

**From:** [atrt2-bounces@icann.org](mailto:atrt2-bounces@icann.org) on behalf of [Carlos Raul](#)  
**To:** [Larry Strickling](#)  
**Cc:** [ATRT2 \(atrt2@icann.org\)](mailto:ATRT2 (atrt2@icann.org))  
**Subject:** Re: [atrt2] New Draft of Report on ATRT1 Recommendations 9-14  
**Date:** Monday, September 16, 2013 5:14:30 AM  
**Attachments:** [ATT00001.txt](#)

---

Dear Larry,

thank you very much for this very detailed and interesting template. Just a few comments on the ATRT2 findings section, following the same 3 points:

1. I think that the overall findings of ATRT2 are positive in terms of recommending GAC to keep working to have clearer internal procedures (an earlier attempt to revised GAC operating principles got in the sand), including the initiative I hope ATRT2 will generally recommend of early engagement PDP and constant efforts for cross-community relations. Presently some members have initiated such a discussion after presenting the "food for thoughts" paper that already has been commented by the US representative.
2. On the second finding, I would recognize that a long internal discussion has dragged along on the need for GAC, and the good disposition of donor countries to develop professional/analytical capabilities through an independent secretariat, that works year round and not only for the agenda and organization of the public meetings
3. On the third finding I would try to establish a direct link with the discussion on improvements of the GNSO PDP process, and strongly recommend that GAC officially participates in the charter definition of the GNSO WG and more or less agrees on the public interest rationale of each charter of PDPs (if it has one, which may not be the case for all of them). Also GAC active participation in the (3) public comment periods of the PDP cycle should be recorded. This should reduce the scope for surprises. As far as I understand there is also an ongoing effort for a joint GNSO-GAC working group, that could be helped and tested as a good example for better cross-community work.

Finally, as far as the style of the recommendations, my reading for the AoC 9.1. b) is that ATRT2 can directly make recommendations to the GAC and not necessarily ask the Board to do it for us. GAC is well represented in ATRT2 and I think that the effect of the recommendations can be made directly to GAC for consideration of their members. Maybe it only requires a softer language.

I'm sorry I cannot travel to Washington but will participate remotely.

Best regards

**Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez**

Skype [carlos.raulg](#)

---

Apartado 1571-1000  
**COSTA RICA**

On Fri, Aug 30, 2013 at 4:01 PM, Larry Strickling <[LStrickling@ntia.doc.gov](mailto:LStrickling@ntia.doc.gov)> wrote:

Attached.

---

atrt2 mailing list

[atrt2@icann.org](mailto:atrt2@icann.org)

<https://mm.icann.org/mailman/listinfo/atrt2>