

----- Message original -----

Sujet: Suggestions on forthcoming Board meeting with the GAC

Date : Fri, 14 Jan 2011 12:01:22 +0100

De : Olivier MJ Crepin-Leblond

Pour : peter.dengatethrush@icann.org

Copie à : Olivier MJ Crepin-Leblond

Dear Peter,

The following is a suggestion which I make with input from the ALAC, for due consideration into choosing timing and place of the forthcoming GAC/Board meeting. I'll keep this as short and concise as possible.

Proposed meeting Date: Mid-February.

Rationale: there are concerns that a meeting taking place at the end of the month will not give enough time for the Board to take notice, discuss and act on the points raised in the meeting, in time for the SFO meeting. Similarly, the GAC members would not have enough time to report to their governments and their stakeholders.

As a result, there would be a real threat that the meetings in SFO would not contribute positively to the possibility of pressing the "go" button in SFO. More potential delays. More unhappy constituencies.

Proposed meeting type: a mix of open & closed.

Rationale: both closed and open models have their advantages & inconveniences.

Proponents of the closed model argue that there are several points of internal GAC & Board relationship building which might not benefit from being public - and could stop from GAC or Board members from being free to say what they wish to say during the meeting. This argument certainly has its validity.

Proponents of an open meeting argue that ICANN, a champion of the open model of transparency, cannot politically have a closed meeting between the GAC and the Board. It is a simple case of eating one's own dog food, in light of the uproar released by civil society after the recent CSTD decisions regarding IGF-related governance.

Opponents of the open model argue that if the meeting is going to be turned into a "circus" with people after people coming onto the microphone and giving mixed signals, this would be a waste of time.

We therefore kindly propose the following for your consideration:

- that the meeting, likely to last 2 days to be thorough, shall be composed of a mix of closed and open meetings, with an emphasis that the closed meeting time shall constitute less than 40% of the total time allocated for meetings;

- that it shall be possible to follow the open meeting remotely, through an Adobe Connect room, Internet streaming and a telephone bridge, to a standard no lower than the standard proposed at an ICANN Annual General Meeting (AGM);

- that the Chair and Vice Chairs of SOs and ACs, plus a select number of people in the GNSO council (number to be determined but akin to a selection of people taking part in Cross Community Working Groups (CWGs)) shall be invited to make comments and take part in the discussion in *some* of the open sessions. They shall be called "Community Representatives (CR)";

- that for this to be fully effective, travel funding shall also be required;

- that the Chair and/or Vice Chairs of SOs and ACs might, at a common GAC-Board invitation, appear or make statements for a part of the closed meetings, provided there is consensus between GAC and Board on their presence;

- that the rest of the people following the meeting shall have observer status but shall have full freedom to be in touch at all times with their Community Representatives and shall therefore be able to speak through them.

In closing, I should remind you that since we are not apprised of a sufficient reason for a closed meeting, we would strongly recommend the default open meeting.

Yours sincerely,

Olivier MJ Crépin-Leblond
ALAC Chair
(with input from the ALAC)