ICANN
Transcription
GAC GNSO Consultation Group meeting
Tuesday 04 March 2014 at 14:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GAC GNSO Consultation Working Group call on the Tuesday 04 March 2014 at 14:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-gac-20140304-en.mp3
 On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#mar
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/

Apologies :
Volker Greimann - GNSO vice chair

Members of the group
Government Advisory Committee
Manal Ismail – co-chair - Egypt
Ana Neves - Portugal
Suzanne Radel - USA

GNSO Council
Jonathan Robinson – co-chair - Registries Stakeholder Group
Mikey O'Connor –Internet Service Providers & Connectivity Providers Constituency
Amr Elsadr – Non Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG)
David Cake – GNSO vice chair

Coordinator: Recording has started. Please go ahead.

Terri Agnew: Thank you very much, (Gayle). Good morning, good afternoon and good

                   evening. This is the GAC GNSO Consultation Group on Early Engagement

                   on 4 March 2014.

On the call today we have Mikey O'Connor, Manal Ismail, Jonathan Robinson, Suzanne Radell, Ana Neves. We apologies from Volker Greimann. From staff we have Julia Charvolen, Olof Nordling, David Olive, Marika Konings, Glen De Saint Gery, Nathalie Peregrine and myself, Terri Agnew.

I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you, Mikey.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. Hi everyone and welcome to the meeting. It's Jonathan speaking. I'd really like your help with this because we've put an agenda together, something that Manal substantially led and worked with me for last Tuesday's meeting, but actually we've moved on a little since then. And so I'm feeling what we really want to come away with here is two key items is my understanding. Well I guess it's three really: a confirmation of whether we're going to have another meeting before Singapore, a plan of action for anything that needs to be done in preparation for Singapore, and an understanding of what will take place during the Singapore meeting. Those seem to be the three key items.

I'll just pause a moment and see if there's anything I've missed there. So the way we've scheduled it is an opportunity to just touch on the two different work tracks that we had - I see there's a revised agenda coming up.

Mikey O'Connor: Isn't that about right? This is Mikey.

Jonathan Robinson: Hello, Mikey. It's less about the revised agenda, it's more about just making sure we capture the key items that we need to take away with us out to this official key point that we need to make sure.

So I wonder if - I'm just wondering how to take this, and I wouldn't mind some guidance from anyone on the call. We could work through the agenda as we had previously. I actually did update it a little in the interim but obviously didn't get it to Marika in time. Really I think there's two different work tracks and

then there's really a question of what work we expect to get done between now and Singapore and the confirmation and the detail of the meeting.

So Mikey, if we just look at the way in which that was set out, I guess let's take some discussion on the two different work tracks then, Manal and others if you agree. First of all, look at the day-to-day work track and see how that looks and if there are any comments or issues as to how that's been set up.

Looking at that myself a moment before the call, it struck me that actually we could usefully populate that at least in terms of the facts not the decisions we've taken. At the moment, it's completed started as kindly prepared for us - oh no, I see this is a different version that's come up now. It was something different up here a moment ago, which is the one I had seen previously.

This is actually well populated now. I mean useful information. Hi, David. Welcome to the audio. Manal, go ahead.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Jonathan. Yes, actually I agree to your proposal that we go through both work tracks first and then wrap our plan from now till Singapore and what exactly to be presented there. I think it would be useful while discussing the work tracks to focus on what we will be presenting during the joint meeting.

I would also like to remind us that there was one of the aspects that was being discussed by the PDP working group, we decided to move it to the day-to-day work track which might add one more option to be considered and which means one more table to be added, just to make sure that we all agree on the material that's going to be presented.

Having said that, we have not actually discussed the different alternatives and we still are missing the pros and cons, so do you want to get into this? Do we want to just discuss the options and wrap it as is and have this presented in Singapore? I mean we need to decide on this.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Manal. I think I heard an action for you there, Mikey, just to note that we need to move one item across from the PDP work track into the day-to-day work track. Manal, can you just remind us which is specific item that is in case Mikey's - you've got it, haven't you Mikey?

Manal Ismail: Yes it had to do with both the secretariats' coordination, better coordination of the GAC and the GNSO secretariat. It was being discussed in the PDP and we felt that it might be broader than just the PDP, and it has to do with the day-to-day work.

Jonathan Robinson: Good that's helpful. Thanks, Manal. So it's effective coordination between the secretariats on a rolling or day-to-day basis. I'll tell you what's striking me is I think I'd feel more comfortable knowing first of all whether we intend to meet on the 18th and second of all, talking about, you know, the structure of the meeting in Singapore, the structure in content to the meeting Singapore, and then we can see how much we need to cover now and how much of this can be covered on this in terms of the two day-to-day work tracks.

So my suggestion is that we reverse the agenda around and sort of know where we're going in order to know what we need to do because otherwise we could get very much caught up I think in the detail of one or both of these work tracks, which after all are largely meant to be covered I think in between times, although it's useful to be able to talk about them when we're together on a call like this.

So my temptation would be to try to settle the issues around the Singapore meeting. Hi Amr, noting that you've joined and welcome as well. So I'm suggesting and I wouldn't mind some feedback on that sort of reversing the agenda around a little bit and thinking about the structure of the Singapore meeting. And there's been some dialogue on the list about this between various of us. And so it seems to me that it would be good to settle that.

Now one of the threads there was how much of this is an opportunity to simply update the GAC and the GNSO on our work today and how much of it is to actually get feedback. And I think where we were starting to head to was what we'd be expecting feedback on is elements of the work and the way in which we were approaching the problem and the structure in which we were approaching the problem, but not necessarily asking for detailed feedback, especially given the forum on all of the fine detail. But I'm conscious I may be putting my interpretation of where we'd got to.

So I wouldn't mind any feedback on what others think about how we could most productively handle that approximately one-hour interaction, bearing in mind that one of the other possibilities in that interaction is to also update the GAC on current PDP work going on in the GNSO as well. In other words, the entirety of the conversation between the GAC and the GNSO may not necessarily be about this but also might be about more broadly just given some form of update as to the landscape of current policy work going.

Any thoughts or comments or feedback on that? Amr?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Jonathan. This is Amr. While in answering the question on whether we just want to present progress of our work as opposed to getting feedback from the crowd and these of our session in Singapore, I'm guessing that whether we ask for it or not, folks will want to speak up and give feedback one way or another. So even if we don't ask, you might have people in the room who just ask to be heard having one opinion or another.

So my thinking is really just to sort of for the presenters to one way or another to maybe control the form of feedback we will be getting in the room to something that will be constructive to our work at this point. Because our work is as far from being at a mature phase and most of what we're doing is still a work in progress. So what we really need at this point is maybe some additional thoughts. Someone who isn't as close to the topics as we are, might have some innovative thinking we haven't considered, and I was just

hoping that maybe we could somehow channel participants of the meeting to give us what we might need at that point. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Amr. And before I go to Suzanne, just for the avoidance of doubt, I mean I'm in - I'm absolutely expecting and hoping for an interactive session. It's just a question of at what level of detail we seek feedback, you know, whether it's more of a direction level than the detail level. So just in case I was misunderstood in the way I presented that. Suzanne?

Suzanne Radell: Thank you very much. Suzanne here for the recording. First of all, I also want to thank everybody for the really constructive e-mail exchanges, and I think we've made an enormous amount of progress, just personally, to congratulate ourselves. I guess how I was looking ahead to Singapore is an opportunity to report on the progress that we have made to date, and I do think we need feedback. And I have a sense that we want to bring - it may be slightly easier on the GNSO side. I will confess. I leave that to you help us understand.

I think on the GAC side what for many of our colleagues that we've been talking about this issue for quite some time, right, beginning with the ATRT1 recommendations. But I think it's really, really going to be of critical interest to GAC colleagues for a fairly detailed presentation of where are we today, how did we get to this point and how do we wish to proceed so that we can make sure we do draw in other people, other comments, other suggestions. So to me it's a really important reality check.

I think we all are fairly confident we're on the right track. We've identified all the key issues, but we may have missed something. So I guess I see Singapore as a way of bringing everybody along, so I do think we need to take the time. There's a lot of material we have, and I think it's useful to present it and to try to paint a picture as to where we think the next steps are. Because quite honestly, all of these very, you know, we've had a lot of discussions about the detailed questions. I think we need to draw more

people into helping us to identify are these the right questions and how best to answer them so that we are constantly sort of connected to our respective communities, if you will. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: So noted, Suzanne. It's Jonathan speaking. I see a checkmark from (Anna) in the room supporting the point you've made. And I suspect while there might subtleties in how this is communicated and understood, I think we've got principally the same objective with both the GAC and the GNSO. So I don't see it as being materially different what we need to communicate and achieve and I don't think we're in substantially different places in terms of what's required. So I tend to agree with you.

And I wonder then if the question again strikes me as if many ways our attention over the next two weeks should be - and I don't want to cut us short of being productive, but it might be really that we focus our attention on organizing how we might present the information, the progress to date and the questions we might ask rather than trying to, you know, I'm not suggesting we don't make progress if there's something else we can work on in the meantime and make progress on, but in ways it seems that getting ourselves in shape to present the material effectively in Singapore would be not a bad goal between now and the 18th, a quick sort of rehearsal for want of a better word at the meeting on the 18th, and then taking that with us to Singapore.

Manal?

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Jonathan. Actually I was of the same view as Suzanne exactly. Before going through the discussion on the list, I thought it was going more of a working session, if I may, to make sure the other GAC members are also on board. But I also think your point that the time is limited, the GAC themselves or even the GNSO might not be ready to provide the necessary feedback.

So we probably need - I think we need their blessing on our work, their blessing on the approach and their feedback. The feedback might not be during the meeting I mean. We can even agree on some timeframe that they provide us with either their blessing on the work that has been done or with some concrete feedback so that we can be confident that we are all on the same page given where we are right now.

How to present things at the meeting I think is probably what we need to focus, what's going to be presented and how we should present it. But the objective is to have the blessing of everyone on where we are on the approach we have followed and with some commitment to provide feedback within I mean a short timeframe to keep things going, and it's going to be an opportunity as you also mentioned.

To bring our work to their attention, it's going to be more of awareness and educational session to spare them having to go through the material themselves and to put them on the right track to facilitate that they can provide us with feedback maybe later, maybe online. It doesn't have to be during the session, but at least we have to agree on a way forward.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Manal. That certainly helps me and its characteristically clear thinking. I suppose what that, you know, that naturally makes me think of a kind of - and just to be clear, I don't disagree with any of that. That makes complete sense to me, and it seems to me then that that I can envisage a form of presentation which is interactive and permits discussion and feedback at every point but set the scene via a background that presents the charter that comes out that then explains how we split it into two work streams, the two different streams. And I think we could present that fairly systematically and effectively.

And then we might even put up one or two slides at the end, depending on how that lends itself, a structure like that, with questions that we would really like feedback on, noting if anyone can provide feedback on any item the work

that we may even seek particular feedback on key items. So I wonder if it would make sense then to draft -- thanks, Manal, I see your support in the chat -- I wonder if it would make sense for one of us to draft an outline of that presentation and get that circulated shortly after this meeting.

And that's something you and I could do, Manal, as co-chairs of the group. We could agree and outline a kind of structure and then sort of workshop that with the group over the next period to make sure that that was, you know, well thought about well in advance of the meeting. And I don't know whether it would be normal. I sense - thanks, Suzanne, I see your support as well. I sense that the GAC or organized and good about circulating documents in advance.

I have a sort of - I wonder about circulating a presentation in advance. Sometimes I worry that if you do it, you struggle to get people's attention. I don't know what we should do there, but we could certainly circulate the supporting materials and then prepare the presentation sort of slides amongst ourselves. Suzanne?

Suzanne Radell: Thank you for that, Jonathan. I do think as Manal has reminded me very helpfully, thank you Manal, the GAC now has the charter. Manal, I can't remember what else they may have, but on our side there's a bit of a risk and I don't mean to paint colleagues in a negative light at all. It's just like your community, a lot of us are feeling quite overwhelmed at the moment with only two weeks and a few days to go with a enormous amount of material to slog through.

So would have some small hesitation about sending them the PowerPoint in advance only because it's quite dense, and while I think we're all very comfortable with it, my concern might be that it would be hard for people to digest. I do think clearly we need to have it ready and available for the presentations, but I think we may be better off holding off on all of the backup material until the meeting itself.

I'm happy to be overruled; it's just kind of a gut instinct feeling that we are already swimming in documents. And so I think the charter itself is very useful. We need everybody to sign off. We want people to agree that yes, this makes sense to us, thank you very much. Now we're going to get an update from you all and we provide the update by providing the material that we're all currently working with. It's just one sort of note of a caution if I can - and again I'm happy to be overruled if I'm being too hesitant. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: That accords well with me, Suzanne. I'm personally aware of the absolute deluge of material coming out of, in and around the whole area in which we work. So it sounds like where we're heading to is, you know, the possibility - we've got the chart circulated to both groups so everyone should be aware of that, the pre-preparation of a presentation. And as part of that, in seeking feedback both during and at the end of the presentation and offer to circulate the detailed material on the different work streams and so on to both groups so that if anyone needs that as backup to then provide more detailed support, it's available to them.

You know, I think Amr your question in the chat about by material are we talking about material we've finalized or documents, I think this is all, you know, the only thing we have finalized really is the charter. I mean all of the rest of is work in progress so I think any material is about work in progress, and I think my sense of things is about making sure we bring our respective groups along with us. And that's partly because that's what we should and could do anyway.

And secondly, I think there's something quite important. We are working with a relatively informal structure here. We're not working according to a standard structured plan, so it's incumbent on us therefore to make sure we communicate effectively and continue to bring others along because we don't have structured and standardized phases in the work plan we're working to.

Manal, I see your hand has come up.

Manal Ismail: Yes thank you. I'm just thinking out loud here. So are we suggesting not to circulate the material until after the meeting? Because I think we don't really have thick documents and the charter, as Suzanne mentioned, has already been circulated before. Frankly when I first circulated the charter, I was too optimistic. I was hoping for some feedback over the mailing list that we could take into consideration and consider this done.

But since this didn't happen then we want to bring it to their attention in the face-to-face meeting so that if not getting the approval on the spot then at least some commitments to get their approval soon after. But I don't really see any harm from circulating the material itself in advance. I mean people would appreciate having them early on even if they don't have the time to go through it. I mean I might be mistaken. Again, I'm equally hesitant as Suzanne. But if I were them, I would have preferred to have received the material before the meeting. But again, I'm not sure what others think. If I understood the proposal right.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes I sense, Manal, and trying to follow what's going on in the chat as well that this isn't the strongest feeling. I mean it is an argument to say that to the extent that people are overwhelmed, this is just one more piece of information that they won't pay attention to, but those that would like to do it and pay particular attention to it, it may leave them better informed.

I guess to there's a question about what did we mean by material, and I think there's really - the material is that which has already been shared by the group online which is our working documents, and the secondly there is a proposal by me I guess to prepare some form of slide presentation, let's say the PowerPoint presentation, in advance of the meeting and to not necessarily share that head of the meeting because my experience and feeling me tells me that it's better to talk through a presentation like that rather than talk through it. But...

Okay Amr, I see your hand is up.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Jonathan. This is Amr, and allow me to think out loud right now. I'm trying to compare what we're going to do in this session with the meetings we have for our working groups, GNSO working groups, at these open public meetings and when we have participants coming in who aren't necessarily part of the working group. Typically I feel that it's more constructive to not get into too much detail on ongoing work during these meetings because we could end up wasting a lot of time that is very valuable and limited.

Typically I guess we'll only have maybe about an hour, or at best maybe 90 minutes for this session, and a big chunk of that will be used up with the presentation. And so if we're actually asking for feedback or if we want this session to be interactive, we somehow need to control the schedule, if you will, of that session. And getting into too much detail about what we're thinking and what the work in progress is, frankly I feel that that could be replaced with this sort of feedback going to an online discussion and when we have something a bit more concrete to present.

But I do think just sort of a broad, well just broad strokes of an outline of what it is we're discussing and what direction we're thinking of going - moving towards, I think that might be a better idea instead of getting into too much detail, especially on stuff that - on work that we haven't finalized as a group yet. But those are just my thoughts and some of my concerns, but I'm not necessarily too worried about abiding to them too strictly. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Amr. Let me switch straight to you, Suzanne.

Suzanne Radell: Thank you very much. Suzanne now speaking. Actually I'm very sympathetic to Amr's concerns and I'm also trying to keep track of the chat discussions as well. So I guess if I could back to Manal's comments. I do think we, you know, when our final agenda comes out, the GAC will have links in the actual

agenda. So I do think, to me, one possible scenario would be to remind folks that we've sent this charter out and I think we should reinforce that we are in fact seeking sign off so that the charter is done, but we need - if anybody has any questions or hesitation, whatever, that's an opportunity, and we should probably hear that.

My guess is, you know, fingers crossed, we do not hear any sort of questioning as to how we framed the problem and our proposed way forward. I think we need to get that out of the way. That's a done deal. We're on the right track. We get everybody's buy in. And then I think we certainly could attach - do a link to the presentations. My guess is a lot of our colleagues are not going to look at that until the meeting itself. For those who do print it out and travel, sort of trying to understand it, I think it's going to be -- just a personal observation -- I would find it, you know, sort of clear but sort of not.

And so I do think -- and Amr I hope I'm not offending you -- I do think actually it's probably worth our while to explain to people how did we get to this point; why are we characterizing our work in this way? We broke it down into two sort of separate work streams. I think we might want to clarify that. To me it's very logical. I don't see anybody objecting to that.

But I do think we need to walk people through that. I feel strongly like as Manal does that we on the GAC side really, really need and want buy-in because this is a very critical project that we're working on. And I think there is a great deal of interest but it needs to be presented. It needs to be explained. And I think we want to see a lot of heads nodding around the room. And I don't think it'll take too, too long to present.

And then I think we need to open it up so that people - we're trying to trigger thoughts, right? We want to trigger more interest and questions as to what are our next steps, how are we going to tackle this? How do we tackle that?

So I think we do want a sense, during the meeting itself to the extent we can get it, and I like Manal's idea that we then sort of offer a window of time, perhaps the following two weeks, however - whatever we agree where we are actually asking people to yet again kind of sign off on what we have proposed as next steps. So that way we're never out of step and we manage expectations. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: I see a checkmark from Amr to your point...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...and, you know, frankly I'm hearing - the threads I'm hearing as we talk are essentially in agreement with one another. And I think it seems to me that whilst nothing is off the table as far as we can discuss, present and get feedback on, our primary objective coming out of that meeting is to have an informed pair of groups who are bought into and effectively signing off on the charter and...

Suzanne Radell: Right.

Jonathan Robinson: ...moreover on the direction we are taking. That doesn't mean they necessarily signed off on every fine detail because it's work in progress. But if we...

Suzanne Radell: Right.

Jonathan Robinson: ...can get support for the charter and the direction we're doing well. Great, so that feels like we are pretty much in agreement with one another I think. Now I - it seems to me that a good target, as I said at the outset, would be to have a presentation available for this group to have a look at by our next meeting.

Now here I'm presuming we'll be able to meet on the 18th. Can I check if - who - if anyone has a problem or a concern about us meeting on the 18th? That's Tuesday two weeks from now; it's the Tuesday of the week prior to the ICANN meeting.

David Cake: Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, David.

David Cake: If it's going to be a - sorry, I can't put a checkmark on because I'm not in the - I don't have Internet connectivity so I'm only on the phone bridge. But, yeah, just wanted to agree the things Suzanne said about - I do think we need to have someone walk us through, you know, walk through presentation at the time.

But also, yes, agree also we need to - do need to make sure we leave some time for - we don't fill - fill the time - to structure out all the time there and leave plenty of time for comments and planning is the thing I wanted to add.

Jonathan Robinson: So thanks, David.

David Cake: And also I've got no problem with the 18th. Sorry, I can't add it to the Adobe Chat so...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, David. I see Glen notes that people will be traveling at that time. And, Glen, that's what I was aware of and specifically why I wanted to ask the question. Mikey, your hand is up.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, this is Mikey. Sorry for screwing up your screen. I need to check - yeah, I can make that. My question is do we have a sense of how long the session time is that we have to fit this in? Because that will dramatically

impact the length and detail of the presentation. If we have half an hour it's different than if we have 90 minutes. And I didn't know if we had a schedule for that.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Mikey. My understanding is we're working with a one-hour slot. David, you may be able to comment further but I'm pretty sure it's a one-hour slot. Slightly ambiguous as to whether it could be 90...

David Cake: Well I wanted to say, I mean, just - I mean, we are working with a one-hour slot. But that's the per GAC GNSO interaction it may not all be to do with the result of the result of this group. We may need to leave some time for other things that - other GAC GNSO interaction issues that may come up such as GAC members who might want to speak - something specific about a working group or something so.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Right. This is...

David Cake: ...is all I'm saying.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, this is Mikey again. That was sort of the thought was that if our whole slot with the GAC and the GNSO together is an hour then we probably, for this group, have something on the order of 15 minutes to 20 minutes of that, right, Jonathan and Manal? I...

Jonathan Robinson: Mikey, my view is - and, David, that this is a little bit elastic. We can - we could reasonably argue that the whole of the period could be - could and should be covered by this important issue. What I've relatively - what I have put across, I think, to Heather at some point is that this is the primary purpose of our interaction at this stage. However, we could put something in front of it which would be highlighting the current ongoing work of the GNSO.

But, you know, that could just as easily be - I mean, Marika in the previous couple of meetings has produced a very attractive summary of ongoing policy work in the GNSO. And we could just as easily spend 5 or 10 minutes saying, you know, here is the work that's available. You know, I think we have - there is some flexibility.

So certainly I would expect this - our interaction on this topic and on this subject be a minimum of 30 minutes and, frankly, I could see it taking the majority of the one-hour slot.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Jonathan. That's really helpful.

Jonathan Robinson: And I see Suzanne in the Chat suggest that we consider focusing the entire slot on this. Yeah, and then there's this other topic which is the consideration, Suzanne, that you raise about whether any existing work groups could be considered test cases.

Well that's an interesting one. I know that's been mentioned on a couple of occasions. One gets in a slightly circular argument I think there - it's sort of - on the one hand it's very tempting to experiment. On the other it's one of the rules of engagement which is what we're kind of working on now and what are the mutual expectations.

My feeling is - and this is a feeling - that actually just by virtue of the fact that we're meeting on a regular basis and engaged through the purpose and through this group we stand a better chance of knowing what's going on anyway.

Suzanne, I see your question about this (unintelligible) and the truth is I don't have a clear answer. And it's not that I'm - I just don't have inspiration at the moment as to what we could do. Fire away, Suzanne, I see your hand is up and then Mikey.

Suzanne Radell: Thank you, again, Jonathan. Bless your heart for saying inspiration. I don't know that I'm particularly inspired either so my apologies to the group. I'm not trying to generate any confusion. It's - I may be betraying sort of my personal commitment to this particular project. I actually think this is such a key activity for us that my only thinking was - and it's very (unintelligible) so feel free to push me back and say it's premature.

My only thinking was this is a good way to connect the dots. We're always getting updates, I mean, quite candidly. And the problem on our side is how to digest that material. How to assign, you know, a priority ranking. How to understand whether it's this particular ongoing work project in the GNSO or that one that any individual GAC members and/or the GAC as a whole should pay attention to.

So that's sort of a work assignment for the GAC, if you will, we have to do a better job of trying to digest all that and then make a decision. So that's where my thinking was taking me but it's very sort of ill formed so my apologies to colleagues, you know, for perhaps confusing things. I'm not trying to do that.

I'm just trying to think out loud how do we keep connecting dots here so that, you know, the universe of what is happening today and the universe of what we are trying to grapple with, which might be slightly different tomorrow, how do we keep those two universes in sync? So that's where I'm coming from just by way of explanation. But I'm in your hands as to whether that's simply too much for people to take.

What I guess I'd like to avoid is a presentation on this and then we shift right into yet again a sort of another talking head about what's actually happening over there in the GNSO and it comes across as, again, overwhelming, you know, how do people digest that? What does it mean to bring them up to date?

It's great for people to be brought up to date but on our side we haven't built the filters, if I may say - this is a personal view - as to how we determine then which of these projects really resonate from a public policy perspective. So thanks for letting me explain, I appreciate it.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Suzanne. And I think I get it that the challenge is, you know, here we've got this wonderful scenario of building a brighter future yet if we're not careful we carry on with the same old broken present and it's a question of how we marry those two. And that's a bit of a mischaracterization but perhaps when I talk about broken present but perhaps just helpful to make the contrast as strong as possible.

Mikey, your hand is up.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Jonathan. It's Mikey. Let me just - I inserted sort of a summary of what I thought Suzanne was saying. This may not be quite right in our sort of first sketch of the outline of the presentation. And I want to take you to a picture that I drew that we might be able to use to tie this together which is to say that if you look at the PDP process what we're hoping for is more participation from the GAC earlier.

What the GAC is hoping for from us is a better organized and clearer series of requests to them to let them know what's coming out of the PDP process. And sort of at the heart of the whole thing is this queue that's right in the middle.

And one way to tie these together - this is one of the slides that, you know, I'll be lobbying that we present in the slide deck. And what we could do is say hang onto this queue idea because later on in our presentation we're going to talk about the list of stuff that's coming in the working groups. And we could tie that into the list that Marika built that then Manal broke into chunks on the list.

And we could start to say we're sort of edging our way towards that and this is sort of how these two things tie together and integrate the list of projects or list of working groups or list of requests that is typical in these meetings with this, you know, bright shiny cool new future that we're describing. That's just one approach that we could take there. That's my thought.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Mikey. A quick question for you. I saw Suzanne - I think provide a checkmark in the box for the - in the Chat room for your slide which I think is potentially very helpful material. You talked about a list that Marika built - a list of what is that? I just want to be clear.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey again. Let me just check and see...

Jonathan Robinson: I just wonder if it connected with some - because when I referred to something a moment ago prior to each of the past two face to face meetings the ICANN Policy staff has produced a digest, a short summary of the current work going on - policy-related work going on within the GNSO and that's proved to be very useful for GNSO participants and may well be something of interest to GAC members. So I just wondered if that was what you're referring to or something else?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey again, Jonathan. I've thrown that document that I was talking about up on the screen. This is the one that Marika originally circulated the - this chunk and then I broke it into - let me think so that you can see what I'm talking about.

So this was the original document that Marika circulated. And then what I did is I broke them into those stages that we've started thinking about the PDP. So that's what I was thinking is that we could - through slightly restructuring that typical document that Marika prepares along these lines we could start to knit these two things together.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, got you. Thanks, Mikey. And I understand that. Manal, your hand is up.

Manal Ismail: Yes. I was just going to elaborate on the active GNSO working groups. It was a list that Marika has compiled and Mikey recategorized them by stage. And I checked within the Consultation Group whether I can share this with the GAC and there was a green light to do so.

So I already shared this exact file on the GAC mailing list telling them that this is another format of sharing notifications from the GNSO and asking them whether this is a useful thing to receive and whether they have any preference for categorization by stage versus more elaborate form versus the one-pager brief that you have mentioned which is circulated I think on monthly basis.

So I can forward my email to the GAC to this Consultation Group just for the info. But again I did not receive any response on this but just to keep you posted that this has been circulated on the GAC list.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Manal. And personally I did not miss that and I had got so that's great. And I know you've checked before and I'm sure it's - but it is interesting that no one's responded which suggests that - either a combination of busy and/or otherwise engaged. Suzanne.

Suzanne Radell: Well thank you again. And thank you, Manal, for reminding us. I confess that it had forgotten so my apologies. And I do think, if I can put in a plug, I think Mikey is really onto something with this re-draft of the base material. The base material is exceedingly helpful obviously but it too is very dense and it doesn't give people an easy sense to know well where is this project in the GNSO's timeline?

So I do think we need to be aware, again, with apologies on our side, it's hard for GAC members to keep track of GNSO's PDP timelines and structures. We

know about them, you know, broadly but we don't live in that world because we don't operate that way.

So it's always useful - I think Mikey's way of breaking it down into stages is perhaps a good bridge building exercise between what we are doing about, you know, the brilliant new future and sort of what remains nonetheless in progress today so all of this really good work is going on.

Again, it's going - it's rather hard to digest so I like Mikey's approach of trying to break it down into the stages because clearly we want to draw people's attention to the whole universe of all that work. But if we're trying to reorient GAC people to the early stages then this is a really helpful methodology to use.

So for example there is already, I'm told, at least one GAC member, I believe it's Spain, actively participating in the very first sort of item on the list, privacy proxy services. I can guarantee you that a majority, if not all GAC members, really care about that issue; simply aren't aware enough of what's going on, don't know how to restructure their schedules to take this into account.

We could use this as a really good sort of wake up like here's where things are, the next opportunity appears to be commenting, you know, public comment on the issue report, the preliminary issue report. That's brilliant for people to know because that's early enough in the process it strikes me, that we can attract a broader range of GAC interests.

So I like where Mikey's going with this and I think we need to - maybe that's the way - his methodology is how we can close up the meeting, if you will, in the last however many minutes we decide to allocate. Because I take your points, it's useful to use the meeting to bring people up to date but I think we need to do it in a way that we can do the dotted line back to this particular project. Thank you.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Could I get in the queue?

Jonathan Robinson: Please go ahead, Marika. I'll just, though, before you say that that I'm personally - I'm supportive of Suzanne's comments. I like what Mikey's doing. And I think we're getting somewhere here so, Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just to note as well, and taking Suzanne's comments, I think is very important that we indeed take this back to the broader conversation because, you know, of course I can't see what Mikey's doing on the screen but some of the points he's outlining and Suzanne was referring to is exactly what we've been trying to do in the one-pager.

Where we basically put up front like, you know, what is the next step or next opportunity for engagement? There's a graphic in there that shows exactly at what stage of the process it is and a very short description on, you know, the background on it.

So I think from us, from a staff perspective, it would be really helpful, you know, as an outcome of this process to know, indeed, you know, what works and what doesn't work so we can, you know, get some consistency around that.

Because indeed now, you know, the short summary a lot of the information that was in there I just took from the one-pagers or from the project list that we also have on, you know, on the GNSO Website and on the wiki page. And so we have a lot of information so really trying indeed then to understand, you know, what we have available.

Because as said, you know, for us, you know, getting feedback for example on the one-pager on why that doesn't work or what does work, you know, helps us then as well translate them into possibly something new if you believe that, you know, that would be more helpful in getting GAC members, you know, digest that information in a more accessible format.

So I definitely agree that, you know, again taking that from - just for this meeting to the broader discussion so really can come away at the end of the day with, you know, some tools and methods that we know from both sides will be effective and that we from the staff side are able to support as well on an ongoing basis.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Marika. I'll just remind participants in the call that we're now coming up to 5 minutes before the hour. And we've run on in a slightly less structured way than we presented on the agenda but I - personally I think we're doing a good job of covering what we need to.

And I won't attempt to sum that up quite yet. Let's hear - Mikey, I saw your hands up, Mikey, please go ahead if you have something else to add.

Mikey O'Connor: Sorry, Jonathan, I took my hand down. I didn't want to derail you. I hope I didn't. I have a quick question because we are getting a bit close to the end. If we were to look at this to organize the content we present - and I apologize, I have a glitch that cuts off the top of that - it looks like our slide deck could be organized as a background section, highlights of the charter, discussion of the two work streams.

A segue into that preliminary inventory sort of based on the conversation we just had and then leave with a series of questions that we would like the group to comment on. If that's okay maybe we could eliminate one action item. At the beginning of the call or towards the beginning of the call, Jonathan, you agreed to take an action to organize an outline of this presentation.

I'm just wondering if we could take this as the draft outline in which case I'd be happy to bang together a first draft of a deck for review on the list. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Mikey, for that constructive input. I do have a small response but let me let Manal come in first and then I'll come back to you in a moment.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Jonathan. And thank you, Mikey. Just very quickly I was going to propose, first of all, that we have a poll for this last specific call just to make sure we know who will be available and who will not because we don't even have everyone on this call. So maybe we can issue an early poll to know whether we need this last call or not. Otherwise we can leave it scheduled and cancel it if not needed.

Regarding the presentation I think we should be quick in getting something out and putting it on the list. And I hope that we can thoroughly discuss the presentation on the list and not leave it until the coming conference call because this is going to be really the night of everyone's travels. So I hope that we get this done quickly and have it discussed over the list.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Manal.

Manal Ismail: Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: I picked up two actions from you and I agree with you, I think we need to make sure that the call is - that everyone is available so we can do some administrative work around that. I hear you loud and clear and I'm sure others do as well. The intention should be to sign off on the presentation on March the 18th or do some final polishing tweaks rather than present it for the first time.

Hearing Mikey's suggestion a moment ago I think he's raring to go and, you know, we should be grateful for that. Mikey, my only comment and feedback on that was that I think, you know, we could quickly tweak this but I think we should probably be taking feedback - or possibly taking feedback on the work of this group and then going into - and by the way as a pilot coming out of the

work of this group here's an example of the current work within the GNSO structured - restructured on the base of this.

So it's really a tweaking and potentially swapping around of your last two bullets but in essence I'm in agreement with you on structure so we're not far apart. It's a tweak. And I see Manal and Suzanne, I think, providing support for that in the Chat as well.

So we've hit the top of the hour. I think we've had a free ranging discussion. And it does appear there's been very constructive - Anna, thanks, I see your checkmark has come up as well.

And it seems to me that we've come up with a couple of key action items primarily about delivering a first draft of the presentation which I've heard you volunteer to do, Mikey, at least a skeleton and start to populate it. And we'll get on with that as quickly as possible for sign-off by this group at the March 18 call if we haven't sign it off on the list already and so that becomes a placeholder.

We'll do some careful checking to make sure we've got as many as possible on that. And it sounds like we've actually managed to emerge from this call, my feeling with the help of you all, in pretty good shape. So that feels like we're in not a bad place.

Just one moment then to see if anyone has any other closing remark or comment if I've missed something or they'd like to make sure we capture a key point?

Thanks, Amr, for your support in the Chat. And it sounds like we're in pretty good shape then. All right, everyone, let's work on that presentation in the mean time. It doesn't stop us doing any additional work on the work streams but primarily I think we're about polishing up what we've done so far and getting it in shape to have an effective discussion and sign off on the charter

and sign off on the overall direction and shape of the work of this group in Singapore so that's good news.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Jonathan.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Great job.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, everybody. Bye-bye.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: All right.

Mikey O'Connor: Terri, you can stop the recording at this point and we'll...

Terri Agnew: (Gayle), if you could stop the recording.

Coordinator: One moment please.

END