

---

BUENOS AIRES – GAC Joint Meeting with GNSO  
Sunday, November 17, 2013 – 15:30 to 16:30  
ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

If everybody could please take their seats, the meeting is going to be starting.

This is the continuation of the GAC plenary, Sunday November -- pardon me, Sunday November 17th, ICANN 48, starting at 3:30.

If everyone could please take their seats, the GAC/GNSO session will be starting.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Good afternoon, everyone. If you could take your seats. Please take your seats. We would like to begin.

Okay. We are starting now. I'll start to name names. Okay. Thank you, everyone.

So now we are having an exchange of the GAC with the GNSO.

And the focus of this session is going to be on the issue of GAC early engagement in policy development at ICANN. There's a fair bit of history to this. And we have experience from the gTLD program and other sorts of issues that help inform this current effort to find ways to engage the GAC early on and to identify ways to work with the GNSO on generic top-level domain issues and other generic issues.

---

*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.*

---

And so today our session is going to be led by Jonathan Robinson from the GNSO, who is the chair of the GNSO Council. And so thank to you and to your colleagues from the GNSO for coming to meet with us.

And then, from the GAC side, Manal Ismail from Egypt, who you will know is the co-chair of the Board/GAC recommendation implementation working group that was set up to put in place the GAC-related recommendations coming from the first accountability and transparency review team. And now that we have draft recommendations coming from the second accountability and transparency review team, we see this as still an outstanding area of work. And so the aim is to keep moving this forward. And one of the ways in which we can move this forward is by working within the GAC with the GNSO on these issues. We do have some materials, and they should be available in hard copy for anyone that needs them. And, at this point, I will happily hand over to Manal and Jonathan to take us through the next hour. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Heather. And thank you, all. I think you very well introduced the topic. And we only have an hour to go through our agenda. And we are already, like, five minutes late. So,

---

without any further delay, I will hand over to Jonathan to walk us through the agenda and the slides that have been prepared.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Manal. Good afternoon, Heather. Good afternoon, GAC colleagues. Thank you very much for taking the time to meet with us. I understand your time is precious and that we need to focus on things that are of mutual interest and where we think we can make progress rather than simply reporting things that you are already aware of.

As you know, the GNSO is the body within the ICANN structure charged with developing policy for generic domain names. And it is -- coming out of the ATRT, the original ATRT, as Heather said, there was a recommendation for early engagement in policy. And this is something which we are enthusiastically embracing and have been trying to work with you on.

So really what we wanted to do here was touch very briefly on current GNSO work and the continuous improvement approach that we're taking and then zone in properly on the status of -- the current status of the GNSO/GAC interaction and, particularly, specific policies about possibilities for how we might effectively work together and, to give you some sense of perhaps what the

---

challenges are and how we might take those through a series of next steps and a way forward.

If I could have the next slide, please. Very briefly, the GNSO is actively involved in a series of initiatives, one of which includes actively recognizing that whilst the PDP process, which is the policy process by which the GNSO develops policy, that ultimately may have a binding impact on the contracted parties with ICANN, we recognize that, whilst that needs to be slow or needs to be necessarily deliberative and thorough, there are plenty of opportunities to improve and streamline that. So that's some work, regardless of any review team recommendations or otherwise, that the GNSO is actively working on in terms of self-improvement, if you like.

In addition, as Heather talked about, the ATRT2 has already produced a set of draft recommendations. We are cognizant of those draft recommendations and aware of where those touch on the GNSO's policy development processes and work and are going to keep a close eye on that.

In addition, we're aware that the board is in a position to soon, relatively soon, commission its own review of the GNSO and we are engaged with structural improvements committee of the board who are responsible for commissioning that. So there is plenty of activity going on in and around improving the way in

---

which we do our work and undertake our work with a focus on efficiency, accountability, and various parameters. So that's something which I just thought it would be very useful for you to be aware of over and above any work we are doing or in addition to any work we are doing with you.

For those of you that are interested, there is an active stream of current policy work being done. And the last thing I'm going to do is attempt to take you through any of that in any detail. But there is a succinct briefing note which is linked to from this presentation that relates directly to the current activity. And, if you do have the time, it should take you no more than a relatively short time, 5, 10, 15 minutes to cast your eye over that. And you'll feel properly informed as to the current policy work going on in the GNSO.

So that's what I wanted to say there in terms of our update on the GNSO efforts within the policy work that we're doing. And now let's move on to the next slide to talk about what's happening with respect to the GNSO and the GAC and the early engagement.

One of your colleagues or some of your colleagues helpfully produced a suggested -- and this is one of the documents that Heather referred to -- some suggestions as to where there might be effective improvements to the interaction between the GAC and the GNSO policy development process. That was well-

received and positively received. It was something which certainly looks like it would be scoped to develop some work. The response from the GNSO was to say, well, hang on, there's also something which we should be aware of. And that is that there are opportunities for other supporting organizations and advisory committees within ICANN to already interact with the GNSO policy development process. Let's make sure we are 100% clear on where we are -- where those opportunities exist. And we shared that document with the GAC. And then we began to look at how we might combine those two documents. And, as we looked at that, what we realized was that there are -- that, as you might expect, that throws up a series of detailed questions and issues that come out of it. And that is the second document that you, I hope, have available to you. It's called GAC engagement in GNSO policy development process.

So what we've tried to do is say here are some current methods. Here are some opportunities that have been proposed by the GAC. And here are a series of detailed questions or issues that arise from that. And those are tabulated. And what we might do in a moment with Manal is perhaps highlight some of those points. But, before going on to that detail one other area that was -- that's received some positive attention in the previous one or two times when we've spoken is the possibility of what we might call a reverse liaison. That is someone from the GNSO with

good knowledge of the GNSO policy development processes and policy making methodology to come to the GAC and be available to answer specific questions, to provide specific inputs. And we've even gone so far as to think about what the qualifications of such an individual might be. For example, it probably makes sense that they are not on the GNSO Council currently but have been recently on the council such that they are not encumbered by council work from engaging with the GAC and fulfilling that reverse liaison capability but, nevertheless, are knowledgeable on current methods and policy issues.

Of course, what that then showed us was there are a series of detailed questions that arise from that as well. Examples of that might be would that liaison be expected to be participating in and be included in all GAC sessions, closed or open? What might be the GNSO's expectations of such a person? What might the GAC's expectations be? Would that person be funded by ICANN to participate in face-to-face meetings? And so on.

So there's a series -- in both of these two very well-intentioned areas of activity -- this is the existing interaction points and the proposed improvements, bullet one on the slide and, bullet two, the reverse liaison -- out of both of those cascade a series of detailed questions which need to be discussed and teased out so that we have the right level of expectation of what might come

---

out of both of those two key points. And then third on this slide is how we might think about the possibility of trying out some of those points, whether it's the use of a reverse liaison -- but, really, I think we're really referring more to point one here, which is the proposed improvements, whether we might try those out with one or more current PDPs. So I think that's a brief status of where we're up to.

Let me pause here and see if either, Manal, you would like to make any comments or anyone from the GNSO council or from the GAC or if there are any comments or questions from within on where we are so far before we look at the next steps going forward.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Jonathan. And, if we don't have any reactions so far, we can, if you don't mind, have the table projected maybe to go through further details of what are issues that we should be looking at. I'm sure we don't have the time here to get into the very details of all the issues. But at least we get the sense of what are things that need to be nailed down to have this activity concluded. So, if we can get the table projected, please. Okay, sure.



---

So it, basically, highlights the steps that's normally followed for a PDP, a GNSO PDP, and introduced the suggestions made very helpfully by U.S. for where the GAC could be requested to provide input.

So there is also issues and questions that arise from having integrated the GAC's suggestion to the PDP. We need to look into those issues. And the table was circulated earlier, but I'm sure not everyone had the time to read and go through.

But, for example, what would be the time frame required for the GAC to review and comment? I mean, if -- if the GNSO has requested feedback from the GAC, how would this fit into the overall timeline? And I'm sure something like this may differ maybe from one topic to another.

Normally, I think that the GNSO notifies the GAC through an email to the secretariat. So, again, is this an agreed way to proceed with? Does the GAC see something different? How would the GAC input be handled or considered by the GNSO? What if there is some disagreement? Would this halt the whole process, how this should be considered?

So there are so many issues that we can go through very quickly without getting into the details but just to agree how to proceed forward. For example, would the GAC indicate up front whether

it intends to comment? Or is the working group expected to wait until a GAC response is received? If substantial time is needed to develop a GAC response, would it be acceptable if the working group would continue its deliberations noting that the GAC input is forthcoming? Who determines whether consultations are needed and how and when are these conducted? Also, the working group is required to acknowledge inputs received from other SOs and ACs but may or may not agree with the input. So, if it does not agree, it will outline the rationale for its disagreement in its reports. And the question is: Is that in line with incorporating GAC input, meaning that, if there is disagreement, would a rationale be provided and that's it and everything continues? Does the communication on the opening of the public comment forum meet the requests to send to the GAC for review? And, if not, what does the GAC expect otherwise?

And, also, what is intended or expected -- sorry. Oh, yeah. This is the step where the council recommendations report to the board includes an overview of consultations taken. And this is a step where the GAC is not really consulted in the normal process.

And there is a suggestion that the GNSO Council consult with the GAC prior to the final decision.

So the question is what is intended or expected? And is this similar to the board notification of the GAC prior to it considering

---

policy recommendations for adoption? If so, how much time would be required for such consultation?

Noting that, typically, the GNSO Council will vote on the first or second meeting following the submission of the final working group report.

Also, if another form of consultation is foreseen, how would this look or happen in practice? And, finally, what happens if the GAC recommends that the GNSO Council should not adopt the recommendations or, if possible, changes are suggested?

So I'm sure there might be other questions also. But, I mean, those are the questions that popped up immediately from the GNSO incorporating GAC's suggestion for early input.

So, again, if anyone has any initial reaction to this before -- so I see Norway's hand. Norway, please?

NORWAY:

Thank you, Manal. And thank you for -- to Egypt for engaging in -- with the GNSO on these important issues. I think we -- what you just went through identifies, of course, all the different issues that need to be solved.

But I think, also, we just need to identify the formal versus informal procedures of early engagement. Of course, the formal

---

procedures can be defined in -- as the ATRT2 draft report indicates, do we need any bylaws changes or not to define this?

But, of course, also, the formal early engagement can also be defined in the GNSO PDP and also could be defined in the GAC operating principles to try to provide answers to all those questions as you just went through.

So that's, I think, something that we need to agree on where to define the early engagement processes and try to identify also what you sent.

I think also very important to try to specify what's the obligations of the two parties? Because the obligations for the GAC to provide the response to a request from the GNSO and what are the obligations for the GNSO to treat the input from the GAC? I think that also needs to be defined properly.

But it could be loosely defined or defined in a lengthy way or not. But I think we need some sort of definition of this into this document where we specify the procedures. And, if we do that, then, of course, a lot of these questions will be answered. And, of course, in addition we can have informal interactions like, for example, a meeting during -- like this. A joint meeting between the GAC and the GNSO is an informal exchange of discussions on issues, which is also important and useful, I think. But, of course,

---

it does not trigger any formal obligations to any of the parties. So I think it's a combination of the two, the formal and informal things. I think, that would be very useful to try to define. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Norway. This is very helpful. I'm not sure if Jonathan wanted to react also. But let me very quickly comment on one thing you mentioned regarding the bylaws. And I think we have to agree first on the ideal thing that we want and then see where would this be reflected, where to reflect this and have it documented and whether it needs change in the bylaws. So it is definitely a needed step, but I see it coming later in the process.

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

Thank you, Manal. Thank you, Norway. I think that is helpful. That's exactly the kind of response we need to tease out from this series of questions. As you can see, we've got this quite relatively well-structured document that says these are the phases of PDP; these are the current opportunities for input; these are some proposed new methods for input. And, if we are to have these proposed new methods for input, we ought to have a common understanding so we don't end up with a misunderstanding of, as you say, the obligations or expectations that cascade out from

---

that. So it's exactly right. It's intended to -- these questions to tease that out.

I must say I also respond warmly to your point, though, on the informal interaction. And I would say that my sense is we would be always willing to brief you on all of the work we're doing, a subsection of the work we're doing, or one very specific piece of the work we're doing and to have your input at any time at a meeting and have that informal interaction as well. So thank you for that suggestion.

MANAL ISMAIL: So yes. Iran, please.

IRAN: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I try to speak slowly and separating syllables one from the other in order to be properly understood.

First of all, I thank everybody involved in this issue. The topic and process is helpful, is good. Early engagement in the PDP.

However, so many questions are raised and so many substantive questions are also raised at this meeting. For most of them, still there is no answer. So, until we find an appropriate mechanism how to address these questions and how to formulate the course

---

of action required for these questions, I don't think that we should be engaged to changing bylaw. We should not rush to do that until we have a concrete answer to these questions in order to not compromise the stability of the bylaw. Bylaw is sort of the convention for us. So we should not, because of any question which has no proper answer yet or there are a variety of answers, which we have not been able up to now to finalize that to go and changing bylaw.

However, I come to the part of the question I raised, what are the mechanism to answer to all of these questions?

You have mentioned that we have one hour. With so many questions, it would be difficult to reply to that.

So I think it is up to -- it is incumbent to us, not up to us, it is incumbent to us to find mechanisms how to respond to these sort of valid questions raised and also valid substantive questions raised by such by distinguished colleague from Norway.

So I suggest, Madam Chair, that you kindly take any appropriate actions to formulate ways and means to reply to these questions. And, in fact, these are some of the questions. There may be more questions.

And I remember that at the last meeting, we had the same one hour of discussions, and good questions raised. And we have not

---

been able to answer to those questions except we have some comment, early comment on that.

So at this stage, I think it's very difficult to follow the discussions.

Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Iran. And I fully agree with all what you have said. Actually, what we were saying that we need to, as you mentioned, agree on the overall process that we want to see in place, then see what parts mandate changes in bylaws or whatever. And I think you have very smoothly introduced the next part of the agenda, which I will refer to Jonathan to take us through.

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

Yes. Just a remark, though. Thank you, Iran. Those are good points. And that's quite clear that it seems to us that we have a lot of questions. And, frankly, one of the things that we've struggled with a little bit is by what method do we take this forward? How do we go ahead? Because it's all very well having the good intent, all of the questions that that throws up, both with respect to the reverse liaison and the possibility of alternative or various interaction points. So I take your point. It's



---

how do we -- how do we make some progress on trying to answer that?

And we have a suggestion for you, I think, which we can perhaps come to on the next slide and see what responses to that are. Because clearly this forum is not practical to make that kind of progress.

So what our thought is is to -- Well, let me just say one other thing before we do that, is I just want to make it clear, and this is very respectful of the position that GAC members find themselves in as country representatives and that they may not be able to participate in these -- in working groups or in other areas, but I do want to make it clear that it is always open -- the GNSO is always open to having GAC members, should they choose to or feel able to, to observe or participate in any GNSO meetings, at any GNSO PDP working group meetings, both at this meeting and afterwards. And all meetings are recorded. So even should you feel that you are not able to participate as such, you are perfectly able to obtain the recordings if there's a particular PDP that causes you concern or that you have a specific interest in.

So I am sensitive to the fact that it is not always possible to do so, but I do want to make it on the record that it is available to do so. I don't mean that to be in any way provocative; rather, just to be making it clear that the door is open, so to speak.

---

But going forward to our next steps and way forward, what I think we've got to is that we really seem to need a small group of representatives from the GNSO and the GAC to really pick up and work with and try to make some progress on these issues, so that by the time we next meet with you, we can actually say here are some proposed answers to these questions. These are ways in which -- now, I don't even yet know that we will find the answers, but we really need to, I guess, enable a group to start to make some real -- put some hours in to try and make some progress in answering those.

So that's really the proposal. And then we undertake some intersessional work between now and the next meeting so that by the time we have an equivalent meeting with you next time, we're able to report progress on either the reverse liaison or the answers to these questions and make some concrete progress.

So that's really where we propose taking it next.

Over to you, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you. I see Iran asking for the floor again.

Iran.

IRAN:

Sorry, Madam Chair, for asking for the floor again.

Yes, thank you very much for the reply you've given, and thank you very much for the suggestion you have made that at this meeting, due to various conditions, we are not able to treat the questions and having proper reply to that. However, we need to work for an appropriate mechanism, and you have mentioned one of them which is useful. And, in fact, the experience of GAC recently showed that establishing a working group to work between the GAC session was quite useful and productive and efficient. We have seen that yesterday.

And so what I suggest, perhaps for consideration of distinguished colleague, that we establish a joint working group of the two entities and designate someone to lead that. Perhaps yourself if you continue or want to do that or whatever. And working between the two, and try to prioritize questions that which one is more or has more priority in order to be treated first? While we do not want to exclude any other questions, importance -- all of them are important, but still, we have to have a degree of priority for them in order to enable us between the two GAC meetings to react. And I think that, at least at this stage, is the only mechanism that could work until we get experience and to see that it might be additional mechanism or might be some improvement.

---

So that is the establishment of the joint activity between the two. And someone leading that -- as I mentioned, either yourself or anyone else or any vice chair, or I don't know. And that will be the good thing.

But prioritization is very, very important.

Perhaps at this meeting of GAC, maybe we could be able to make some suggestion with respect to order of priority, or if we are not able to do that at this meeting, the first action by the leader of the group would be to ask those participating in the activity of joining to suggest the order priority, and then take next steps.

Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Iran. And I'm happy the proposal for a way forward is well accepted. And I think this is a good way forward. And as Heather mentioned earlier, this particular part of the implementation was delayed partially because of the new gTLDs discussion, but also I think partially because we were intersessionally, we were working in isolation. The GAC is working on certain proposals. The GNSO is working on other proposals. And then it's very hard to merge this here in a plenary. So a working group I think is going to progress intersessionally.

---

So I see the U.S. asking for the floor, and then we have U.K. next.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Madam Chair. And thank you, Jonathan, and other councillors and GNSO members, for coming in with such a very sort of well thought-out approach. You have really clearly put in a considerable amount of time and thought, and I think certainly very grateful myself, but I think it's a really testament to the fact that you are as committed as we are to find a way forward out of our little silos, as we all like to talk about them here.

So I wanted to suggest -- to commend you for that. It's an enormous amount of work. I would have to grow with my esteemed colleague from Iran. There are a lot of questions, and there may be more. So I do think we need to start tackling -- We have to start somewhere. I kind of sense that was your thinking as you all prepared this. We need to start somewhere.

I'd also like to suggest, and maybe that will calm some of the hesitation, it may well be the case that down the road, we need to look at bylaw amendments. I would suggest that we not sort of fixate on that in the near term; that we keep a running track of what might have to be looked at, but that we try to get the work started by just calling it an experiment, if you will. I mean, do you have to start somewhere in finding those opportunities for more

---

face-to-face interaction and a more regular sort of communication.

Part of the challenge, I think, both of our communities have is, to a certain degree, your community, the GNSO community, is very large and very diverse. And so for us, part of the value of increasing our interactions is to better understand the interest and the concerns and the perspectives of all of those diverse interests.

We are, perhaps, sometimes easier in that we're all governments and so we all understand how we engage with each other, but we do know that even after all these years being in the ICANN tent, sometimes the GAC seems to be mysterious.

So it would be good for us to help you understand how we do what we do, and part of that happens in national capital, just the way we consult, the way we coordinate, the time it takes to get expert input, whether it's an intellectual property issue or a consumer protection issue. The individuals you see here typically don't possess all of that expertise. So we have to consult, which then takes a certain amount of time. So when you are having a working group that is having weekly calls of two hours and needs answers, that's exactly where we have the challenge at home, because it's not always possible.

---

So I don't know how. I think we do need to set up a Joint Working Group. I think that's an excellent idea. I'm happy to volunteer. Feel like I've been involved in these issues for quite some time, and very keen for us to find some way forward.

I would also note that this is very closely related to another GAC working group on GAC working methods. And I do think because we have now this initiative from you, which I believe we all understand as being under the rubric of the Board/GAC Recommendation Implementation Working Group, that perhaps we take those early engagement points out of the GAC working methods and assign it as a subset here, and do agree to an joint working group to try to advance work intersessionally.

So I will stop there. I know we're running out of time, but I did want to thank you very, very much for this very thoughtful response. And hopefully we are all going to be -- We will be discharging our responsibilities, hopefully, on new gTLDs, largely, at this meeting and can then turn attention to a lot of the other pressing issues that you all have on your plates.

Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, U.S. We have U.K., then Switzerland.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Yes, thank you, Manal, and thank you, Jonathan, for coming here to present on this with such clarity, the task ahead for us.

You know, it's been a nagging worry for me for some time how I, as a GAC representative from one country, are going to find the time and the resource to fulfill this responsibility that we've all agreed is incumbent on us to engage in policy development as early as possible. And the structured approach that you've set out here with inputs from the U.S., much appreciated, is very helpful, indeed.

And I certainly see the key objective, really, is to identify the stage in any policy development process when we, the government representatives, need to engage on any public policy aspect which has been identified, if any are identified.

So I think the kind of structured and the step-by-step approach is very helpful in clarifying in my mind where the intersects between the GAC and the GNSO are going to lie. It's very helpful, indeed.

I have the sense that perhaps in a lot of policy development, there may not be any issue for us. I don't have any data analysis on that. And I did wonder, first of all, whether the preliminary issue report was a first stage for us to sort of engage on the issue and then tick a box, nothing for us, or it sets, then, in train a process and a timeline for us to engage.



The reverse liaison idea I think is an excellent one. It provides the channel, the conduit for information to pass to us as to what is happening in terms of policy proposals at an early stage. And I certainly see a lot of value in determining how we can implement that liaison in the way that's been envisaged. I really support that.

So I'm keen for us to get moving on this now, as previous speakers have said. And a Joint Working Group idea is -- or initiative is I think a valuable thing to do so that over the next few months, we can then start to finesse some of these options where we jointly work together. I think that's -- that's an important objective. And perhaps by the time the next meeting, we'll have some specificity on the questions that need to be resolved.

But I also have the sense that we shouldn't try and overengineer this at this stage. There will, with practice when this is fully -- when this operational, this GAC engagement and policy development, we will learn from experience, I guess. and maybe some of the questions that we're tabling now might only be resolved were experience and practice. But that might well be the case.

So basically, I'm very supportive of this. It's a clear, structured approach, and I think a lot of colleagues, like me, who haven't had the chance, really, to focus on processes that already exist, it's

---

---

really helpful for us in understanding the existing processes and how we can enhance those consistent with the ATRT recommendations. So I'm very willing to help and contribute in the development of this, with concrete progress for the next meeting in Singapore when we can discuss some of the specifics, perhaps, in more detail.

Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, U.K. Very helpful remarks.

Switzerland.

SWITZERLAND:

Thank you. And I would also join those who thanked Manal and everybody for this interesting and relevant work.

As also my colleague from the U.K. said, one of the problems we suffer from, most of us, is basically the lack of resources to deal with all the issues that we're confronted here in ICANN with the resources necessary. This is a problem that is actually growing even further.

So we are really looking for simple and easy mechanisms to engage as early as possible in discussions as it's more efficient for all of us that we have discussions at an early stage and not come

---

in very late where it's much more work and efforts and costs are involved in modifying things that could have been done, adapting things that could have been done much easier earlier.

But we also need simple and effective mechanisms to try and have a decision on these proposals that are on the table here, and to then actually implement them so that it actually makes our NGO work work easier. And as Suzanne from the U.S. has mentioned, we have also started in an internal working group to try to make GAC working methods more effective. There is some overlap, but there's also some issues that are purely GAC internal. I think we should use these, both processes to identify things that we can implement now easily and identify things that need more thinking and maybe changing of the bylaws, which are a longer term issue. So on both working groups, we should basically follow two tracks.

And then I guess you know that we now have a doubled GAC secretariat, so we have four people at our disposal, and I think it would be also useful, I think, to involve the GAC secretariat in the working out of these mechanisms and also in helping to provide briefing papers for things that help provide communication, facilitate communication between GNSO and the GAC. And we're looking forward to actually having this secretariat support that could also be used for this. Thank you.

---

MANAL ISMAIL: Definitely. Thank you, Switzerland. And we would definitely rely heavily on our secretariat in this coming period.

So Norway.

NORWAY: Yes, thank you, Manal. Just a quick -- a quick point, and I think that's a very key issue that my colleague from the U.K. identified, to try to identify where the public-policy issues do sort of affect. Because also as Switzerland said, we are not resourced to do interaction with the GNSO on all the issues. So of course the key priority is to find where it's useful, and that we actually do have a role to provide input to this. Because we as the GAC, of course, would not like to spend much time on issues that have no sort of impact or have no results. And so I think that's really a key issue, to try to identify that.

So -- But of course it's not an easy task, but I think we need to do something to try to identify that, and some processes. And as mentioned, the secretariat could also probably be used for trying to identify some public-policy issues within the sort of work plan of the GNSO and in the GNSO PDPs. Thank you.

---

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Norway. Indeed, a very important point that needs to be considered.

So if we don't have any further requests for the floor, then maybe we can conclude.

I think a concrete action item that we come up with from our session today would be that we should call for volunteers who would be interested to participate in this working group from the GAC side as well as from the GNSO side. We can work this, of course, off the meeting, and we can exchange this online later and kick start the working group.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you very much, Manal. Thank you, GAC colleagues. That's very encouraging. I think we have -- it's very useful and helpful to have your support for a mechanism to take things forward.

I've certainly heard a couple of key points for me. One is wherever possible we should gate out of the process those that do not have public-policy impact for the sake of efficiency.

Two, we need to recognize the respective pace at which the two groups work and manage that effectively. And certainly a couple of calls for not to overengineer this and perhaps to experiment or

---

try some simple approaches first before trying to overdesign the whole thing.

So thank you to those of you who listened and thank you to those of you who were also able to contribute. I know not everyone was, but really appreciate the time. That's very useful for us going forward.

CHAIR DRYDEN: That's great.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, and back to our chair.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Just thank you both for your work. And I hope that you would both consider leading that working group effort and continue to work -- guide work on this.

So thanks again to the GNSO for coming to meet with us about this important issue.

And for the GAC, please don't leave. The NGPC is due to join us more or less now to have our exchange with them. So thank you.

[ END OF TRANSCRIPT ]