guidance would need to be provided to the liaison what the rules of engagement are in relation to participation in GAC meetings   Agree .. I believe he/she will be normally attending all GAC open meetings (the default of our GAC meetings) and of course may request the floor .. We still need to discuss whether he/she will be able to participate to 'closed meetings', inter-sessional conference calls, GAC WG, … .. Worth noting that GAC WG on GAC working methods is also discussing rules for liaisons engagement (whether GNSO or otherwise) in GAC meetings and is being led by Gema (Spain), who is also a member of our consultation group, .. It would be good to align our final recommendation ..We should also clarify which issues the GNSO liaison would address (e.g. any and all GAC issues or those related to gTLD matters/policy   * How to synchronize GAC and GNSO expectations about outcomes?   Maybe both GAC & GNSO Council chairs may meet briefly after the final GAC meeting, to get a brief summary from the GNSO liaison on foreseen opportunities as well as challenges he faced and need to be addressed ..We should consider whether a “mission statement” at the outset might be useful in establishing the purpose and parameters of the liaison function   * If this role is filled by an existing GNSO Council member, it might be challenging to participate in certain GAC meetings due to conflicts with GNSO meetings   Agree .. and I believe GNSO suggestion was to assign a stepping down member ..   * Should there be a mechanism by which the GAC or GNSO can dismiss/change the liaison?   Apart from the pilot, which should be limited by time, I believe the GNSO liaison will be guided by the rules that are to be agreed regarding his/her engagement in GAC meetings (which meetings to attend, which information may be shared outside the GAC? …) .. so it is implicitly understood that violation of those rules may cause such dismiss .. In this unlikely event, I believe this should be done through both chairs, the GAC and the GNSO Council, of course explaining the reason ..   * As the focus is on early engagement in policy development, the liaison(s) would need to be well informed and closely involved in policy development activities in order to be able to perform the liaison function effectively.   Agree .. I hope coming from the GNSO and serving on the council, he/she would have the necessary experience and would also know where to dig further info and whom to contact whenever necessary .. | |
| **How would this work in practice?** | Probably calling for supporting lines of communication between liaison and topic leads, WG chairs etc. To be further discussed | |
| **Is additional funding required to implement?** | Yes, if the liaison is not already a funded traveller, to allow the liaison to be able to participate in person in GAC meetings at ICANN meetings. (note, the GNSO could also explore the option of reserving one of its existing travel slots for this position, should additional funding not be obtained, e.g. a SG/C could put forward a candidate for this position assuring that as part of the travel slots allocated, one slot would be reserved for the liaison position) | |
| **Would it be possible to implement this option as a pilot?** | Yes  I believe starting LA meeting? | |
| **Overall Assessment** | **Pros** | **Cons** |
| Open channel of communication between the GAC and the GNSO Council after GAC meetings) | Will not necessarily have a cross-cutting experience on various GNSO policy activities; isn’t this the purpose or at least one of the core purposes of the liaison function? |
| Easy to coordinate through a single point of contact | Needs funding (not sure if this is something to be considered, maybe when comparing options) |
| Have the necessary experience and spared the time | Mechanism is highly dependent on a single person (negative impact if not available for one or more meetings) Concur and note that this is a substantial burden; suggest this function be complemented with other improvements in communications (e.g. perhaps amending the monthly policy updates?) |
| Can be implemented starting LA meeting |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **B. GAC Chairs / GNSO Chairs regular interaction** | |
| **Describe option in detail** | A regular call (assumed monthly) between the GNSO and GAC Chairs during which a status update on respective activities would be provided and upcoming opportunities for early engagement identified. (This option does not exclude other options being explored and could also serve to review other options being implemented and suggested adjustments, if needed). Concur and suggest we consider whether regular calls could be organized between GAC and GNSO issue/PDP leads, once identified | |
| **How does this mechanism achieve the objectives?** | This mechanism could potentially achieve all goals, provided appropriate information aggregation and feedback mechanisms to ensure that information also flows through to the whole GNSO and GAC. As noted above, no one action or proposal is likely to “achieve all goals”, but this group considers them to contribute to achieving the shared goals | |
| **What are the potential issues / complications / questions to be addressed?** | * Scheduling challenges for joint availability as well as for call length to cover all relevant matters * How to ensure that information flows back to the whole GNSO and GAC? * Calls for timely updates of all current relevant matters to the respective Chairs beforehand * How to synchronize GAC and GNSO expectations about outcomes? | |
| **How would this work in practice?** | Monthly phone conversations, presumably. To be further discussed | |
| **Is additional funding required to implement?** | No (unless any F2F time is foreseen) | |
| **Would it be possible to implement this option as a pilot?** | Yes | |
| **Overall Assessment** | **Pros** | **Cons** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **C. Topics Leads Buddy System** | |
| **Describe option in detail** | For each topic under consideration by the GNSO that is considered of significant interest to the GAC, a topic lead would be identified both from the GNSO and GAC side. The topic leads would establish between themselves a means of co-operation and information sharing focused on GAC early engagement. The topic leads would provide a status update on their efforts on a regular basis to their respective organizations. GNSO topic leads would participate in GAC meetings if/when needed (in person if in attendance at an ICANN meeting or remotely).  I have a question here, where is this option from option F .. in other words where are those Topic Leads from GNSO Council PDP liaisons (same group, different group, subset, superset, ….) As per our last call, the GNSO members clarified that the group identified in Option F represent internal GNSO liaisons; would it be possible to somehow merge C and F? Or to at least provide the option for the GNSO to use either a PDP WG lead or the GNSO Council PDP liaison for this purpose? | |
| **How does this mechanism achieve the objectives?** | This mechanism could potentially achieve all goals, provided that a mechanism is in place to capture the conversations and updates for broader GNSO & GAC review. However, focus would mainly be on early engagement and less on overall understanding of working methods.  GAC monthly Early Engagement Documents could help identify topics and leads (Olof?) As noted above, the current monthly “early engagement” documents should be assessed for their scope and timeliness in terms of actual “early engagement”; some of them refer to work that is well beyond the issues report stage and it’s not at all clear where/whether/how the GAC might contribute | |
| **What are the potential issues / complications / questions to be addressed?** | * Mechanism relies heavily on individual availability and commitment * Calls for clear engagement briefs for GNSO topic leads if/when needed to attend GAC meetings * In this format, there would be a lack of uniformity (which is something that could be further explored if deemed desirable)   What's meant by uniformity here? Does it refer to same number and same people?   * How to synchronize GAC and GNSO expectations about outcomes?   I believe regular stock taking exchanges (face-to-face or over email) would help synchronize expectations .. Those could be carried out less frequent as soon as a stable mechanism is in place ..   * Calls for a clear system for appointing, briefing and linking up topic leads | |
| **How would this work in practice?** | To be further discussed | |
| **Is additional funding required to implement?** | No | |
| **Would it be possible to implement this option as a pilot?** | Yes | |
| **Overall Assessment** | **Pros** | **Cons** |
| This option includes experts in different topics under consideration by the GNSO | This would require additional time / commitment from both GNSO and GAC topic leads |
| Focuses only on topics that are considered of significant interest to the GAC or do we mean topics that are subjects of PDPs? | Participation in GAC meetings might be difficult if in direct conflict with GNSO meetings |
| Topic leads will be dynamically allocated to match ongoing discussions of interest | Mechanism needs to be developed and would rely heavily on individual availability and commitment |
|  | Topic leads are also identified by the GAC side (more commitment and ease of peer-to-peer communication) | Focuses only on early engagement vs. overall understanding of working methods |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **D. Rethinking recurring joint meetings** | |
| **Describe option in detail** | New approaches could be sought to focus the joint GAC-GNSO meetings on day-to-day co-operation and enhanced mutual understanding for example by: 1) identifying ahead of time topics of mutual interest and identifying specific questions to facilitate the conversation; 2) provide updates on status of PDP WGs ahead of time (e.g. webinar?) to the GAC so that meeting can focus on specific questions / flagging of concerns; 3) invite liaisons / topic leads to provide an update on activities; 4) provide new members with a short overview (for example one pager) that describes remit and working methods of respective organizations; 5) etc. (Note, it might be worth mentioning the new format that the ccNSO-GNSO joint meeting is experimenting with – first 30 minutes are focused on discussing topics of joint interest at the Council level (e.g. joint WGs, FY15 budget & strategy plan), followed by 30 minutes during with a couple of ccNSO & GNSO WG Chairs provide a short intro to their respective efforts that are considered to be of mutual interest, followed by a cocktail reception during which members are encouraged to connect and further discuss some of the topics flagged). | |
| **How does this mechanism achieve the objectives?** | Depends on how meeting is reorganized. Multiple reorganization options possible, as outlined above. | |
| **What are the potential issues / complications / questions to be addressed?** | * The size of the groups as well as lay-out of the meeting room makes it challenging to experiment Perhaps we could experiment with a particular topic for the LA meeting, permitting all of the GNSO stakeholder groups to explain their perspectives, and the GAC to share at least initial thoughts/considerations? * Different ways of working / expectations for the meeting * How to synchronize GAC and GNSO expectations about outcomes? | |
| **How would this work in practice?** | To be further discussed | |
| **Is additional funding required to implement?** | Depends on how meeting is reorganized (e.g. adding a cocktail at the end of the meeting would require additional funding) | |
| **Would it be possible to implement this option as a pilot?** | Yes, at least to some extent, depending on options selected. | |
| **Overall Assessment** | **Pros** | **Cons** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **E. Further develop / expand early awareness & notification notices** | |
| **Describe option in detail** | (Note: This item is also expected to be further discussed as part of the GAC early engagement in the GNSO PDP work stream). Further feedback / input from the GAC would be desirable in order to expand on this option – currently notifications are sent by the GNSO Secretariat to the GAC Secretariat and/or GAC Chair. The documents are then posted on the GAC website and GAC members notified. If this current method is not deemed effective, alternative mechanisms could be explored to further develop and expand early awareness and notification (which may also be achieved by some of the other mechanisms under discussion here). The notifications are often lost in the multitude of emails GAC members currently receive so we need to go beyond a simple “heads up” | |
| **How does this mechanism achieve the objectives?** | The documents currently provide good overviews and insights, but further steps seem necessary to prompt early engagement in practice. This is linked to the “triggers” concept in the PDP paper/chart | |
| **What are the potential issues / complications / questions to be addressed?** | * How to synchronize GAC and GNSO expectations about outcomes? * How to expand/develop the notices – and by whom? * How to further promote knowledge and use of the notices for early engagement action? | |
| **How would this work in practice?** | To be discussed. | |
| **Is additional funding required to implement?** | No, but may depend on selected option and ambition level. | |
| **Would it be possible to implement this option as a pilot?** | Yes | |
| **Overall Assessment** | **Pros** | **Cons** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **F. Group of existing GNSO Council PDP liaisons interacting with the GAC** | |
| **Describe option in detail** | For each GNSO Working Group, a GNSO Council liaison is appointed to ensure a mechanism by which WGs can communicate to the GNSO as well as providing a mechanism for the GNSO Council to assist it in its role as manager of the PDP. As these liaisons typically participate on a regular basis in the WG deliberations but also have a seat on the GNSO Council, they have a unique perspective of the substance of the issue under review as well as the GNSO Council’s role in this process. These liaisons could form a group (via a mailing list mechanism for example) that would be tasked to provide the GAC, either the whole GAC or via a counterpart group, with regular updates and opportunities for engagement. Similarly, this group would take back any feedback / input to the respective WGs to ensure further consideration. Ideally one member of this liaison group would be appointed as the head liaison who would work with the GAC / identified GAC group or individuals, to determine the most appropriate way for such regular updates as well as identifying if/when participation of any of the liaisons may be desirable in any of the GAC meetings. (Note, the head liaison function could also be filled as described under option A).  Agree .. I think this is complementary to option A .. As mentioned above I would appreciate further clarification regarding the difference between option C '**Topics Leads Buddy System**' & option F ' **Group of existing GNSO Council PDP liaisons interacting with the GAC**' .. do they both imply the same representation from the GNSO side? Is the only difference, is that option C suggests topic leads to be identified from the GAC side as well? | |
| **How does this mechanism achieve the objectives?** | This mechanism could potentially achieve all goals, provided that a mechanism is in place to capture the conversations and updates for broader GNSO & GAC review. | |
| **What are the potential issues / complications / questions to be addressed?** | * This would require additional time / commitment from existing GNSO liaisons to GNSO Working Groups * Depending on timing, participation in GAC meetings might be difficult if in direct conflict with GNSO meetings * On the GAC side a mechanism would need to be developed that would allow for regular exchanges of information and input/feedback flowing back to GNSO WGs. * How to synchronize GAC and GNSO expectations about outcomes?   I believe regular stock taking exchanges (face-to-face or over email) would help synchronize expectations .. Those could be carried out less frequent as soon as a stable mechanism is in place .. | |
| **How would this work in practice?** | To be further discussed. | |
| **Is additional funding required to implement?** | Depends on how it would be implemented. | |
| **Would it be possible to implement this option as a pilot?** | Yes | |
| **Overall Assessment** | **Pros** | **Cons** |
| This option includes experts in the different GNSO ongoing policy activities | This would require additional time / commitment from existing GNSO liaisons to GNSO Working Groups |
| WG Liaisons have a unique perspective of the substance of the issue under review as well as the GNSO Council’s role in this process | Participation in GAC meetings might be difficult if in direct conflict with GNSO meetings |
| The group of existing GNSO Council PDP liaisons will be dynamically allocated to match the current ongoing activities | A mechanism needs to be developed to allow for regular exchanges of information and input/feedback flowing back to GNSO WGs |