**Issue Scoping – Draft GAC Quick Look Mechanism**

Highlighted in blue are steps that are new compared to the current process. Highlighted in yellow are some issues that will need further consideration by the CG.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Step** | **What** | **When** | **Who** | **Comments** |
| 1 | Request for Issue Report submitted to ICANN Staff, which should indicate whether there is standing GAC advice on the mentioned topic if known to the requestor | Day 0 | GNSO Council / ICANN Board / Advisory Committee | There is a template to be filled. It was suggested to add a field indicating whether there is a standing GAC advice on the mentioned topic. |
| To the GAC:   * Is this addition ok? * Any further suggestions? * …   To the GNSO:   * Is this addition ok? * … | | | |
| 2 | Communicate to the “GAC Quick Look Mechanism Committee” that an Issue Report has been requested, including information on the topic, and that a Preliminary Issue Report is expected to be published by X date (usually 45 days after transmission of request to ICANN staff) | Day 0 - 5 | GNSO Liaison to the GAC | The “GAC Quick Look Mechanism Committee” is used here solely as a descriptor of a function, TBD whether to be performed by an existing (sub) group or a new structure.  This mechanism is expected to look into and prioritize not only GNSO requests but also other requests by the GAC. |
| To the GAC:   * Is the idea of creating a “GAC Quick Look Mechanism” accepted? * Should this be some sort of an ongoing committee? * Who should be on this committee? GAC leadership? Topic leads? GAC Secretariat? Dedicated GAC members? Other? * …   To the GNSO:   * Is the idea of sending an early alert by the GNSO Liaison to the GAC accepted? * … | | | |
| 3 | Publication of Preliminary Issue Report for public comment, including information on any standing GAC advice on the topic, if available. | Day 45 | ICANN Staff | Note, ICANN Staff has up to 45 days to prepare the Preliminary Issue Report but may ask for an extension if additional time is needed.  There is a suggestion to include information on any standing GAC advice relevant to the topic under discussion. |
| To the GAC:   * Are you fine with the suggestion to include information on any standing GAC advice relevant to the topic under discussion? * Any further suggestions? * …   To the GNSO:   * … | | | |
| 4 | Submit notification of publication of Preliminary Issue Report for public comment to the GAC | Day 45 | GNSO Liaison to the GAC / GNSO Secretariat (?) | Previously, this used to be the first step where GAC gets notified about an Issue Report. |
| To the GAC:   * To whom should this notification be sent? GAC Chair? GAC secretariat? GAC leadership? GAC topic lead? Quick Look Mechanism Committee? Other? * …   To the GNSO:   * Who should send this notification from the GNSO side? The GNSO Liaison to the GAC? GNSO Secretariat? Other? * … | | | |
| 5 | Convene Quick Look Mechanism Committee to review Preliminary Issue Report | Day 45 - 60 | GAC Secretariat | TBD whether to be done by email exchange, conf call, escalation routes, clarifying questions etc |
| To the GAC:   * Can the GAC Quick Look Mechanism Committee (or any other agreed mechanism) review the Preliminary Issue Report intersessionally? * How will the review take place? by email exchange? through conference calls? Other? * Is the 15-day window (from day 45 to day 60 of the process) a reasonable default period? * …   To the GNSO:   * … | | | |
| 6 | Quick Look Mechanism Committee communicates its recommended response to GAC | Day 60 | Quick Look Mechanism Committee | Recommended response options are:   1. Has public policy implications and the GAC will commence preparations to provide input on the issue to the PDP WG 2. May have public policy implications and the GAC will consider further whether to provide input on the issue to the PDP WG 3. Is unlikely to have public policy implications, but the GAC reserves the right to provide input on the issue to the PDP WG should it determine at a later stage that there are public policy implications, e.g. in view of developments in the WG (one-pagers could serve to facilitate following developments for the GAC) |
| To the GAC:   * Is there any other possible initial response? * Can this step take place intersessionally? * If yes, how will the Quick Look Mechanism Committee communicate its recommended response to the GAC? Over email? Through a conference call? Other?   To the GNSO:   * Does the GNSO expect any other initial responses? * … | | | |
| 7 | GAC reviews Quick Look Mechanism Committee recommended response and decides whether to agree or disagree (this could include referring issue back to Quick Look Mechanism Committee or the GAC deciding as a whole on a response) | Day 60 - 80 | GAC | Does this review require F2F time or could this be done via teleconference or via email?  Even for teleconf/email solutions, there could be a scenario d) “inconclusive/diverging views”, calling for escalation to a F2F. |
| To the GAC:   * How will the review normally take place? by email exchange? Via email or conference call? Requires face-to-face meeting? May require a face-to-face meeting in case of diverging views? * Is the 20-day window (from day 60 to day 80 of the process) a reasonable default period? * …   To the GNSO:   * … | | | |
| 8 | Communicate outcome of quick look mechanism to the GNSO Council | Day 85 | GAC Secretariat / GAC Chair (?)  (once agreed, likely by secretariat on behalf of Chair) | Question: should this be communicated to the GNSO Council Chair, the GNSO Secretariat or submitted as part of the public comment forum. |
| To the GAC:   * Is the 5-day window a reasonable default period? * Who should communicate the agreed outcome of quick look mechanism to the GNSO? GAC secretariat? GAC chair? Topic lead? Quick look mechanism committee? Other? * …   To the GNSO:   * Is the GNSO ok with receiving an initial GAC response within 40 days? * Is the GNSO flexible should the GAC requests longer? * Should this initial response be communicated to the GNSO Council Chair, the GNSO Secretariat or submitted as part of the public comment forum? Other? * … | | | |
| 9 | If outcome of quick look mechanism is option a or b, form a DT to develop input (option a) or consider whether input needs to be provided (option b) that can be provided to the PDP WG when it commences its deliberations | Day 85 | GAC | Note: the PDP WG would be formed after the GNSO Council reviews the Final Issue Report and decides to initiate a PDP.  N.B. DT = Drafting Team |
| To the GAC:   * Is the GAC ok with this? * Is there any other preferred means to develop GAC input? * …   To the GNSO:   * … | | | |
| 10 | Closing of public comment forum on Preliminary Issue Report | Day 85 | ICANN Staff |  |
| To the GAC:   * …   To the GNSO:   * … | | | |
| 11 | Submit Final Issue Report, including outcome of GAC Quick Look Mechanism to the GNSO Council | Day 100 (estimated) | ICANN Staff |  |
| To the GAC:   * …   To the GNSO:   * … | | | |