SAN JUAN – BGRI Working Group Meeting
Saturday, March 10, 2018 – 18:30 to 19:30 UTC
ICANN61 | San Juan, Puerto Rico

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So, we will be starting in a minute. So if you can please start taking your seats. So, thank you everyone for staying till the very last session of the day. So, so this is agenda item 7 on the board GAC recommendation implementation working group scheduled for 1830 on Saturday 10 March for 60 minutes. And please again remember to state your name and affiliation for transcript purposes when you are called upon. So. Thank you for coming back at time.

So, this is basically the board, GAC recommendations implementation working group meeting. I was just wondering whether we need to change the name of the working group. It's not becoming indicative anymore. So this group was initially formed to implement the recommendations of ATRT of the accountability and transparency review teams one and two and now it is looking at the effectiveness of GAC advice to the board and working on enhancing the GAC board relationship.

So we have a few things to discuss today and I think David, you already have a few slides for us, so.

DAVID OLIVE:	Thank you Manal. We'd just like to put up the agenda for the board today. The six length of timeline for GAC consideration, suggestion to improve structure of the communiqué, number strict, the use of the action request register for tracking of GAC advice, number four open GAC advice items and number five, new GAC participation, training and other programs and then any other business or topics is six. If there's agreement, Mdm. chair, we would have you move forward with that.
MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:	So, any suggestions or objections to the agenda? Yeah, if not, then please let's move forward.
DAVID OLIVE:	I will turn it over to my colleague Christine Willett to go over the first topic, GAC advice consideration timeline.
CHRISTINE WILLET:	Let me shortly introduce this. Basically as you go back through history there's been a lot of changes over time. Initially it was all very fluid.
MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:	Sorry, Maarten because the transcript on it right. So let me just…

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I am not Christine Willet.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Working group is cochaired of course by the GAC and the board, so we have Maarten cochairing this working group from the board side. So I'm sorry, Maarten over to you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you. So the history of improvements over time in board GAC collaboration coming from the time where prior to 2013, 2013 everything was really very ad hoc, we moved toward time where the GAC communiqué came in in 2013 which helped improve the communication already. And yet, the responses sometimes took a lot of time and to enhance the could predict ability and ability of the GAC to be better able to deal with also the response of the board, we have permitted to a new timeline and it is exactly this timeline that Christina will present. This has been presented in the Hydrobot and we have kept to that and would like you to hear and give your comments on that, Christine?

CHRISTINE WILLET: Thank you Maarten. Christine Willet, ICANN org. This is a general timeline that the board and org has been endeavoring to follow for consideration of GAC communiqué's sense of the Hyderabad

communiqué. Roughly between ICANN meetings their summer between 14 and 18 weeks in general throughout the year and we have developed a timeline of activities that aligns to have board consideration of the communiqué roughly by week 12 in advance in advance of the next meeting optimally for weeks prior to the next ICANN meeting. Next slide?

Specifically for a San Juan communiqué from ICANN 61 we have a more aggressive timeline that we are going to endeavor to pursue. There are 15 weeks between ICANN 61 and 62, however the board is made it a practice to consider the communique and adapt a score barred at their intersessional workshops and that is at present scheduled for week 16 following ICANN 61 and so this is a very aggressive schedule that the board will endeavor support the board to pursue and I will caveat depending on the complexity and nature of the issues that are in the communiqué there could certainly be challenges in maintaining the schedule.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you very much. Just to also show there's a couple of other elements, one is the interaction of other stakeholders in ICANN and the other thing is we as a board want to make sure that the scorecard you get at the end is a solid one which is why we try to have it ready for full board discussion and decision in the first upcoming board meeting after the communiqué, and this time

again this leads to the aggressive timeline which makes about eight weeks from now and about seven weeks before the next GAC meeting you will have that.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you Maarten and thanks Christine and if you'd like after every item we can posit just to see because they are not necessarily related so if we can make this interactive and so allowed me to also give GAC colleagues on this background because we received a request from the board to share questions. We would like to discuss here and this was before we received the scorecard in response to the GAC communiqué. So this issue was raised that we would like to have the scorecard earlier so that we can have an accurate list of questions to share with the board. Again, as was mentioned by Christine and Maarten it's a bit challenging due to the reasons that were mentioned and this is really an aggressive timeline for the board. So we truly appreciate your considering to try as feasible. And I also think it's a mutual understanding. So you would also understand that we might find you in our list of questions depending on the scorecard whenever we receive it. So I'll stop here and see if we have any comments from GAC colleagues before proceed with the following agenda item.

`   So if not, then can we please proceed Christine?

CHRISTINE WILLET: Thank you Christine Willet ICANN org. The next slide speaks to suggestions, potential changes to improve the structure of the GAC communiqué. Maarten may I address? Would you like me to read this or…

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I think basically what we have seen is a very well structured communiqué which we from our side don't have specific requests. There are two issues with that we would like if there is asked to the board that it in one section so that we don't have to judge ourselves that we may need to respond questions that we might take out of [the rest] that is the one thing and we also talked about whether open issues should be repeated or not. And we feel that that is not necessary. In particular because now with the new use of the action response, action request register we keep will track of t---

CHRISTINE WILLET: The next slide speaks to the action request register. This is the internal tracking tool that the org is using to track a variety of advice to the ICANN board as well as to correspondence. We put it in place to track GAC advice back in June 2017. And the org went back and reviewed all the advice provided by the GSE in the

communiqué going back to Beijing at ICANN 46. We discussed this at 60 and Abreu dobby and shared it with the [indiscernible] and the GAC the list of advice and what we call historical advice going back five years. We documented evidence of the Board's consideration and responses to address and take action on that advice. And we presented that inventory in Abu Dhabi.

So, going forward we would look tolook to your point and question, Manal, we would look to agree on that inventory and the status of items and we could publish that inventory and the status of those items in an agreed-upon place on the GAC website and/or on ICANN.org and update that as the status changes. That is how we are proceeding with advice from the other advisory committees.

So, to that note, after the inventory was presented ICANN 60, the ICANN board as the BGRI and the GAC for feedback on the inventory of items and I have a couple other slides going through the status of the open items. But in general all items have been considered by the board. There are 15 items pending ongoing community work. And 11 items pending implementation work. And those are covered in the next slide but I will pause there.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Any comments or questions from GAC colleagues? super, thank you let's proceed please.

EN

CHRISTINE WILLET: Thank you, next slide. The inventory of items that we shared at ICANN 60 and now reflects the status of items according to these phases, all advice is looked at and processed through a five phase framework phase I to receive, acknowledge, publish the advice, phase 2 to understand the advice, phase 3 for the board to evaluate and consider the advice, phase 4, once the board considers the advice, generally they will direct the organization to move forward and implement such advice and then finally we moved to phase 5 to close the advice. And this reflects the status that we shared at ICANN 60. Next slide?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: This affects also the next agenda point. These are the open points that are pending ongoing community action that is described below. And that is I guess all we have to say about it at this moment. You feel we must anything? This is a list I think as we both understand is the current list for open questions, right?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes that's right and I invite the colleagues to have comment on the open items of advice to make sure we are all on the same page. So. So, any comments... Or we can proceed? So yeah, thank you.

HARRY CHAPMAN: New Zealand. I was just wondering on your thoughts on the board when the board has consider J advice or some members with the GAC disagree [indiscernible] the board is considered the [ambassador]

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I guess basically this has happened in the past and once we have the procedure that the communiqué is presented to the board shortly after we have a call within the board and the GAC to clarify the questions, not to answer them, not to negotiate or discuss but purely to make sure that we get it will, that it is all understood. So this helps and then we get the scorecard, which is bringing it all together very clearly. And we sent to that, we discussed this again in the groups. So I think we have been able to ensure that we respond to the questions rather than to something that we misunderstood by now.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you Maarten and thank you New Zealand for the question.

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LANN: I'm also on the board if I understand correctly I've been on a couple of these calls and I do think it's improved tremendously in

the two years I've been on the board because we actually say is this what you meant, and what exactly were you aiming at, and I think it has dramatically improved the quality of the boards replies, and, but if I understand it correctly the reluctance in the past to say we don't take your advice is because some kind of formal process then, that actually starts. So if there is no clarification during the call, and if you come back in some next stage, but I'm looking at the experts, and maybe the staff can help, there is, I think if there is a formal actually we do not take the advice, or you think that we haven't taken the advice, some kind of process is launched and I'd like a clarification on that.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: According to the handling of GAC advice by the board we have a series of steps linked to of course the requirements of the bylaws to go through the appropriate steps for consultation understanding acceptance or rejection of GAC advice. And that is fairly understood in the groups, for the handling of that by ICANN.org and we make that and remind the board of that as we go through that. The issue of course is when we get consensus advice from the GAC the board looks at that and in general decides that they will accept the advice or if they do not accept the advice there has been a series of formal consultations that they must go through to explain further talk with GAC and others about that and finally come to a decision. If it is indeed not to be

accepted, then there has to be, according to the bylaws, rationale for that reason and to be very clear with that. After an extended process to explain.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So Manal Ismail. So having heard New Zealand I'm wondering whether we may need to have a step for example to acknowledge the board scorecard after it's being received? Is this something we would like to have I'm thinking out loud here.

SWIZERLAND: Thank you Manal, sorry if I am a bit confused, but perhaps it is a late hour and that it is already early morning hours in Switzerland now. But, going back to what you mentioned in the follow-up section we have normally in the communiqué, are we deciding here anything on that or are we... Because if I understood you well, the board is suggesting that we skip or that we don't use that section anymore in the communiqué, and that we better go through the ARR, which is another new acronym... Or didn't I understand that?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So let me try to clarify a bit how things develop. Because actually the board didn't ask for anything. It was just how the discussion developed. For the previous two communiqués we had this section of follow up on previous GAC advice. We were expecting

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM 61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

response to this and the board consistently looked at the GAC advice to the board section only. So we were thinking whether it is better to have this section also under GAC advice to the board so that we get response to this, but then it came the discussion about the register that we now have for all things that the board receives. In those pieces of advice are already marked in the system as open.

So again we are thinking together whether we still need to follow up on previous advice or we can rely on the system. If we need to have it, then we can see where to put it in the communiqué so that the board do not miss it. But again, it is an interactive discussion. We are thinking together. So Becky please.

BECKY BURR: If I could just clarify I think the concern was there was no follow-up to report because the open items were still open and they were in process and working, so the board didn't provide new information because there was no information to respond to. On the other hand, we are assured that we have not forgotten about the fact that there is open GAC advice that we need to respond to because we use the register for that. So it is simply a, whenever there is an update on an open item in the registrar we are going to come back with a scorecard on that. If the purpose of the follow-up in the communiqué is just to remind us that there's

open items, then we could although, or not we could rely on the register as a source of collective reminder and acknowledgment that the board still owes the GAC input and response. I think that is really the only discussion.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, so Maarten will add and then I will give you back the floor, Jorge.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Okay so basically how it looks like as we have tracking of the open things and we have the communiqué. I can imagine that if there something in the open things that you have to say, that you add that to the communiqué, and there's things you may have nothing to say about. No problem. We are still tracking them. And I guess from our side if we respond to the scorecard to the communiqué on any of the open issues we also have something to say even if you haven't asked for it we will. So, in that way the register helps us to keep track of the open items and the communiqué is your primarily tool to communicate to the board and the scorecard is our primary tool to indicate back to you. Would that help?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Jorge?

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you for the clarifications. I guess this is more an issue of tracking the issues and not letting the information be dispersed in different places. I guess that with good meta-tagging of the different parts of the communiqué, this could be resolved by people who are familiar with such meta-tagging. But just to go to a substance, I think that when we put something in the follow-up, previous advice, it is not normally, hey, you still owe us a response on this or that. But, we are adding normally some information which doesn't amount to new advice, but which may be interesting also for you to keep on developing your position and your response to that advice. So I think that it is useful, but I agree that it is good to keep a good consistent tracking of each topic. So if there is a simple and efficient way of doing that, I would agree on that.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay then, France?

FRANCE: Thank you Manal. I agree with Jorge. I think it's very positive to have this action request for register but I think it there was some confusion because in a previous slide it was said that we might get rid of the follow-up section GAC advice because we have the

action register but if I understood what Maarten said it's not excluding because actually what we are going to do is use the action register to check on previous GAC advice and using that we might realize that the way the board reacted to a previous GAC advice for instance is not the way we envisioned. Or for instance, we might think that the board is not implementing the GAC advice in the way we envisioned. We might use it and communicate to the board in the follow-up section of the GAC advice. So my understanding is that it is not excluding it, rather actually we can find a way to articulate them to use [the follow-up section] in a better way.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, France. David?

DAVID OLIVE: To the point on, as you see on the slide here the open item seem to be the shorthand but of course behind that in the register and materials that would be available you can then find more detail including the linkage of the scorecard and Christine can explain a little bit more about that.

CHRISTINE WILLET: Yes so the inventory that the board shared with ICANN 60 is very detailed and comprehensive in fact behind these items there are

14 individually parsed items of advice, what would be a separate item on a scorecard today. So the board has taken action, made consideration, adapted scorecards on all 14 of these items in three of these categories for instance, and the idea is that if the board and the GAC agree that these are the items that are still pending, and by pending we mean not necessarily requiring further board action, but pending action of the community, then there is not necessarily need to follow up on these items as long as we agree that they are open.

However, to someone else's point, if there is something new to augment the advice, then that could be added under a consensus advice item and it would be very clear for the board to understand that that was incremental advice and additional action being requested.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Christine. Any further questions or comments before we proceed? Okay then can we proceed please Christine?

CHRISTINE WILLET: Thank you. Christine Willet. So the next slide shows items in implementation. So phase 4 is what we call the implementation phase. The board has adopted a resolution and directed implementation work to begin. Again, these items, five categories

of advice but it is a 12 individual advice items. Since ICANN 60, since we presented at 60 we have moved to the GTL the string similarity item from phase 3 requiring phase 3 review to face for implantation because the board adopted a resolution on refinement of the string similarity review. So these are the items that we are currently monitoring in our actively in implementation.

So this would again be another phase of an opportunity for the board and the GAC to agree on these open items. And then the next slide will take us into the next topic, which is about new GAC member on boarding and training.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So, any comments before we go to the following section of the presentation? Okay. Then...Rob over to you please.

ROB HOGGARTH: Thank you very much. I was happy for the opportunity and I was pleased to see you added this to the agenda of the meeting because it operated an opportunity to join members of the board and members of the GAC who I have briefed separately on the issue surrounding how we can improve GAC participation and interactions with the board on a number of different levels. When I first joined and was given the opportunity to represent ICANN

staff in supporting the GAC about six months ago one thing that I was told was that of all the communities within the ICANN ecosystem the GAC was on the experience to the term that was used to me was the highest turnover. And I didn't really understand that, and shortly after the ICANN 15 a meeting we as the ICANN GAC support team started to track the various goings and comings of members and participants in the GAC community. And what we found to be quite interesting was that in fact the anecdotal information was correct I'm sorry. I'm trying to get the slide not to jump so much. in the time between ICANN 59 and 60 we saw 51 new participants join the GAC. 40 more joined between ICANN 60 and 61, so in six months we have 91 new participants in the GAC. And this is coming out of a total of 359 participants as of 1 February. So, literally we are seeing 38% change potentially in the membership participation of this important aspect of the ICANN community. We have also tracked departures. As you can see, those are not high, but are also quite active. 31 individuals left working with the GAC.

Now there are a number of different anecdotes with relation to that. As I have reported at this meeting we have three new members of the GAC. So that just creates new participants, in some cases individual members of the GAC at additional representatives. We have seen a lot of that with respect to the public safety working group where there has been great interest

in the number of the issues related to GDP are, domain abuse and those types of areas and so there are reasons for some of those increases but it does reflect the fact that many new individuals are beginning to participate. And one of the issues that the GAC is facing with a number of other ICANN communities is the issue of general participation. How do we encourage people not only to und and take the time to learn about what's going on in the various matters important to the community, but how can we also make those individuals productive participants in those discussions.

My colleagues and I on the policy development support team frequently talk about the difference between participation and informed participation and how much more important the informed aspect of participation can really make in terms of getting things done, moving discussions forward and being more efficient in terms of how the work takes place.

 So, this is basically information that we have confirmedis correct. There are changes. We are going to continue to continue to keep tracking those numbers over time and the hope is that over time maybe this is a unique time period in the history where we see a lot of turnover or we may determine there's a significant renewal aspect to participation in this very important community. And there are a number of reasons that we can begin to explore in terms of whether that's just the career path of someone who

happens to work within the GAC, or whether that reflects a changing of the guard, where a number of people are now moving on in their careers, getting promoted, or retiring. Or whether this reflects a change in the level of participation that governments are taking vis-à-vis ICANN. And these are all things that we hope to explore a little bit. We have not figured out exactly how to do that. How to sort of break that code but those are areas that we are looking at.

But you wanted me to talk about training. So let me talk about that just a little bit. I'm not quite sure what's going on with the slides. I had a great slide that showed our mind mapping exercise that we engaged in since ICANN 60. I oversold it. It's not great. But it's interesting of what we began to do from an inventory perspective to try to get a sense of what were the various pieces that came and were involved in training or educating or just basically bringing someone up to speed and we found quite a large number of connections, not only within what the policy develop and support team does, but with what the government engagement team does. What's the... other groups within ICANN who touch various parts of the community are involved in in terms of the work. The global stakeholder engagement team for example does a lot of outreach. Many of the members of the GAC many of the participants have much more contact with the GSE team than they do with the GAC support staff or that they do with

the GAC Secretariat. So being able to understand some of those connections are frankly going to help us to look at on boarding and training in a comprehensive way. And thank you very much to my colleague Julia Goulton who carefully played with the slide. I'm now ready to move on to the next one. So thanks very much for that effort.

So where we are now in terms of reducing that to some more basic understanding of what things look like now is we are just basically looking at what are the areas and how can we combine some of this activity so we do look at it comprehensively. And essentially it is five major areas.

It is operations, communications, resources, meetings and programs. And we've undertakenThe effort to look at this in a comprehensive way. Understand where the connections are and figure out ways to improve how they relate to each other. It is certainly important from [indiscernible] and the senior teams and your perspective is the board because we want to make ICANN more efficient that we are duplicating efforts. It's a matter of making things more effective and efficient in terms of how we interact with someone who is new and joining the GAC community.

But it is not just newbies. Or newcomers. There's also a reflection, as you look at some of the programs and activities where it's also

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM 61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

helpful to veterans of ICANN. A number of members of GAC leadership participated in the leadership training activity that took place a couple days here before the ICANN meeting. That's a valuable tool because it makes them more effective. So it's not just about new participants. But it's about making the existing participants even stronger.

One example of what we have done in terms of Trying to coordinate with other teams is, we have worked very effectively over the last year with the government engagement team involving ourselves in capacity building workshop pilot program. And, this is something that I've mentioned in some of the briefings to various groups and many GAC members are familiar with this because it takes place right before and ICANN meetings and also can take place between individual meetings but it's a concept of creating a curriculum, creating a training program that new participants on a regional basis can get involved and understand directly from their colleagues and from ICANN staff what some of the GAC issues are, what some of the aspects of GAC that are important to a government, and what is true but other aspects of the community.

The slide that I've got up here is the result of a survey from the most recent capacity building workshopThat was just a few weeks ago in Kathmandu, where I think we had an example of almost the ideal best practice, if you will, workshop where over a

couple of days there were members of the GAC and potential recruits who heard from one of our vice chairs from [GRAO] for members of ICANN staff information about what the GAC was responsible for and how it interacted with other parts of the community. This is just a very simple survey that was put together after the meeting that reflected the important issues that are important to new participants. Information about the ICANN ecosystem, policy development information, helping people connect with working groups and understand how policy development processes worked. Technical skills development to frankly learn more about how the DNS works and operates, because many members of the GAC who come to participate have not necessarily had that as their primary responsibility in the government, or in their department. So, learning more about the technical aspects of this unique architecture is important.

And then important aspects of local issues and Another aspect of the pilot program which has been law enforcement and really trying to promote the efforts that are being made to prevent domain abuse and other activities within the DNS that are bad actors.

And then finally just general education about This multi-stakeholder group model and what is happening there. So if I can just sort of some up sort of what we are doing as a result of a lot of this initial research is in the short term a lot of this work is

helping us to develop ICANN learn content, taking advantage of existing resources, leveraging those and producing some information that people can reach out to grab and learn from. And the GAC is going to have a session later this week in which members of that ICANN staff team are going to be explaining some of that process and are going to be highlighting that they are going to soon be publishing some content that people will be able to access and use.

There's also going to be an assessment of the capacity building workshop pilot effort.That is due to take place around the timing of the Panama city meeting. That is important because it has potential budget and resource implications. It's been a pilot program that, frankly, the government engagement team has funded out of you know, where they can find a few dollars here and there. If this ends up as it is proving to be an effective program, where can we find those resources to support that?

We are also working with other communities. Manal and her predecessor, Thomas have been very proactive in reaching out to other communities, in particular the at-large advisory committee. You will the car there was a joint statement in Abby dobby about lowering barriers to participation. There's also some really good development work that Elon is doing with the GNS0, that Perry is doing with the ccNSO. So figuring out what the liaison function is and how the groups can can make it better is a sort of great

interest to the GAC leadership, and to that extent we are working with the GNSO staff to work with a pilot webinar program to allow members of theGNSO explain to interested GAC members, new and veterans what is it and how does it work in creating a format that will be useful to them. From a longer-term perspective as I mentioned earlier we are going to continue to work on the demographic side to really work and learn more about how we can be better supporters of the members and participants in the GAC. And try to help them and identify ways to leverage their brain power, time and resources.

Another aspect of that, and I will conclude on this, Is that we are looking at some new tools within the ICANN IT team and program application team to help us keep the records. You know, examining how we can truly be able to help somebody come on board, see that we are following up our checklist, that they are getting the welcoming letters at the right time, potentially being able to examine attendance activities that we currently do on a very ad hoc basis, just looking at the GNSO working group data and things like that so that will be a longer-term project over time.

Fundamentally though, I think this reflects a change in the approach that the GAC is taking to really trying to work hard on operationalizing and working on getting more people involved at a high informed level and looking forward to giving you all

individually and collectively briefings in the future on how we are progressing on these efforts. So thank you very much.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Rob. So any questions for Rob? Yes please Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: So why it's on this agenda because this is board GAC relations I think one of the things you might find with turnover of people is that there's always this mystic relationship with other bodies. With other pilots with GNSO I mean you take away some of that because communication is what it does, and so I can see that may be even useful to have prior to the next ICANN meetings a webinar where you can have the opportunity for new GAC members are indeed other GAC members just to interact and hear about intent, not about specific issues, not about negotiations but just to see how we together with our passion for this community make it happen as a smooth way into the work that needs to be done. So, that was almost [a default] that we had, when we talked about inviting you on the agenda. So David, you wanted to add something?

DAVID OLIVE: Yes Manal and Maarten just to go over what I've heard in terms of action items for this discussion if I may and see if that is the correct interpretation. In terms of the timetable, we presented the timetable for the consideration of the GAC communiqué for ICANN 61 according to the various weeks we hope to have it as soon as 4 to 8 weeks out before the next ICANN meeting the second item would be in terms of the communiqué structure to keep it as is. And use in a tracking tool for open GAC advice though if new information is needed to contribute to the open advice the consensus view would be obviously welcome to hear that in the GAC communiqué.

The third item was again using this new tool for open GAC advice which has all the details and the parsing of the information. That is a way to keep track of that and we will be reminding people of that. And finally to provide them the final full information of the historic GAC advice which is considered done, closed if you will based on board actions. So those would be the for I have taken away. I hope that is about right.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, David. I think this is a fair summary. Any comments or remarks from GAC colleagues? If not then that I would like France please.

FRANCE: Thank you just very quickly I wanted to thank Rob for the presentation and I can only agree that new GAC participant training webinars and explaining how I can structure because we know the acronym is but the new GAC members and you are basically bombarded with new acronyms and sometimes it is just hard to get on board, so I think these kind of trainings are extremely important and as Maarten said as well you know meeting with the ICANN board for instance for new members not negotiating, but just talking about how ICANN structured in a very informal way is very useful and I think will help GAC to understand how ICANN structured and also communicate with other parts of the community including GNSO, it's a very good idea and I think we should try to intimate that.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you I could not agree more.

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LANN: Less than two and half years ago I was brand-new to the ICANN community so I can feel very much how daunting it can be if you are new to try to fully find your footing and to be able to be an active and contributing member of the community. And I just want to say that I I have been very impressed within the board by the incredible desire of the board to make sure that the GAC can fully participate and we understand that individual GAC members

are under incredible pressure. I mean sometimes ICANN is only one of many dossiers that you have to do and it's not always easy to find within your ministry or your department the support, so why do you have to fly to another one of these meetings and why do you have to do all these things. These are incredibly challenging circumstances and I have a strong feeling that inside the board that whatever we can do to help facilitate that to make sure that we cooperate, that we have a dialogue, but also that we know each other, there are so many new people. You know, Ghislain and I were just thinking maybe we could arrange cocktail receptions regionally or something like that so that we can get to know each other and do more than shake hands but actually have a conversation so we would love to make sure we deepen that relationship so that we can all play our part you know, and our shared mission to keep the internetworking. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you I think it's a great idea. Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you for this meeting and I think the fifth point to the action point is let's try before the webinar to planet before Panama. Just with [VTRI] present and all those new board members that would like to just call in for an informal conversation. Yes? With that I think we have been very efficient Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Without this concludes the BGRI working group discussion. Thanks to everyone, thanks to board members who took out of their time and busy schedules and things to GAC colleagues who survived the very long day and long discussions and many thanks to the interpreters as well. Thank you all and we start tomorrow at 830. I have to say that there are board discussions on GDPR I will have to attend those discussions again because this is a topic of interest to the GAC. So, my very capable GAC leadership colleagues will be filling in for me, thanks to all of you. And I'll be back during the afternoon sessions. So thank you all.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]