ICANN
Transcription
GAC GNSO Consultation Group meeting
Tuesday 09 September 2014 at 13:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GAC GNSO Consultation Working Group call on the Tuesday 09 September 2014 at 13:00 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.

http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-gac-20140909-en.mp3

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar

http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#sep

Attendees:
Government Advisory Committee
Manal Ismail – co-chair – Egypt
Mark Carvell, UK
Suzanne Radell - USA
Ana Neves, Portugal

GNSO Council
Avri Doria – Councillor - NCSG
Amr Elsadr, Councillor

Apology:
Jonathan Robinson, Chair
David Cake, Vice Chair

ICANN Staff:
Marika Konings
Julia Charvolen
Olof Nordling
Terri Agnew

Woman: Recording has been started. Please go ahead.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the GAC GNSO consultation group call on the 9th of September 2014. On the call today we have Ana Neves, Manal Ismail, Suzanne Radell, Avri Doria and Mark Carvell. We have no apologies.

From staff we have Marika Konings, Julia Charvolen, Olof Nordling and, myself, Terri Agnew. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you, Manal.

Manal Ismail: Thank you and welcome everyone. It's been quite some time since our last call. And mindful of the time, I do apologize again for starting late. I was fixing some technical problems with my audio.

So if we can go straight ahead to our agenda. We have a quick update on a GAC member survey. If you recall, we already have the survey. We have only eight responses and then we extended the deadline for the survey until the end of the month of August.

And the last update was that we had 24 responses, so if Marika, please, if you could give us a quick update on where we stand now that the deadline has passed.

Marika Konings: Yes, of course. Thanks Manal. So this is Marika. So what you actually see up on the screen is the overview of the survey results. For those of you - that may have difficulty viewing some of the information there, I've also posted the direct link to the summary of the results as part of the agenda on the right (pod) on your screen and we'll also be circulating that after the call.

So after passing - the deadline has passed now, we had received 29 responses from GAC members and I can maybe briefly take you through and

I think maybe the findings - and again, you know, the consultation group my do some further study and analysis on the feedback received.

But just as a brush, I think you can tell from the first question where we basically asked GAC members how familiar they are with the existing mechanisms that the GNSO uses to raise early awareness or has its availability to communicate on policy and (unintelligible) activities.

So as you can tell, you know, the first few of those, the GAC early engagement policy document, the policy update, as well as the policy update Webinar are all somewhat familiar or familiar to GAC members, although (unintelligible) behind percentage knows that they're completely unfamiliar with those.

But then if we go further down the list, you see that the unfamiliarity with some of the other mechanisms is increasing. That includes the GNSO background briefings that we prepare ahead of ICANN meetings, announcements that come from the GNSO secretary's request for input from GNSO PDP working groups and participation in GNSO working groups.

And as you can note from the comment, and I think that comes back as well in some of the other comments, it seems that, you know, a lot of that has to do with, you know, the overflow of information. A lot of information is being received, presumably not only in relation to GNSO initiatives or from, you know, GNSO related groups.

So it appears that it's sometimes difficult to, you know, distinguish between what may be important or urgent or necessary to be reviewed compared to, maybe you know, general (announcements) and other things. So at least that is what I can - seem to be reading through the lines looking at some of the comments.

So and the second question we asked was for those mechanisms that you rated somewhat familiar or very familiar, can you, you know, let us know what the usefulness of those is. And, again, you see, you're a little bit of a mixed result, you know, some indicating on some of these that they're, you know, very useful, useful, somewhat useful.

I think only a few, you know, for example, the (use) of background briefings rate, you know, (roughly) behind on - or the not familiar, so not able to assess, so at the same time, you know, for those that are familiar with the document we provide, I think they range between somewhat useful to very useful.

But, again, if you look at the comments, I think you know, people indicate again that this is, you know, really difficult to keep track of all the information that is provided and sheer volume of activities going on and, you know, there's time to have relevant participation.

So then we also asked if all of those that you have rated less than very useful, please indicate how this mechanism can be improved to achieve the very useful rating. I think we got a number of different suggestions.

I think on the first comment, and if I may provide also some personal commentary to those - someone suggestion that, for example, on I think - and particularly to some of the - the one page that we provide will be helpful if we would actually provide indications on whether public policy aspects are implied or indicated in any given issue.

And, again, I think that's something where probably we would very - feel very uncomfortable in doing so as that is something we view as, you know, within the agreement of the GAC and not necessarily part of the GNSO or the GAC to tell - or staff to tell the GAC what we believe is public policy, so you know, the information we typically provide is around the issue and the assumption that, indeed, is for the GAC on the base of that to identify whether that effects of implies public policy implications.

And also (notes a) relationship between policy initiative and GAC advice. I do believe that we've been trying to do that at least on the one pagers, but again, that's something that we can look at. Some also see that some good discussion may be helpful and I don't know if that particularly relates to having your group discussion about how those mechanisms work or whether that's, you know, whether that would be of interest in actually presenting some of those documents as it may be easier.

Some also know more attractive methods of communication or messaging may be helpful. Some suggest, for example, on the policy update that they issue be more frequently shared and ones among some note in relation to the policy update Webinar, that you know, the schedule doesn't always allow them to participate.

Sharing the publicly available materials, which I do believe is something that does happen. Again, on the other ones, some are suggesting that (their rack) engagement and follow up with the GAC secretary and executive would help.

And then I think on the request for (unintelligible) GNSO PDP working groups, again, people notice it's hard to discern. You know, they end up, I think, with the other emails so it's not always clear what is expected or needed or what stage the GNSO work is.

And then participating in GNSO working groups, you know, some of those that may be the biggest challenge, some note that some of them provide positive experience with that. Some have less positive experience with that but also some note that it's the frequency of working group meetings as well as a time commitment that is required is not always an option for GAC members to get themselves involved in that work.

So then we also asked whether there were any other ways in which existing mechanisms should be revised or new mechanism should be created to

promote early awareness of an engagement of GNSO policy development activities.

And a number of suggestions were made there. Some of those, of course, already are actively working on them. Some of them refer to the GAC GSNO liaison and the second agenda item so you'll hear more about that.

Now also that - suggesting that this group should actually review all the comments received in response to the survey and based on that, you know, prepare some suggestions for more in depth discussion (relayed).

Noting as well, that you know, engagement may be more interactive and seeing how that can be improved. Some commenting that the GNSO Web site is helpful but that some of the information may be buried, so it's better - easier to find information, may be helpful.

(Regular) feedback on outcome of PDP processes, including a summary of previous processes. Again, I think that is something that we're trying to capture in the one-pagers but maybe that is something we can look at in more detail to see how those could be made more helpful or, indeed, if that should be replaced as some other kind of mechanisms.

And then some of them suggested more (unintelligible) relationships and more ways to be engaged on the standpoint the other party is doing (it). I guess that's part of why we're all here as well.

So I think that's - the snapshot - the findings from the survey and, of course, happy to take any questions or, you know, give people, as well, an opportunity to review the results after this call in further detail and see if there - if you need the further lessons we can learn from this or additional suggestions we should be covering as part of that.

Manal Ismail: So thank you, Marika, and yes, definitely we should further look into the results of the survey and draw some conclusions and - which should guide our work on the day-to-day awareness mechanisms and more specifically also on the PDP awareness and notification mechanisms also.

So as Marika mentioned, this will be circulated on the mailing list and members will have more time to look into it, but if we have any immediate reactions for now, we can take them.

And before giving the floor to anyone who would like, I should have noted that (Jonathan) has apologized. He's traveling for two days of meetings. And he said that he will do his best to join but he was not sure he was able to make it. So with that, do we have any comments on the survey? Okay, then we'll be circulating it on the mail - okay, Mark, go ahead please.

Mark Carvall: Yes, thank you, Manal and hello everybody. I think this survey just underlines the challenge of integrating GNSO policy development into the GAC mindset, if you like.

It's, I think for most GAC members, when they look at their work plan, their GAC commitments and so on, they only focus on the GAC and what's happening in the GAC and what - the work that's being generated by the GAC.

I think we have, as a committee, we have to sort of look to extend that perception of the word to embrace the GNSO so I have to say the (real) challenge is to integrate the work of the GNSO and the relevance to the GAC of those elements of GNSO activities early into GAC planning.

And then that way, people will - people on the committee will, for starters, sort of engage in the mechanisms of communication as to what's going on and where they have to look and to prioritize GNSO elements policy development into that priority process. But that's my immediate take on this. Thanks.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Mark, and yes, we seem to be suffering not lack of information but rather excessive information that's not properly streamlined into the GAC work, so Marika, please if you want to respond to this.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. And Manal, I think you got it exactly right because I think, indeed, it's definitely not the lack of information that's available but it's probably more thinking and discussing on how we can, you know, (transform) it in a digestible way that makes it easier for the GAC to absorb and be able, indeed, to focus on those aspects that you believe are most important or most urgent.

And, you know, I think, you know, we can look there as well at some other ways of doing it. I do believe, I think, in some of our other discussions or some of the other ideas that have been floated like on at triage committee or early response, those kinds of things may already alleviate, you know, some of this because that would allow for kind of mechanism in place to at least focus on, you know, but is deemed most important.

But from our side, you're talking from the GNSO staff side, we could also look at things as maybe a kind of monthly open house Webinar session where we just say, look, you know, we're happy then to talk about any kind of policy issue that is currently open and we're asking input.

And so if it's easier for people instead of reading a lot of materials just to, you know, show up for one of those calls and just ask questions, you know, something like that, we could, you know, think about if that would be useful or even, you know, experiment with a number of various ways in which we may be able to, you know, make the information easier, adjustable, or allow for more kind of engaged conversation around topics and - you know, that may make it easier for GAC members to actually decide or think about what will be the best way to get engaged.

Is it indeed, you know, wait for public comment? Is it indeed to start a conversation within the GAC? Is it indeed to, you know, participate in the GNSO working group and so at least it's clear, as well, in that way. And through that, we can even separate out where a different, you know, policy development processes stand and what may be the most opportune way to provide input on those.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Marika, and Suzanne, please. And then we can move to the next agenda item.

Suzanne Radel: Yes, thanks. I just wanted to chime in to first thank Marika for presenting the material. I think it is extremely illuminating on our side and I think you did a really good job of summarizing the results.

I did want to pick up on something that Mark said and the issue of how do we, you know, the GAC sort of feels inundated. My sense is, frankly, the whole ICANN community is beginning to feel, you know, inundated with work.

And it's a real struggle for everyone to keep up. So hopefully this is a shared concern that we might want to tackle. But I wanted to focus on the issue of doing a priority ranking, if at all possible.

So my question is actually to the GNSO side. Does the GNSO struggle with this as well and have you given thought inside the GNSO, can you do a priority ranking so you don't feel so overwhelmed by multiple PDPs underway at the same time?

Because I'm thinking the more we can better understand the GNSO process, then we can tackle the ideas we have raised before like a triage approach or an early morning group inside the GAC because until we know a little bit more about how the GNSO works and whether you're - because your timelines for PDP comments say on an issues report, are pretty fixed.

And I guess my question there is, is there any wiggle room there where, if we could understand how to maybe jointly do a priority ranking, then can you perhaps extend the comment period so that whatever we decide to do on the GAC side, whether it's a triage committee or an early morning group, we can actually draw people's attention to something but perhaps the 2121 day timeline might still not be enough. So I just wanted to put those questions out there. Thank you.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Suzanne. Avri, would you like to respond?

Avri Doria: Yes, this is Avri. I'll respond a little. I'm sure Marika will need to fill in things I say. In terms of ranking, I remember that the GNSO has actually gone through a couple of exercises where it tries to rank in a long term way. I don't know that has ever really succeeded partially because the impetus for doing a particular PDP is sometimes very interrupt driven, something happens, something noticed.

You know, there's a board issue. There is a GAC issue. There's an ALAC issue. There's some issue that comes up, since most of the PDPs are actually started based on the request for an issues report. Now, there's a little bit of stretch that has gone on in that historically.

Sometimes the council has, you know, gotten the issues report, the final issues report and basically, you know, said, "Well, let's delay on this one a little while," and such, but there has been limited ability to do that that the newer PDP does give, I think, a little bit more latitude.

There's another part of it that happens. As I say, it is put in. And that has to do with the comment periods. I don't exactly know where this is in the staff yet but what came out of the APRT2 report was basically offering greater flexibility in the notion of how comment periods would be run and whether that strict, you know, 2121 which is expandable.

You know, that 21 period is always expandable so there's certainly latitude there. But whether that strict two dualities is done. Also just to point out that certainly the ALAC has always assumed that it has to try and meet those dates as close as possible because that's what's most useful to the PDP efforts and to the working group efforts but they've also said things like, "We're in AC and getting our input in as soon as possible but when we get it in, has to be good enough."

And we will try and we'll ask them to try and accept it. And so they aim for the comment period. They notify during the comment periods that they may or may not make it. And that's all taken into account. I see Marika's got her hand up so she'll save me from all the mistakes I am sure I am making. Thanks.

Manal Ismail: Okay, thank you, Avri and Marika, please, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. And, you know, (that would be) no mistakes, just maybe expanding or just reaffirm some of the points you made and it's well to note that indeed the - all the timelines that currently exist in the PDP are really minimum timelines.

I think only for the delivery of the issue report there is a maximum timeline but, again, there's flexibility to extend that if staff needs more time. And I think, as well, you see, for example, in PDP that there are many, you know, competing events or issues going on.

You see, as well, a natural slowdown in that process which I don't think is necessarily a good thing but it is what happens in practice because, you know, we do depend on volunteers doing the work and being available to be on calls so we have seen groups, for example, that had to, you know, cancel meetings or go to a schedule of, you know, less intensity just because otherwise it would be possible to, you know, meet the workload.

So kind of - think of the kind of natural prioritization that takes place and as Avri said, you know, we - the GNSO did go through a formal kind of priority exercise but that didn't really work very well because, again, I think there's the challenge of how do you decide what is a priority and what does that mean?

Does it mean that more people are going to work on that, that you move faster? You know, that everything else stops? And I think that has never been really - been clear on how that works.

So also, for example, on public comments, I think what typically happens is that, you know, because normally council, of course, takes the decision at council meetings. Those are once a month. And public comment forms may come in - up in between.

So I think the way that normally works is that, at least you know, the chair or the council leadership may flag an issue on the mailing list and just try to assess whether council members believe that is an issue that needs to be worked on.

And if there is a tight deadline, indeed, there's maybe an initiative to really start something before the next council call or then, the approach is taken, like, Avri said as well, it similarly happens with ALAC where, basically an indication is made that the GNSO council is working on something and will be submitting it.

It may not make the deadline and usually I think that is respected. And I think most GNSO working groups, for example, work in a similar way. When they send out requests for input and also, and of course, there are participants from different communities, we will ask them once we get close to the deadline to say, "Look, are you aware if your group is working on something? If so, we're happy to wait a bit more if you can at least give us an indication by when we can expect it."

Or, you know, are they not going to provide anything which is perfectly fine too but then we just know that we don't need to wait for it. So I think it's - again, I think there's to say that there's a lot of flexibility and I think it's - as long as, you know, groups are aware that something is forthcoming, I think they, you know, are definitely willing to wait for that or at least, you know, anticipate that it may come after input from others has been received.

Manal Ismail: So thank you, Marika and thank you, Avri. So for - I'm hearing that there is a lot of flexibility from the GNSO side, should there be an indication that more time is needed.

So mindful, again, of the time, I'll move to the next agenda item which is, again, a quick update on the GNSO liaison to the GAC. The email was circulated earlier. The council passed the resolution appointing a GNSO council to the GAC starting the LA meeting.

And - for a pilot during fiscal year '15, you know, which ends June 2015. And I understand that there was a unanimous selection for Mason Cole who was appointed to be the GNSO liaison to the GAC.

So I think we should keep this in mind and see how can we utilize this opportunity in light of the upcoming GAC agenda for LA as well as for the options that we will be discussing regarding the day-to-day activities as well as the PDP, of course.

And I was talking to (Jonathan) and we see a good benefit from inviting Mason to join the two remaining calls between now and LA. So I hope this will be okay with everyone and I hope we can try to benefit from having Mason with us on board so that we can prepare efficiently for the LA meeting. So I can see (Omer) and Avri and Mark agreeing. So (unintelligible), please, go ahead.

Man: No, my hand means I meant to agree rather than raise my hand. Thank you.

Manal Ismail: Oh, okay. Perfect. So we'll be having - hopefully we'll be having Mason on board of our next call. And with this, maybe we can shift a little bit the agenda and start with the PDP if you don't mind since. Suzanne, you mentioned that you would like to leave in, like, 15 minutes or something.

So let's start with the PDP and then go back to the day-to-day work (track). Marika very helpfully circulated the - or put those two documents. One - just one flowchart on the PDP which also, not only describes the current process but also highlights opportunities for GAC participation. So I'm not sure if you have already had the chance to look into the flowchart that I can see in the Adobe room now. So do we have any - the actions to this? Marika, please.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I don't think we circulated this before today's call. Why it certainly is part of the agenda, I don't know if everyone had a chance to review this in detail so if it's helpful, I'm happy just to briefly walk through it if you think that's okay.

Manal Ismail: I think it would be very helpful. Yes, please. Can we just hear Suzanne and then I will give you the floor? So Suzanne, go ahead.

Suzanne Radel: Thank you. Suzanne here. I have not had a chance to read this in any great detail and I do appreciate that the new formatting really highlights in red for us exactly what we have to tackle. I guess - you know, and I'm fully on board with these concepts of sort of a quick look, early warning, some kind of triage.

What I think would be helpful is that rather than have - or at least, I'm presently - I guess I haven't spent enough time with the new deck. But I think we need to think this through a little bit further in terms of how best to present it to the GAC because we definitely need to explain sort of how we've arrived at this point.

We need to take into account I think the survey results because they're very very linked. So I'm not entirely sure, and apologies for this, just maybe I need to catch up, I'm not entirely sure that we've made enough of a case for creating a quick look mechanism.

I think it may well be that we need to spend a little more time on the survey results and to walk other GAC members, who have not responded, through those results to see if it might trigger some additional ideas from the floor in LA. Because I think people need to be comfortable with first, understanding the magnitude of what we're trying to do here, how we're trying to manage, as Mark said, we have to now integrate the whole concept of ongoing GNSO PDP work with GAC work and GAC agendas.

And I think that we've always known this stuff is out there, this work is ongoing, but I think Mark has flagged a really key point, it has to become part of GAC work methods, GAC work planning.

So I just think we may need a little more legwork or prep work between now and LA to present this probably as presented by Marika that we're drawing people's attention to these red flag boxes because we need to figure out how best to move forward.

And a couple of questions come to my mind, at least, and maybe having Mason join our calls might help. One option is of course to have a GAC early warning working group or triage or, you know, quick look.

Another might be to explore as an experiment, could that be a joint function so that if the whole point is for us to understand the public policy aspects,

whether the GAC needs to weigh in or not, could that be something we take on jointly?

And I know we don't have that captured in the PDP slide deck. So it's just a question I put out there for people to ponder. And it may be a stupid idea but I just wanted to flag it before having to jump off shortly. Thank you.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Suzanne. And actually I see it's a very good idea. And I think, as we continue our work, we need to bear in mind the results of the survey as well as the existence of the GNSO liaison and benefit from both in synchronizing the work of the GNSO with the GAC whether the GAC should prioritize, the GNSO should slow down, the liaison function should maintain both processes in sync. So I can see Amr's hand up. Amr, please.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Manal. This is Amr. I just wanted to say that I completely agree with what Suzanne just said and with Mark's deduction, though I missed that earlier in the call, of having some sort of maybe process within the GAC that follows up with what's going on in the GNSO to be able to contribute during PDP and during the time that these policy development processes are taking place.

I just wanted to weigh in with a thought regarding the role of the GNSO Council liaison. And I think Manal touched upon this as well and I think that's brought on as well which is I imagine that the GNSO liaison to the GAC, one of his biggest or most important duties will be to help the GAC, maybe in a method that we haven't determined or worked out yet, and hopefully Mason will be able to help us out with that.

But to help the GAC identify what PDPs do have some sort of public policy impact and those are perhaps PDPs that the GAC could focus more on and use a yet undefined process within the GAC to work with the GNSO on this.

I also would like to remind folks of something that we had discussed earlier regarding the role of - we currently have PDP Council liaisons which are liaisons between every PDP working group and the GNSO Council. And I believe we had previously explored the idea of having these liaisons also work with the GAC and help them follow up with every PDP as it is ongoing.

So - but then that liaison's role within the GNSO doesn't start early on in the stage but only actually starts when the PDP working group has been formed. S that liaison would not be able to help much in the earlier stages which are the issue reports and the charter drafting.

But once the PDP has started perhaps some sort of hand off between the GNSO liaison to the GAC and the PDP liaison to the Council can take place. And this was - who will also be a GNSO councilor this liaison will be able undoubtedly to help the GAC follow up on a closer basis with the PDP working groups that are going on. Thanks.

Manal Ismail: Okay. Thank you, Amr. And before giving the floor to Marika to walk us through the flow chart maybe because also Suzanne is going to leave early I can jump ahead of our agenda and say that I was talking again with Jonathan and we were thinking of a face to face meeting for this working group in LA.

And I think it would be very useful to have such a discussion there in a face to face meeting. And we can invite whoever we see important to have - to include in such a discussion. So we were thinking of an open meeting where GAC members who are interested could also be in the room, not necessarily the Consultation Group members only.

And Marika also suggested that maybe we can have this just before our informal gathering and the cocktail thing that we had the past two meetings. So maybe we can start with a face to face meeting of the Consultation Group, an open face to face meeting, and then have some drinks or some informal gathering by the end of the meeting.

And I see this very good opportunity to have this discussion. And I can see Suzanne - okay. Yeah, I mean, we used to schedule this at the end of the Sunday after the GAC GNSO joint meeting, we used to move to the cocktail but we were thinking of having first an open face to face meeting then the cocktail.

So I'm sorry to be jumping between the different agenda items but I just felt it was worth noting at this point in time.

So, Marika, can you please walk us through the flow chart to facilitate the discussion and even the work intercessional please.

Marika Konings: Yes of course. Thank you, Manal. So just as well as a starting point to note that, you know, what you see on this slide is really, as you recall, you know, we broke down the policy development process in a number of phases.

So the one we're looking at is really the first phase. And of course it doesn't preclude that there may be additional or alternative mechanisms that we may want to explore in some of those other phases. But I think most in the group agreed that it was, you know, the most important thing are those initial phases and get early input at that stage.

So that was I think agreed that the focus would first be on those and then, you know, move slowly forward to the next phases and see how additional mechanisms or existing mechanisms may need to be enhanced or adapted.

So basically as well to Suzanne's, you know, I think what is here is really just a suggestion at this stage. This is one of the ideas that was listed on the slides that were presented in London. So I think the idea here is that, you know, in relation to the specific, you know, idea, the quick look mechanism that this is more kind of visual representation on how such a mechanism could potentially work.

And I think Indy the idea would be that, you know, there may be other ideas or other mechanisms that we may want to depict in a similar way. But the hope is as well by doing it in this way it would get a clearer idea of how it is envisioned to work but also what it may require, you know, I think both from a GNSO side as well as from a GAC side, to actually make it work.

So basically indeed the red boxes represent what will be new to the existing policy development process. And I said, you know, the idea is that once a preliminary issue report is posted for public comments, you know, at that point announcements usually goes out to the ICANN Website as well as a public comment form is opened.

That point a GAC quick look mechanism, you know, would kick in. And, again, I think it needs to be further defined what that would look like is that indeed, you know, a GAC committee, is that the whole GAC, is that a joint kind of body between that GAC and the GNSO.

And again there are, you know, different nuances or different variations that you could think of and that we could even work out and see where, you know, both groups feel more comfortable with the idea that that group would basically, you know, just be able to raise a flag at an early stage to indicate whether there are any potential public policy implications.

The idea would be based on that quick look mechanism that communication goes back to, you know, the GNSO Secretariat or to staff to indicate what the outcome was of that quick look mechanism which is then acknowledged and as input incorporated into the issue report.

So the idea being that if, you know, feedback comes back through the quick look mechanism that this, you know, may have serious public policy implications that that would already, you know, give a kind of indication that, you know, the GAC will be looking at this is, you know, preparing to get

engaged in that and that needs to be, you know, taken into account as, you know, the PDP moves into its next stages.

So again, and this as well where you see the bottom at the box - or the box at the bottom right which basically would move into, you know, the next phase of the PDP.

The idea it is that indeed if there is an indication that it may have public policy implications that, you know, require GAC attention and input that that would be as well the triggering point for, you know, a committee to be formed or again, you know, there may be other mechanisms that could or would be identified that would start working on providing more detailed input that would go into that PDP working group once that is formed which basically, you know, is the next phase of the PDP.

So that's a little bit, in broad lines, the idea behind this. But as I said at the beginning, this is just, you know, trying to visualize one of the ideas that was possibly being put forward in our conversations. There may be others, you know, there may be as sad as well variations on this.

So I think it will be important for the group, you know, I think to first of all, you know, probably discuss whether this is an idea worth further exploring and if so indeed, you know, what are some of the things that the group would need to think about.

And as well, you know, how - would you like us to share or present to the GAC as well as the GNSO in Los Angeles noting that I think between now and then we do only have two meetings to go of the group.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Marika. This is definitely very helpful. So do we have any immediate comment now? Olof, go ahead please.

Olof Nordling: Yeah thank you very much, Manal. This is Olof. And just to append a little comment because that is if the quick look at analysis, they said yes, this is has public policy implications, well that's one thing. It may be so that a quick look mechanism says, no, not that we can see at this particular time.

                   But I guess that wouldn't be the time you say; it could, you know, public policies could emerge later on. And I think it deserves to be noted that that may happen.

Manal Ismail: Okay. Yes, thank you Olof. So it's maybe that the GAC sees some public policy in one PDP or wants to remain notified on a certain PDP but has no immediate input or in a very unlikely case that a PDP is not of an interest to the GAC. So maybe we have, yes, three categories.

                   So, Amr, go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks. This is Amr. I have a question actually. When we suggest that an issue report is a - is sort of an action that triggers a response within the GAC to form let's say - decide that the GAC wishes to form some sort of internal committee or working group to follow a certain PDP, does that - does that sort of not include the GAC actually providing input during the public comment period on an issue report?

                   And I ask this because I'm wondering if the current GAC processes, as they exist today, do they not allow for a sort of speedy - or a fast enough response to give sort of an agreed upon comment within I think it's a 21-day public comment period following the posting of an issue report. Is this something that is possible or would it be more practical to just consider this as I believe Marika suggested that it could be just a triggering mechanism. Thanks.

Manal Ismail: So, Amr, just to make sure I understood your question were you asking whether the GAC would be able to provide an immediate quick input or - I'm sorry...

Amr Elsadr: Yes, Manal, that's - that is what I'm wondering. I'm wondering if once an issue report is published and - a preliminary issue report is published and there's a public comment period on the issue report, is it - would it be possible within the timeframe of this public comment period that the GAC provide some input at this stage noting that the public comment period is - might or might not be a bi short for GAC to sort of go through its own processes of formalizing a response and inputs. I'm just wondering, this is a question for me. Thanks.

Manal Ismail: I think normally it's challenging for the GAC to have a GAC consensus view on a PDP issue within the 21 day comment period. But again, I think what was agreed is that even flagging that this issue is of interest could delay or make - take into consideration that GAC input is going to be submitted even later on. But just to give some indication whether the GAC intends to provide some input or not. And of course it all depends on the workload and where we stand.

                 So I can see Marika then Mark and then maybe we should move to the next agenda item.

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika. Just to note that I think, you know, at least, you know, the way it is written up here of course it wouldn't prevent any kind of, you know, more detailed input if that is possible or feasible within the, you know, GAC timeframes.

                 But it may be worth pointing out that in principle the public comment on the preliminary issue report mainly asks the question of, you know, is there any information missing in the issue report that should be included to make sure all the relevant information is available as the PDP working group starts its deliberations as well as the question of whether or not the GNSO Council should initiate a PDP.

The actual, you know, position or views on a certain issue and, you know, potential ways of addressing it that is what is, you know, requested by a PDP working group at the start of their deliberations and hence the kind of flow that is proposed here that indeed, you know, both I think for the GNSO but as well for the GAC, you know, making - having that quick look mechanism would provide a kind of triggering point to say okay, we know this issue is coming and in, you know, one or two months we are going to be asked to provide our input so in order to be able to be ready for that, you know, first of all we raise the flag so the GNSO at least is aware that they can expect us, you know, to pay attention to this issue and, you know, intend to provide input.

And at the same time it will also trigger then hopefully a kind of, you know, either GAC working group or community or however that would look like that would actually start working on the issue to be able to provide indeed that kind of input that is requested at the start of, you know, the working group process so which comes after the issue report.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Marika. Mark.

Mark Carvell: Yes, thank you Manal and thank you, Marika. You've actually made the point that I was going to make. This is very much kind of preliminary stage. I think, as I said in the chat room, if this quick look is launched by I would suggest the GNSO liaison describing this as potentially something coming along the track for the GAC we could probably turn it around in 21 days to say, yes, you know, this looks like something we're going to have to engage with so it's very much a kind of preliminary phase.

And it's incumbent on all the GAC reps to sort of be alert to this, maybe one or two might want to consult, in capital, within that 21 days. But the earlier that this is registered as a potential and flagged and some response to the GNSO is communicated, which may prove not - ultimately might not be something for the GAC or it could be something major for the GAC but if so preliminary. I think we could work within that admittedly timeframe. Thank you.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Mark. And moving to the following agenda item, which is our day to day work track. If you recall we initially had six options to look into. We have already discussed three during the London meeting which was the liaison - the GNSO liaison to the GAC and utilizing existing GNSO Council PDP liaisons as well as the awareness.

So I can see the awareness is continuing with us particularly again in light of the results of the survey. And we also have the leadership regular interactions and rethinking the joint meetings.

I think where we stand now could postpone or even obsolete the option of topic leads and buddy system. So we currently have three alternatives to - or three options could be complementary to look into.

Again, the three were circulated - sorry, it was very short before the meeting - before the call. But I hope we can look into the three options, think of the potential issues that are within the table and think of the pros and cons of each of them and also see whether the GNSO liaison could have a specific (call) in each and every one of the three alternatives.

And then maybe we can have a more substantial discussion over email and ultimately on the next call. So, Mark, are you asking for the floor or this is an old hand?

Mark Carvell: An old hand, sorry.

Manal Ismail: Okay, it's okay.

((Crosstalk))

Manal Ismail: So do we have any comments on the PDP work track for now? Okay, hearing and seeing none. And again, apologies for the late circulation of the agenda

and the documents but it's good that we kick start the discussions again and hopefully make some progress between now and LA.

So finally the administrative issues already one of the topics I had in mind had already been discussed which is the face to face meeting and the informal gathering afterwards. I think we agreed on seeing some benefit in this. We can work on further details and then share this on the mailing list.

I believe we have two calls - two remaining calls between now and LA. I think 23rd of September and 7th of October. And Marika, please correct me if I got the dates wrong. So I hope that everyone will be able to join both calls. We need to make some progress, again, as I said between now and LA and agree own that exactly that we want to present at the LA meeting.

I hope that by then we would have some suggestions regarding the overall PDP process with GAC opportunities for early engagement as well as some thoughts on the different opportunities we have on the day to day coordination particularly in light of that we have also the GNSO liaison with us.

So, Mark, please go ahead.

Mark Carvell: Yes, Manal, thanks. Just to say I actually can't do the next one; I'll be en route to Strasburg that day, I'll be traveling all day by train so it's going to be tricky for me but I will - I can't work on the train easily hurtling across Europe.

Manal Ismail: It's okay. I mean, thank you for letting us know. And I think if we engage interactively over the email this also would do. We can work online and if you have any comments or input we would take into consideration definitely on the next call. Just share it online and we'll take care of it.

Mark Carvell: Okay, will do. Thank you.

Manal Ismail: Okay perfect. So anyone has any further comments or questions or anything? So perfect so thank you all for joining the call. And I hope we would have fruitful discussions over email and leading to our call on the 23rd of September which hopefully Jonathan will be with us on the call and also Mason Cole.

So thank you all and have a nice day. Thank you.

Mark Carvell: Okay. Many thanks, Manal. Thank you.

Manal Ismail: Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Bye-bye.

Olof Nordling: Bye.

Manal Ismail: Bye.

Terri Agnew: Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. (Nori), if you can please stop the recordings.

END