**GAC Quick Look Mechanism – Experiences to date (updated 4 December 2015)**

**Background**: The Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) and Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) agreed as part of their discussions during the ICANN meeting in Singapore (ICANN52) to implement the ‘Quick Look Mechanism’ to facilitate early engagement of the GAC in the issue scoping phase of the GNSO PDP on a pilot basis. The details of the quick look mechanism are outlined here:. The Quick Look Mechanism is being implemented on a trial basis for a minimum of 3 consecutive GNSO PDP's immediately following the adoption of the motion.

Following the end of this trial period, the GAC-GNSO Consultation Group (CG) is expected to report back to the GAC and GNSO Council on the effectiveness of these recommendations as a result of the experiences gained during the trial period. Furthermore, the CG is expected to make a recommendation as to whether or not the preliminary recommendations concerning the issue scoping phase of the PDP should be permanently implemented, either in their current form, or with possible modifications based on the further work of the CG including experience gained during the trial.

This document represents a preliminary overview of the Quick Look Mechanism as it has been implemented to date and some initial food for thought from a staff perspective that may facilitate the subsequent review by the CG.

**Quick Look Mechanism experience to date:** To date, the Quick Look Mechanism has been applied for two GNSO Issue Reports, namely the Issue Report on the Next-Generation gTLD Registration Directory Service (RDS) to replace WHOIS and the Issue Report on new gTLD Subsequent Procedures. The following steps have been followed in these cases, as also prescribed in <http://gnso.icann.org/en/drafts/gac-cg-issue-scoping-27jan15-en.pdf>:

* Following the adoption of a request for an Issue Report or the receipt by the GNSO Council of the request for an Issue Report (in the case of the Issue Report on the Next-Generation gTLD Registration Directory Service (RDS) to replace WHOIS which was requested by the ICANN Board), the GNSO Council Liaison to the GAC informed the GAC secretariat of the request and planned publication of the Preliminary Issue Report for public comment (see for example: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/correspondence/cole-to-dale-14may15-en.pdf> sent on 14 May).
* The GAC secretariat acknowledged receipt on 14 May noting that the GAC Secretariat

‘*will identify existing GAC advice that may be relevant to this issue and provide this to you as soon as possible after consultation with the GAC Quick-Look Committee (comprised, as per previous advice, of the Chair, Vice Chairs, Manal Ismail and Suzanne Radell). We will also give the Committee “heads up” notification on the preparation of a Preliminary Issue Report, so that the Committee and GAC as a whole can respond promptly when the Report is issued for public comment, in accordance with the recently agreed procedures; and our initial advice (that is, ACIG in consultation with ICANN GAC support staff) on whether there may be public policy implications. Without in any way pre-empting the views of the Committee or the GAC as a whole, I should indicate now that I believe that there is existing GAC advice that may be relevant; and that there is a good case for ategorizing the issue as having public policy implications. Hopefully this would not come as a surprise to anyone. However, the agreed Quick-Look procedures will now give the GAC an opportunity to work through the issues in a considered way, including possible mechanisms for GAC input to any policy development process’.*

* This communication was followed by a formal response on 20 May confirming the views of the Quick Look Committee (see <http://gnso.icann.org/en/correspondence/dale-to-cole-20may15-en.pdf>).
* A further clarification and reconfirmation of previous GAC Advice was received from the GAC Secretariat on 9 July 2015 (see <http://gnso.icann.org/en/correspondence/dale-to-cole-09jul15-en.pdf>).
* Staff published the Preliminary Issue Report, taking into account the GAC input received, on 13 July (see <http://forum.icann.org/lists/comments-rds-prelim-issue-13jul15/>).
* The GAC Secretariat submitted its input to the public comment forum on 10 September (see <http://forum.icann.org/lists/comments-rds-prelim-issue-13jul15/msg00012.html>) providing substantive input to be considered in the PDP. See report of public comments here <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-rds-pdp-07oct15-en.pdf>.
* Staff submits the Final Issue Report to the GNSO Council on 7 October (see <http://whois.icann.org/sites/default/files/files/final-issue-report-next-generation-rds-07oct15-en.pdf>).
* The GAC has assigned its Public Safety WG (see [https://gacweb.icann.org/display/gacweb/GAC+Public+Safety+Working+Group](https://gacweb.icann.org/display/gacweb/GAC%2BPublic%2BSafety%2BWorking%2BGroup) ) to follow the GNSO PDP on Next-Generation gTLD Registration Directory Service and develop further GAC contributions.
* Regarding the GNSO PDP on new gTLD Subsequent Procedures, the GNSO Council Liaison to the GAC informed the GAC Secretariat on 14 July of the request and planned publication of the Preliminary Issue Report for public comment (see <http://gnso.icann.org/en/correspondence/cole-to-dale-13jul15-en.pdf> ).
* The Quick Look initial comments from the GAC on the Preliminary Issue Report on new gTLD Subsequent Procedures may be outlined at the GNSO-GAC session in Dublin and are due to be filed in the currently open public comment period for this report (see <https://www.icann.org/public-comments/new-gtld-subsequent-prelim-2015-08-31-en> )

*.*

**Staff’s preliminary observations:**

* Less time is needed by the GAC to provide input than initially foreseen as it was originally anticipated that the response from the Quick Look Committee would be received as part of the public comment forum on the Initial Response.
* Substantive input to be considered in the PDP is very helpful, but at the stage of the Preliminary Issue Report it is input that will be passed on to the PDP WG to consider in due time as the Preliminary Issue Report is focused on scoping the issue.
* Further consideration may need to be given to how to ensure public tracking of correspondence back and forth.

**Issues for CG Discussion:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Questions** | **Comments** | **CG Conclusion / Recommendation** |
| What is the experience from others involved in this process to date (e.g. GAC Quick Look Committee, GAC Secretariat, GNSO liaison to the GAC)? | Manal: As a member of the GAC Quick Look Committee, it was a positive experience, that worked very smoothly and had good results, illustrated in early flagging of GAC interest and even early provisioning of GAC preliminary input. A great deal of this has to do with the mechanisms in place and the smooth coordination between the GNSO Liaion, ICANN Staff and GAC Secretariat. In addition it should be also attributed to good preparations by GAC secretariat. More concretely, every time the committee receives an email from the GAC secretariat, it included a suggested way forward, a proposed draft reply, or both; which, in my personal opinion, helped committee members to provide quick responses and/or suggestions. |  |
| Are there any improvements that can already be identified that should be considered by the Consultation Group?  | Manal: I agree that *"Further consideration may need to be given to how to ensure public tracking of correspondence back and forth."*, in addition to tracking of how GAC input was considered. |  |
| Does the Quick Look Mechanism facilitate preparation and engagement of the GAC in the later stages of a PDP? | Manal: I believe later stages would benefit more from close coordination among a dedicated GAC lead (with or without a working group), the GNSO Liaison and the GAC secretariat. This would be more effective to develop substantial input and engage in substantial discussions. The Quick Look Mechanism, as the name indicates, is more of a standing committee to:* provide quick and timely response on whether the issue under discussion has public policy aspects
* provide quick and timely response on whether the GAC is interested to provide input to this PDP
* Assign the following steps to an existing GAC working group, a new GAC working group or a GAC lead, as deemed appropriate. Thoughts?
 |  |