

**ICANN
Transcription
GAC GNSO Consultation Group meeting
Tuesday 07 January 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 07 January 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/gns0/gns0-gac-20140107-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#jan>

Attendees:

Government Advisory Committee

Manal Ismail - co-chair - Egypt

Ana Neves - Portugal

Suzanne Radel - USA

Mark Carvell - UK

GNSO Council

Jonathan Robinson – co-chair - Registries Stakeholder Group

David Cake –Non Commercial Stakeholder Group

Volker Greimann - -Registrars Stakeholder Group

Brian Winterfeldt –Intellectual Property Constituency

Mikey O'Connor –Internet Service Providers & Connectivity Providers Constituency

Amr Elsadr - Non Commercial Stakeholder Group

Apology:

Gema Campillos – Spain

Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez - Costa Rica

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings

Olof Nordling

Nathalie Peregrine

Glen de Saint Géry

Glen de Saint Géry: Would you like me to do a roll call for you Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes I guess that's normal practice. So thanks then if you could do that. And then we'll kick straight off with the call.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is GAC GNSO Consultation group call on the 7th of January 2014.

On the call we have Jonathan Robinson, Manal Ismail, Suzanne Radell, David Cake, Mark Carvell, Brian Winterfeldt, Mikey O'Connor, Ana Neves

And on the Adobe Connect I believe we have the same people. And for staff we have Marika Konings, Olof Nordling and Nathalie Peregrine and myself, Glen de Saint Géry.

Thank you very much Jonathan. I think I left off some names. And we have Amr Elsadr who has just joined. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Glen. Thanks everyone. Can I just confirm that Suzanne is on the call? I don't see her in Adobe, but you did say she was on the audio.

Suzanne Radell: Yes I am, and my apology Jonathan. I will try to register in Adobe.

Jonathan Robinson: No worries Suzanne. Just making sure you are here. That's great. Thank you very much. All right so Happy New Year to everyone. So start of 2014, our first meeting of which we hope will be quite an active quarter running up to the Singapore meeting.

There are - you will have seen an agenda. And that's posted up in the top right-hand of the Adobe Connect. (Rumor) has also been circulated

on the email list in the background. Manal and I have talked. And she's very kindly on the call in spite of it being a holiday in her country today.

But in our discussion we agreed, well at the previous meeting that we would, Manal Ismail and myself would co-chair this group. And in discussion in regard to this, we agreed that I would run this current meeting for a couple of reasons. Partly because of my existing familiarity with the tools that we typically work with. But just to set that theme for you.

Now not everyone participated in the previous meeting. So I sort of inserted a summarized status quo, so catch a point as Item 1 on the agenda. I thought that would be useful before we dive into the charter of the current work.

We met at the - in December last year. And just really set up a theme for how we would try and work together. As I mentioned a moment ago we agreed that the group would be co-chaired by Manal and myself.

We talked about working methods and, you know, how - whether we record it, whether we had an email list and all of that. And we agreed on a number of things which I do recall circulating to the group in a summary email. But I couldn't locate it this morning.

But really that was about frequency of meetings, whether we can record them, whether we run the email list, whether we use Adobe Meeting Room and some general mechanics.

And then we moved into the scope of the work of this group and how we would manage that. And it was proposed and accepted that a

subgroup essentially be formed. And go away. And just try and frame in the form of a scope of work or a charter if you like, the work that this group would undertake.

That work is being done by the sub-group, or at least some reasonable initial progress, which you also have seen on the mailing list. And in fact, that's really what this - the key point of the second part of this agenda on the call today is all about is trying to just have a - without going through it and with a fine tooth comb, is to take any feedback on that scope of work or charter.

What I would - what would be helpful to me is when looking at this over the last couple of a disease, I realized that it says here it's for discussion purposes only. It's Version 2.

But I wouldn't mind hearing from that group, which is Suzanne, Manal, Mikey and forgive me, I'm not sure who the forth participant in that was. But it would be useful to hear - was that you Amr? Was it Amr?

Suzanne Radell: Sorry, it was Suzanne. But Amr was on the group. Sorry.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, thanks Suzanne. So Suzanne, Amr, Manal and Mikey O'Connor. And so it would be very useful to hear from you guys just to clarify for those of us on the call now what the status of that is.

Is that - I mean did you think - because I wasn't 100%. There was an item earlier down below which talks about - I'm just scrolling through it now - which says topics yet to be addressed by the charter drafting sub-group.

And then it went into goals and objectives and so on. And when I looked at that it seemed to me that those goals and objectives and things were quite well framed and structured. And maybe - or are those still to be addressed?

So I think if one of you, and I know I haven't prepared you in advance. So I apologize for that. Could just summarize the status of this document before we go on to give any feedback or input on it, you know, where you think that that. Is there a volunteer? Mikey, I see your hand is up.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I just want to leap forward because that part that says topics yet to be addressed, that's my mistake. I should've taken that out. It was in an earlier draft that we were working with internally. So that was all I want to do.

If the rest of the gang is okay with that, I can very quickly run through it. But Manal was really our leader. And so I would defer to her on that. I just wanted to take the blame for that particular point.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay that's helpful clarification. And then really the next question is - because that helps me because I thought that the goals and objectives personally were quite well laid out and quite clear on the deliverables.

And I had a pretty substantial agreement with them. Manal your hand is up. So go ahead please.

Manal Ismail: Thank you and welcome (home) from the vacation. Just to clarify that we worked on the document on two phases if I may. We went through

the first part of it. And then we thought we would share it as it is to get some feedback on the first part while we are working on the second part.

So this is why you will find it this topic that says this part is yet to be addressed by the working group. But then this should have been removed when we finished the whole thing. And we circulated the newer version of the document.

As Mikey mentioned, it's just a typo. This topic should have been removed in the second version of the document - in this current version.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks Manal. So then my understanding is that subject to feedback from the broad - from the whole group that this - from the point of view of the sub-group, this document is now essentially complete. And you are seeking either feedback and/or acceptance from the whole group that this accurately frame is the work in the objectives and so on.

So Mikey, you put agreement into the chat. So I think I have a couple of bits of feedback. But let me pause and see if there's anyone else who's got any comments or you've had the opportunity to go through it to provide any feedback on it.

Okay so I will breach the radio silence. It's Jonathan again. And coming with just a couple of comments. First, you know, actually appreciated the document's (strength), that you guys were able to do that. And I found it useful.

In going through it really for me the thing that I really was helpful to sort of hang my hat on was the goals and objectives component, which is why I was so concerned about does it seem to be (done the) job by that phrase that you said is now going to be removed, which is great.

So it seemed to me that that worked well and described clearly what we're going to do. And I like the fact that you were going to then suggest that there is essentially two tracks of work, which it covers it.

In the first track of work you talk about, and in fact in both. They're structured the same. You talk about an initial proposal. And now I guess what we do need to make sure is that we captured that initial proposal in both cases, which is kind of why I sent around, just prior to this call, and you might not have all seen it. But I sent around what is in effect the initial proposal I think, which is that table of existing engagement and proposed engagement. And where there might be topics for discussion.

In my understanding is the initial proposal for the day-to-day ongoing cooperation is the reverse liaison. I wondered is - are there any other initial proposals at the moment? Or have we get to define that? Because as far as I know for the first part, the mechanisms for day-to-day ongoing cooperation, the initial proposal is the reverse liaison.

So I'll just bring them up on the screen in this area here. Can you see? Is my hand, is that the cursor showing effectively, Mark?

Mark Carvell: Yes, I'm sorry. I'm just wanting to comment more generally on the charter. I think it sets up the basic objectives very well. I think what it doesn't quite capture, unless I've missed it somewhere, is the problem

of different working methods of how the GAC and GAC representatives of their respective administrations are able consistently to engage in policy development.

And there were established processes that the GNSO has. And I think that's the challenge, which needs to be underlined somewhere. It's not going to be easy for the continuous sort of roll through of policy development to be maintained with the GAC intersecting only episodically if you'd like from, you know, at times when the GAC is able to do so.

And I think that's the challenge. The real risk and fear is that the GAC is going to have to say hold on. We can't get back to you on this policy aspect. Individuals may seek time to consult within administrations. And the GAC then needs some kind of a forum to consider individual GAC representative points.

You know, so it's the matching of GAC working methods how individual representatives are able to handle the work with the process which is already well-established. And I think that's one of the key challenges in light of this work.

My other point as well is the title of the charter seems to be unresolved. You've got tentative name there. And I think what that tentative name doesn't quite capture the scope. I would suggest it's something like GAC GNSO consultation group on GAC early engagement and policy development processes. It's a rather long title, I concede.

But I think it's important to capture that best objective to secure the early engagement of governmental inputs. Those are my general comments. I fear the text - the paper goes on quite, you know, through several pages. Ideally it would be shorter. But I don't have any suggested ways of trimming it.

As long as the key objectives and the challenge and the problem - problems are set up clearly, and the timeframe of resolving these issues is clearly set out, I'm happy.

And it's good I think the point out critical success factors. So I think that's a good - that's a very good heading. And so I do support that element in the paper. I hope that's helpful.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Mark. It's certainly helpful to me. And this resonates pretty well. And let me - I see you sparked a couple of responses from Manal and then followed by Suzanne. So please go ahead Manal.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Jonathan. And to the first points made by Mark on the challenge itself, I think we tried to describe this under the heading of what is the problem to this group.

So this comes very early in talking. But if it is not clear we can try to clarify along the lines Mark had mentioned. So this should be addressed under what is the problem to the group.

I believe further (data) on how this would be achieved comes with the solutions, which is not yet part of - is not part of the charter because it's yet to be discussed.

For your question Jonathan on the initial proposal (thing). Again, my understanding the suggestion was the mechanism for day-to-day ongoing (cooperation), this should be covered by the table we've been discussing for quite some time. The one you have just circulated.

As for the reverse liaison, we already have some initial questions on that from initial proposals. But I think this should be addressed separately as day-to-day ongoing cooperation to allow for any even more creative ideas for additional. It might not be only the reverse liaison. It might be a permanent group that do this interfacing as suggested earlier by (Mikey) on the first call.

So there might be more than one mechanism to this. And I think the reverse liaison, I thought it would have been a straightforward thing. But discussing with yourself in the rest of the GNSO members, I understand (unintelligible) issues and things like that that (these are some) real issues also.

So - and we have already suggested (two separate stacks). So that's why we have separated the proposals from each other. I hope this answers your questions.

I also have a couple of comments on the document itself. I was part of the drafting group. But I hope this will be okay. (Save them for later).

Jonathan Robinson: Yes thanks Manal. And are you - would you like to defer to Suzanne and then come back with those comments? Or would you like to proceed to provide those comments right away? Perhaps we should let Suzanne, since she was responding I think to market others. And

then if you can come back in with your other comments on the document.

Manal Ismail: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great. Thanks.

Manal Ismail: Exactly, yes.

Jonathan Robinson: If you could just make sure your hand goes up again. And then we'll definitely put it down and come back. Put it back in the queue. That would be great Manal. And let's hear from Suzanne for now.

Suzanne Radell: Thank you Jonathan. Thank you Manal and Mark. Manal actually said many of the things that I would have said. I think Mark that as the small drafting group in creating the charter documents, I think we were very mindful of the underlying problems.

It's a complete difference in working methods. And if you have some proposed edits to the statement of the problem, I think that would be, you know, probably helpful.

We were aware also that the GAC has kind of identified this before. So I would - I know it seems like ancient history. But I think the joint working group report that we finalized, I believe it was mid-year 2011 does have some pretty good descriptions of the problem in the difference in working methods.

So I think we've taken that as a given that that is in fact what this group is chartered to kind of take on. In view of the different working

methods, how do we overcome the challenges that we've all agreed exist in order to facilitate early engagement by the GAC in GNSO policy development processes?

So I take your point. I just think it's kind of captured. But if we need a footnote that goes back to the joint working group, so be it.

I also agree with Manal that we probably want to think about ideas that could complement the concept of, you know, reverse liaison. And one thing I, you know, don't know that we've explored enough in the document is can we look to staff to perhaps come up with some additional ideas that may be interesting in that may be more helpful.

So I thought I would leave it at that. And would like to hear more about any of Manal's proposed edits to the document since it is meant to be a working, and it would be good to hear from other people on this working group as well as to how - what edits people would like so that we're all in agreement as to this is the scope of our work. And this is how we intend to proceed. So thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: And Suzanne if I could just make a brief response. I mean I think that that's - that both you and Manal's sort of clarification of additional points are certainly very helpful to me.

One thing I think we have to be cautious of is allowing the charter document to define too much of - sorry, to actually answer the question. It's really to, as you've been all too aware is to set up a scope of the work.

So we've got to be careful we don't drift into trying to provide the answers in the charter document. That would be my thought on - just a little additional thought on that.

But let me not monopolize from the chair in hand over to Amr and then Manal, as you said, to hear her thoughts on the edits of the document. So Amr over to you.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Jonathan. You basically said exactly what it is I wanted to say, which is the charter isn't really meant to answer any of the problems or come up with a solution.

I mean the problems are just sort of meant to show what we believe the problems are and what the possible avenues are for answering any questions that we might want answered.

And Mark's question is a really good one. And I do believe that it is covered to an extent. Perhaps maybe some more work should be done on the draft. But if you take a look at the objectives on Page 4, you will see the second bullet under objectives is an agreed process for ongoing smooth early engagement of GAC and GNSO PDP projects.

So this isn't just about reverse liaisons and exchange of information, thorough exchange of information through the GAC and the GNSO. But also how this group might feel as a worthwhile means of having the GAC engaged in sexual policy development as opposed to just giving, perhaps giving feedback on policies that have been developed.

So like Jonathan said, this is stuff that, I mean these are our questions that are not answered in the charter. But the questions have been hopefully framed to an extent in the charter draft. And it's up to the group in our ongoing work to answer them.

I also believe that the work of this working group is really going to be an iterative one. And we will hopefully come up with recommendations on how to achieve the goals we want to achieve. And that when looking back we might think okay, there's more work that needs to be done. And this might be reflected in future versions of charters or sort of a second or third phases.

And one of the questions that we probably should be looking at is how when the - how long that this working group might want to continue its work, whether it will be a sort of a - or a consultative group. Whether this is going to be a permanent consultative group between the GNSO and the GAC? Or whether this is something with a mandate that is only ongoing as long as the consultative group feels that it should keep going?

At first it will be an iterative project. And we will need to review our success factors along the way and perhaps adjust our objectives accordingly. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. I think we can pass it straight on - past the microphone straight on to Manal then.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Jonathan. And a quick addition to what has been said by my colleagues in response to Mark, the different working methods also

mentioned under the title or the question what is the chronology of the situation. How did we get here?

So this part also in addition to the statement - the problem statement, this part also mentions the different working methods of the GAC and the GNSO. I believe it's on the second page.

So again as you mentioned Jonathan, the charter focuses on the problem definition. What is out of scope of the group? And what is the scope of work of the group along with the goals, objectives and expected deliverables?

So having said that I have two - I have comments on two questions actually. The first one is the stakeholders will be affected by the problem. (I see) have written the GAC (unintelligible) and the ICANN policy stuff. And I was wondering why didn't we also include the GNSO (sica) studies? Is it because they are already part of ICANN stuff or? So this is one thing.

The other thing, the stakeholders. We said anyone interested in gTLD policies, I believe we should explicitly mention the GAC and the GNSO at least. So should I move to the second question or?

Jonathan Robinson: Well Manal that's a good point. I think Marika's got a comment for you on that GNSO staff point. So let's let Marika just respond. And then you can move on to your second question.

Manal Ismail: Okay.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Just to confirm that the secretary staff is part of the ICANN policy staff. So it will be covered in that (number).

Manal Ismail: Okay so we explicitly included GAC (sica) studies. Not all of them are ICANN stuff right?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I believe that's correct. But Olof can confirm. But I believe that that would include as well the secretary that has been recently engaged. But I think Olof is in a better position to confirm (I might add).

Jonathan Robinson: Olof go ahead.

Olof Nordling: This is Olof, and that's absolutely correct. The way things are heading right now is for an external secretariat. While we still do have, well ICANN policy staff supporting the GAC as well.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay Manal, hopefully that answers your question way that was worded in that way. And if not, please let us know and also continue to your next point then I think.

Manal Ismail: So and regarding the stakeholders, don't you think we should mention the GAC and the GNSO explicitly or?

Jonathan Robinson: It seems to me that doesn't do any harm. I think it's probably been taken as implicit. But I have no, personally I have no objections. That seems sensible.

Manal Ismail: I'm flexible too. I'm just raising this and I'm flexible.

Jonathan Robinson: So maybe I should make a comment here Manal. This was for you and others to consider. But what I'm thinking is we're having a discussion here around sort of minor tweaks and variations.

I'm not hearing significant sort of concern over the charter. And what I'm thinking is that it's likely that the group will go away. Make an iteration. Call it, you know, changing it from Version 2 to Version 2.1 or something.

And but in principle there seems to be pretty broad support for what it covers. And it's subject to some minor tweaks arising from this. So that's - just to help you out and where this seems to be going, that's my thought as to where this is headed is that there will be a relatively quick turnaround of another iteration of the charter, but not a substantial rewriting. Please go ahead.

Manal Ismail: Okay. The part - I think it's the following stage. It's the out of scope work. And here we mentioned early engagement between the GAC and other agencies and (all) a timely exchange of information and once each month a public policy update.

And I'm just flagging the second bullet, which is timely exchange of information. And I'm just wondering whether this is timely exchange of information between the GAC and other (ACSO)s?

Or does it also included timely exchange of information between the GAC and the GNSO? Because I believe that timely exchange of information between the GAC and the GNSO is within our scope, right? It's already mentioned in one of the objectives.

Jonathan Robinson: Does anyone else from the group who drafted this able to comment on that timely exchange of information (unintelligible)? Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I think I may be, again, the culprit on this one. And I think what I was trying to get at is that distinction between what we do is mostly aimed at improving the process but not actually being the process.

So, for example, we might (unintelligible) a mechanism to promote timely exchange between the GAC and the GNSO but I was imagining that we would also recommend some other group to do that. So that was the intent of that. I don't - I don't have any objection to taking that out but that's the reason that it was in there.

Manal Ismail: If I may further clarify very quick because the first time I read this bullet I didn't have a problem because we were - we're not looking into the whole (unintelligible) we're just focusing on GAC early engagement in (unintelligible).

But reading further down in the objectives you've written an agreed process for ongoing, smooth and timely information exchange. So we have exactly the same phrase under out of scope and under the objectives. That's why I'm flagging this out but - so we can either rephrase it to make sure it includes broader than GAC early engagement in PDP or - I mean, just to this thing, what exactly is within the scope and what is out. Does this make sense?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey again. Let me just jump in. It makes perfect sense. And I've taken a note to clarify that because I think we're agreeing on what

we want to do, it's just badly worded. And so thanks for catching that. I think that's good.

Jonathan Robinson: All right so perhaps I could then say, I mean, Manal, have you - thanks, Mikey. And so, yeah, I must say - Suzanne's put in the Chat that one possibility is to simply delete that bullet and I know, Mikey, you said you didn't have an objection.

Personally I think it - certainly as it stands it's clearly - is confusing. And I'll just add my thoughts that it wouldn't do any harm to delete it if - other wording to try and explain what's achieved is harder to come by. I don't think, as it stands, it feels to me that it's absolutely necessary.

But nevertheless it strikes me that what we've got to do now is make sure - I mean, Mark made the most substantive points, although others - particularly Manal and Suzanne have made other comments and input.

So what I was expecting might happen here is that, as I said a few moments ago, that the small drafting group would go away and say, right, you know, based on the recording or the transcript or Mikey's notes from this call, we think the following half a dozen changes might need to be made just to tidy up the title, some of the items, see if there's any way in which it can be shortened.

Take account of the points that have been made and make a reasonable attempt to encompass those and then provide us with a final version of the charter to work with.

That said, it's - I suppose, as we go, there's - it's an interesting one whether the charter should then be cast in stone or not. But that's - and maybe if someone wants to comment on that. Because we're working with a set of rules here that aren't - we haven't - we are operating as a collaborative group rather than according to specific working group guidelines or otherwise.

And this was - this charter is intended to guide our work and help us - mutually understand the scope of the work. So it may be that there could be further tweaks to the charter along the way as long as we kept a control on the version number. But let's try and get it to the next iteration.

Does everyone agree that that makes the most sense to simply hand it back to the group for a minor set of revisions based on this input and then work with it from there? Perhaps it's probably more sense if I see some - a number of checkmarks coming up in the box it probably would have been more sensible to ask if anyone disagreed.

But, Suzanne, your hand is up.

Suzanne Radell: Thank you, Jonathan. I do not disagree actually but what I was going to sort of put out is a request that for those who may not have had time perhaps to review the document prior to today's call if we could set a deadline. I don't know if Friday would be too soon or Thursday?

Could we get some proposed edits? I mean, if people could use the list, you know, the email list that we've now created for the larger group because as a member of the drafting team other than the minor edit

we've just agreed I don't exactly know what other members of the group would be asking us to do with this document.

So I hate - perhaps I'm just being thick this morning but I'm not seeing any concrete or discrete proposed edits. So I do think it's important. I agree with you completely, we need to have agreement on this text because this is our charter.

So if we could find a way to perhaps permit other members to take sufficient time to give us any proposed edits or share questions then I think we'd have something else to go on. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Good point, Suzanne. And that's actually - thanks for bringing it to a head in that way. I mean, I think that makes a lot of sense. Let's call on this call for any proposed changes to the wording no later than Friday this week. And that includes anything like suggested wording for the title or any adding or removing of text.

And then we can aim to cement the wording next week with the drafting - the drafting group can do that. And that puts us in a position to start to move forward. Which given the time we've got for this call is probably worth focusing on now.

And that's the next bullet point really, the way forward of a work plan and some of the practical issues that arise. Now as far as I can my reading of this is the way forward is nicely encompassed in the preferred or at least summarizing the preferred problem solving approach on the last but one page of this charter where it says there'll be two tracks of work; one focusing on a mechanism for day to day

cooperation and one focusing on a mechanism for GAC early engagement of GNSO PDP.

Now I guess the question for us is - the tracks of work will work in parallel according to the charter. And the question - one key question this raised is whether there's a necessity to have two sub groups or whether we can simply continue with these two tracks as part of the main group.

Now we're a pretty small group all with other things taking up our time. So I'll put a strawman out there to say that I suspect we should handle both of these tracks of work within the main thread as a main group. But maybe others feel differently. Maybe they feel it would be more productive if these were taken away and chewed over by a smaller group as we did with the charter.

Any thoughts or comments on the practicalities of how we work going forward given these two areas? Mikey, I see your hand is up.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Jonathan. This is Mikey. At least when we were drafting this section what we said is - in the subsequent paragraphs is that it kind of implies two different groups. I agree that having two separate mailing lists gets very complicated. But sort of the way that we had a sub group go off and do the charter what we, I think, were envisioning was that we would have two subgroups that would make it their primary focus to work on these things.

Jonathan Robinson: Mikey, if I may, the wording says something slightly different. In fact it's interesting. Because what the wording seems to say is that it envisages two different leads with the involvement of all members.

Which I quite like actually. It means there's someone responsible for leading it but all the members are potentially involved and the dialogue goes on the main mailing list. So I'm not - I just wonder if that's - if...

Mikey O'Connor: No, you're right. I stand corrected. Never mind.

Jonathan Robinson: Well, no, it's a good - I wonder - so it'd be good to hear how others feel. I like the idea of two leads. I think having two people - two of us within the group grab hold of it but I wonder if we're big enough to sustain partitioning the work more than that rather than just - essentially what we will have to call a holder of the pen in the two different leads.

David, you appear to be supporting that I think. Manal, your hand is up.

Manal Ismail: Yes, Jonathan. Just to agree to what you have mentioned. This is, I think - I believe what we had in mind when we suggested two leads to make sure that both tracks are progressing equally. And as you mentioned we are (unintelligible) small and we need every single opinion from members within the group so I believe it would be a more (unintelligible) to work - to have this discussed among all members.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Manal. I think we've got a contribution then from David and I see Amr is supporting you on that so go ahead, David.

David Cake: All I wanted to say is I can sort of see how possibly focus groups get initial proposals might be useful. But I certainly think we are a pretty small group and we should probably certainly all be involved in how we develop it from there. So sometimes it's useful to (unintelligible) to focus but I think we all need to be involved in how they get developed.

But I'm quite happy to have it as two lead with the same one group; I think that's quite a useful sensible idea.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so it looks like the first thing we're going to be needing to do then is we're going to be looking for leads of those. In any event we'll need to look for some volunteers to lead those two different threads of work. If there are any - if anyone's - it's probably a good idea to volunteer on list for the record.

But if anyone's thinking of it, by all means, throw your hat in the ring on the list and we will need a lead for both of those groups. And the sooner we can get going with that the better. That'll be good.

So it would be great to get a couple of volunteers to lead those two different threads of work. And then, I mean, practically the way in which we'll work with that is I guess we'll need a document in each case, for each lead to coalesce around.

Now it happens, I think, that we have one document already relatively well formed which is the one I circulated before. So one of the first things that the lead of that group, it seems to me, will need to decide is whether to adopt and continue to work with that document or to start with something fresh.

But as far as the other one is concerned, which is the mechanism for day to day cooperation, we do have one initial proposal which is (unintelligible). And as Manal correctly remembered and pointed out there was another proposal in our earlier meeting and there'll be others.

So that - the document for that group will need some - the initial document for that group will need a bit of work. So, yeah, that seems to be where it's going to go and that'll be done on the list.

Now our plan is to, in addition to do that is to meet on a two-weekly basis, every two weeks assuming that remains necessary. And I provisionally put out a schedule that - and I - and we had discussed rotating the time but it looked like we just might be able to work with this time without - providing it wasn't on a Friday and still keep David involved.

So in a sense my question I think is really for David if he can tolerate this or would feel that it would be better to have some alternate times. My feeling being that if possible it's better to stick to a single time and ideally a single day of the week.

So my proposal is Tuesday 1400 and I'm acutely aware that in particular this is probably most inconvenient for David. But whilst I don't want to do the full Doodle poll here if anyone's got any strong feelings that this really does work or more importantly doesn't work for them or can't work for them it would be good to hear that now just so that we can sort of shape the Doodle poll accordingly.

David Cake: I was just going to say this time is fine for me actually.

Jonathan Robinson: So David, that's very good to hear. Thanks for that so that's helpful.
Mark, I see your hand is up. Go ahead.

Mark Carvell: Yes, thank you, Jonathan. I think this is broadly the correct approach.
The timing for the 4th and 5th of February that's fine. Once we start

getting into late February and March it becomes more problematic for those government representatives like me who are off to Geneva and Strasburg and so on.

So, you know, for me personally the third tentative scheduling of 18th and 19th doesn't work. If an alternative could be put on Doodle for 24th and 25th that would help me; 18th and 19th I'll be in Geneva. It's when the (unintelligible) review multi-stakeholder platform meets - as that's the problem there.

And the week of the 3rd of March is a very busy week. We've got IETF in London and there are (unintelligible) things going on. So that's going to be difficult for me. I might be able to dip out of things to join on the fifth I think but if an alternative.

On the fifth one we're getting close then to the Singapore meeting. I just wonder what the value is of a discussion so close to Singapore. I do have another problem; I'm in Strasburg on the 18th and 19th because the Council of Europe for me personally but obviously I don't want to - everything to revolve around my diary, I'm not suggesting that.

But I just wonder if actually we have an early meeting in Singapore or maybe on the eve of the Singapore meeting the GAC will meet on the afternoon of the Saturday. We could meet on the - physically, you know, a face to face, on the morning as this group. Just a suggestion.

But I'm just anxious that we do move to the substantial questions and set out in the table - the updated table you've just circulated, Jonathan,

the 3-December on the policy development process and you've got a number of questions there.

So if you're asking us now to react to those questions between this call and the next call I think that's probably a useful exercise to do. You know, I've started to look at some of the questions you very usefully raised and I think some can be answered quite quickly; others not so. But perhaps between now and the next call we could gravitate towards these questions in the document. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Mark. That's a good point. Yes, so on the date - I mean, we clearly won't be able to accommodate everyone all the time. I was particularly sensitive about this time slot for David but I also wanted to hear if there are any substantial issues and you've raised a good point that, you know, many of you and your colleagues may be in Geneva or at the IETF so that's useful.

And, yes, I think we should be tackling the substantive points as soon as possible from tomorrow essentially. To go ahead I've got Manal and Suzanne in the queue. Go ahead, Manal.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Jonathan. Like Mark I might be having problems with the second and the third schedule (groups). The third is due to the same reasons as Mark mentioned; the (unintelligible) plus 10 and the open consultation of the IETF.

I'm not 100% sure yet whether I'm going to be traveling or not so this is very tentative. But for the first week of February we have some regional ICANN activities in Dubai which I'm heavily involved in. So I might not be able to join the call unless it doesn't conflict - it does not

conflict with the meetings over there. So - and, again, I don't want to impose my own agenda but just flagging this early on that I'll be able to join (unintelligible). Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Suzanne, go ahead.

Suzanne Radell: Thank you, Jonathan. And I'm, I suppose, one of the fortunate government bureaucrats who does not have to cover all of those things; a lot of those issues are taken up by colleagues. So I think you're right, Jonathan, we may never be able to find a schedule that accommodates everybody.

I think I can provisionally make all of those calls and so I'm happy to do that. But if others feel strongly they want a new Doodle poll I'm happy to participate as well.

I did want to chime in, though, on Mark's suggestion - and forgive me, Mark, I'm not trying to be negative here. But the Saturday morning idea in Singapore I do think we can probably suggest that or ask the chair and vice chairs of the GAC if that might work because I'm already hearing suggestions about a possible capacity-building session for the GAC which Mark and Manal know we often do in different regions for different meetings. So I don't want us to sort of make promises to our GNSO colleagues here that we might not be able to meet. Sorry.
Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: That's a good point, Suzanne, and thank you for that. I mean, the truth is that the GNSO has the working sessions on the weekend and Saturday is traditionally pretty full for us as well. So I think if I take Mark's point about the proximity of the meeting, of a Tuesday 18th or

Wednesday 19th of March meeting plus the desirability of meeting face to face, which I think would be very attractive, we just need to be aware that I guess - I had two factors in mind.

One is getting as much meeting time at least scheduled, even if we don't end up needing it, which is why there's five meetings between now and Singapore is just to try and fill that schedule and carve it out of our diaries if at all possible. And then, third, we had a real chance of producing some forward progress by Singapore.

Having said that, I fully acknowledge and accept that if we can meet face to face in Singapore that will be desirable and we should try and find some means for doing so. But the challenges will be not only from the GAC side but also from the GNSO side as always.

Okay so I think we've got a good basis to really start to commence work. Suzanne, has your hand gone up again? David, your hand is up from previously, I believe and Suzanne as well so if you could remove those if we are - if we have responded to both of those hands previously, that would be great. Suzanne, did you want to speak again?

Suzanne Radell: I did. And my apologies.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...it's not always obvious whether a hand's gone up and gone down again. Please go ahead.

Suzanne Radell: No, no and fair enough. Fair enough. I did want to sort of put out there maybe as we progress our work, you know, getting comments from colleagues here in this group and we refine the scope paper it may well be if this particular smaller group cannot meet, although I agree with you, I think we should shoot for that in Singapore; face to face is always better.

We might want to give some thought as to how we would respectively report to our, you know, you on your side to the GNSO more broadly; we to the GAC more broadly.

There may be some value in having this group get on the GAC's agenda, at a minimum, and possibly yours as well, to provide an update as to the progress we've made to date because at some point we will all need to go back to our larger respective communities I imagine.

And we're going to need and want sign-off every step of the way with whatever recommendations we come up with. Would I be correct in thinking that? Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Suzanne, certainly from my perspective I would expect that to be the case that we would need to - I mean, I would hope that we would find a slot possibly as part of our joint GNSO GAC meeting to report progress. And depending on what had been achieved in the meantime and what consultation had been achieved to indicate that this was either progress with some form of endorsement or more likely progress with the requirement to go and get feedback from the respective groups.

Manal and Mark, I see both of your hands have gone up. I am conscious of the time, we're coming to the top of the hour, so if you could be brief and then I'll try and sort of sum up what I think we've agreed on the call so far today. Thanks. So Manal and then Mark.

Manal Ismail: Very quickly just to concur - yeah, very quickly just to concur with what Suzanne has said, indeed this is one of the critical success factors we have identified so it would be good to indicate when the charter is ready to share outside this working group so that we can share it with the broader GAC members and the (BGRI) working group as well. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Mark.

Mark Carvell: Yes thanks. And just very briefly I'm hoping that in Singapore we can do a bit of signing off and endorsing on the GAC side as well as on the GNSO side. I think it's incumbent on all of us really to make fast progress with this issue. It's been around for quite some time as we're all very conscious of. It goes back to the ATRT1.

I think if there's no box ticking of progress in Singapore it'll look pretty bad so I hope we're all sort of fired up with that objective and that, you know, on the GAC side we can say we have agreed this with the GNSO in the communiqué but we - if there are still significant points to address we have a clear timeline before London to address those. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks, Mark. I agree, I mean, certainly it has a high visibility and it will be good to - I just think we need to be realistic about what we

can achieve. Let's work hard and see where we get to. But I fully take your point on the visibility and sensitivity of the issues involved.

So what I think we've got here is we've got a near final version of the charter. We've got some proposed amendments either within this call and on the text shared and so on so - and we've said we would - we will put a deadline of Friday of this week for any other further comments on the charter.

And thereafter, next week, the charter drafting group can finalize that and present it to the group. I think we can perhaps aim to formally sign off on this on our Tuesday 21st meeting. But in principle that should be a formality at Tuesday 21st if all goes well.

In terms of the actual substance of the work I don't see any reason - my personal opinion is why we can't commence with that immediately. So we're looking for volunteers on the list ASAP for someone to hold the pen for each of those two tracks of work.

And we can commence working with that by email exchange and revision of - and refining of the document - and come back again to discuss that on Tuesday the 21st which looks likely to be our next meeting with the rest of the meetings to follow via some form of consultation, likely a Doodle poll.

I think that captures the main points. I hope I've summed that up accurately. So we're in reasonably good shape to make progress immediately. And given that we're at the top of the hour I think that's it. Anything that I've - any substantial point that I've missed or that anyone would like to raise prior to closing the call?

Thanks, Mikey, for your summary in the Chat; that's very useful. So I think with that we'll bring this call to a close. I'm just waiting to hear if there's anything else coming in the Chat. Great so that's very good. That was a productive call.

I know we're all keen to get going on this so let's try and keep active on the mailing list in the - in between meetings as well because that's where real progress will be made. And feel free to engage with one another on a one-to-one basis and then bring it back to the mailing list as necessary.

Thanks, everyone. Look forward to talking with you in the meantime and meeting up again on Tuesday 21st. All right...

((Crosstalk))

Mark Carvell: Thanks everyone. (Unintelligible), yeah, bye.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, all.

END