

	1. Utilizing, streamlining and prioritizing early awareness & notification notices –Reviewed following results of the survey
Describe option in detail	(Note: This item is also expected to be further discussed as part of the GAC early engagement in the GNSO PDP work stream). Further feedback / input from the GAC would be desirable in order to expand on this option – currently notifications are sent by the GNSO Secretariat to the GAC Secretariat and/or GAC Chair. The documents are then posted on the GAC website and GAC members notified. If this current method is not deemed effective, alternative mechanisms could be explored to further develop and expand early awareness and notification (which may also be achieved by some of the other mechanisms under discussion here). In order to assess the effectiveness / familiarity with current awareness & notification notices, a survey will be circulated during the ICANN meeting in London amongst the GAC which aims to provide further input to the CG to make recommendations in relation to this option.
How does this mechanism achieve the objectives?	The documents currently provide good overviews and insights, but further steps seem necessary to prompt early engagement in practice. This is linked to the “triggers” concept in the PDP paper/chart
What are the potential issues / complications / questions to be addressed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How to synchronize GAC and GNSO expectations about outcomes? <u>Through a joint committee including the GNSO liaison to the GAC and GAC members of a Triage committee.</u> How to expand/develop the notices – and by whom? <u>No current need to expand rather prioritization, streamlining, channeling and following-up is needed through the current available mechanisms.</u> How to further promote knowledge and use of the notices for early engagement action? <u>The GNSO liaison to the GAC along with GAC members of a Triage committee, should be very familiar with all mechanisms, work with the available information, prioritize the topics at hand and provide the GAC with concise briefs, concrete questions and a clear deadline.</u>
How would this work in practice?	To be discussed. <u>The GNSO liaison to the GAC along with GAC members of a Triage committee, should be very familiar with all mechanisms, work with the available information, prioritize the topics at hand and provide the GAC with</u>

MANAL 20/9/2014 12:46

Deleted: Further develop / expand

MANAL 20/9/2014 12:46

Deleted: To be further reviewed

MANAL 20/9/2014 12:51

Comment [1]: The survey has indicated that, although not all GAC members who responded are equally familiar with all the current mechanisms in place, yet the problem seems to be too much information that is not properly channeled and utilized; not lack of information.

MANAL 20/9/2014 12:50

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0,63 cm, No bullets or numbering

MANAL 20/9/2014 12:51

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0,63 cm, No bullets or numbering

MANAL 20/9/2014 12:55

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0,63 cm, No bullets or numbering

	concise briefs, concrete questions (such as: whether or not the topic is of interest to the GAC and if yes, whether the GAC intends to provide input or just want to stay informed) and a clear deadline. This should serve to flag to the GNSO what to expect from the GAC side and timelines could be aligned afterwards through the GAC-GNSO (steering) committee, including GNSO liaison, GAC members as well as relevant GNSO PDP leads, if needed. Follow-up in the same manner on expected GAC input and/or participation.	
Is additional funding required to implement?	No, but may depend on selected option and ambition level.	
Would it be possible to implement this option as a pilot?	Yes	
Overall Assessment	Pros	Cons
	Having GNSO requests compiled and integrated to GAC agenda	Work load for GNSO liaison and volunteer GAC members
	Frequency, load and timeline will be coordinated through a joint committee to align and synchronize expectations	Challenges in organizing meetings, calls and other necessary intersessional communication
	Help in coming up with a GAC initial indication of interest to the GNSO and later, in providing GAC early input	New layer for both secretariats to consider and coordinate with
	2. Rethinking recurring joint meetings	
Describe option in detail	New approaches could be sought to focus the joint GAC-GNSO meetings on day-to-day co-operation and enhanced mutual understanding for example by: 1) identifying ahead of time topics of mutual interest and identifying specific questions to facilitate the conversation; 2) provide updates on status of PDP WGs ahead of time (e.g. webinar?) to the GAC so that meeting can focus on specific questions / flagging of concerns; 3) invite liaisons / topic leads to provide an update on activities; 4) provide new members with a short overview (for	

MANAL 20/9/2014 14:38

Deleted: - TO BE FURTHER ASSESSED POST LONDON

	example one pager) that describes remit and working methods of respective organizations; 5) etc. (Note, it might be worth mentioning the new format that the ccNSO-GNSO joint meeting is experimenting with – first 30 minutes are focused on discussing topics of joint interest at the Council level (e.g. joint WGs, FY15 budget & strategy plan), followed by 30 minutes during with a couple of ccNSO & GNSO WG Chairs provide a short intro to their respective efforts that are considered to be of mutual interest, followed by a cocktail reception during which members are encouraged to connect and further discuss some of the topics flagged).	
How does this mechanism achieve the objectives?	Depends on how meeting is reorganized. Multiple reorganization options possible, as outlined above.	
What are the potential issues / complications / questions to be addressed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The size of the groups as well as lay-out of the meeting room makes it challenging to experiment Perhaps we could experiment with a particular topic for the LA meeting, permitting all of the GNSO stakeholder groups to explain their perspectives, and the GAC to share at least initial thoughts/considerations? • Different ways of working / expectations for the meeting • How to synchronize GAC and GNSO expectations about outcomes? 	
How would this work in practice?	To be further discussed Inter-sessional topic-specific conference calls and/or webinars	
Is additional funding required to implement?	Depends on how meeting is reorganized (e.g. adding a cocktail at the end of the meeting would require additional funding)	
Would it be possible to implement this option as a pilot?	Yes, at least to some extent, depending on options selected.	
Overall Assessment	Pros	Cons
	Better preparation for joint meetings	Challenge of scheduling additional topic-specific calls and/or webinars
	Better utilization of joint meetings time	Challenge of identifying and ensuring participation of all relevant parties

MANAL 20/9/2014 14:55

Comment [2]: Need to re-think in light of LA GAC agenda, when it is out, and the role of the GNSO liaison in sharing expectations from GNSO side as well as facilitating discussion of GAC GNSO-related agenda items.

MANAL 20/9/2014 15:37

Comment [3]: Is this still possible despite the tight time between now and LA meeting? Could 'Whois' be such topic?

MANAL 20/9/2014 15:42

Comment [4]: I believe this time, we will have an open face-to-face meeting of our GAC-GNSO consultation Group, followed by drinks, right?

	More fruitful and joint-objective-oriented discussions	Challenge of ensuring call output is taken into consideration and conveyed to all GNSO and GAC members
--	--	--

	3. GAC Chairs / GNSO Chairs regular interaction –	
Describe option in detail	A regular call (assumed monthly) between the GNSO and GAC Chairs during which both chairs can align thoughts, synchronize expectations and exchange status updates on respective activities as well as upcoming opportunities for early engagement. (This option does not exclude other options being explored and could also serve to review other options being implemented and suggested adjustments, if needed). Concur and suggest we consider whether regular calls could be organized between GAC and GNSO issue/PDP leads, once identified	
How does this mechanism achieve the objectives?	This mechanism could potentially achieve all goals, provided appropriate information aggregation and feedback mechanisms to ensure that information also flows through to the whole GNSO and GAC. As noted above, no one action or proposal is likely to “achieve all goals”, but this group considers them to contribute to achieving the shared goals	
What are the potential issues / complications / questions to be addressed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scheduling challenges for joint availability as well as for call length to cover all relevant matters • How to ensure that information flows back to the whole GNSO and GAC? • Calls for timely updates of all current relevant matters to the respective Chairs beforehand • How to synchronize GAC and GNSO expectations about outcomes? 	
How would this work in practice?	Monthly phone conversations, presumably. To be further discussed	
Is additional funding required to implement?	No (unless any F2F time is foreseen)	
Would it be possible to implement this option as a pilot?	Yes	
Overall Assessment	Pros	Cons
	Better understanding and better coordination between	

MANAL 20/9/2014 16:00

Comment [5]: When agreed expected to start after LA meeting.

MANAL 20/9/2014 15:59

Deleted: TO BE FURTHER ASSESSED POST LONDON

MANAL 20/9/2014 16:09

Comment [6]: May be useful to also include vice chairs, GNSO liaison, GAC Triage committee members if one is established and GNSO PDP leads as deemed necessary and appropriate.

MANAL 20/9/2014 16:10

Deleted: a

MANAL 20/9/2014 16:10

Deleted: would be provided and

MANAL 20/9/2014 16:10

Deleted: identified

Jonathan Robinson 23/7/2014 10:58

Comment [7]: Good thinking here. Liaison will need to work with PDP leads as well as Council & GAC AND where necessary bring PDP leads into the conversation with the GAC.

Jonathan Robinson 23/7/2014 10:58

Comment [8]: Agreed. See also above.

MANAL 20/9/2014 16:15

Comment [9]: I think they're basically the challenges in 'potential issues / complications' listed above..

	leads of both constituencies	

