ICANN
Transcription
GAC GNSO Consultation Group meeting
Tuesday 17 June 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 17 June 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. The audio is also available at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-gac-20140617.mp3
On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#jun
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar

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

GNSO Council
Jonathan Robinson – co-chair - Registries Stakeholder Group
Avri Doria – Councillor - NCSG
 David Cake, Vice Chair – NCSG

Apology: none

ICANN Staff:
Marika Konings
Olof Nordling
Julia Charvolen
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: This conference is now being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. Please go ahead, all lines are open.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Louise). Jonathan, this is Nathalie, would you like me to do a roll call?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, apologies, please go ahead.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the GAC GNSO Consultation Group meeting on the 17th of June, 2014.

On the call today we have Ana Neves, Avri Doria, Suzanne Radell and Jonathan Robinson. We have an apology from Manal Ismail. And from staff we have Marika Konings, Olof Nordling, Julia Charvolen and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

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

Jonathan Robinson: Hi, everyone and thank you very much, Nathalie. Welcome to all of you who could make the call. I know it's a very busy time this week in the run up to the ICANN meeting. If you're feeling anything like me you'll be feeling like the more you do the more there seems to appear to be - that needs to get done.

Suzanne Radell: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: So what - we'll try and keep this efficient and perhaps even finish ahead of the hour. There are - first of all let's just make sure we look at the items on the agenda.

And prior to even doing - going through those three items I suggest that we have a quick look at the action items from last week's meeting. So I'll run through those quickly and while I do you can think about if there's anything else you'd like to see on the agenda that isn't currently present.

So we, last week, committed to provide comments on the GNSO liaison spec and we've now finalized that and created in a draft version for circulation to both GAC and GNSO which reminds me that it hasn't been sent to the Council and so I'll make sure that's - gets done.

In addition we talked about presenting the first two steps during the - of the - of one of the work tracks, the first two steps of the PDP. Showing the chart with all the PDP phases. And then of course taking input from the survey to determine elements of how GAC input should be treated.

Then you're going to review some comments and questions. I think we'll come back to that when we look at the work track itself if there is anything more to be added or modified there.

Recognize the need to - which is a key question really - what's the impact of the GAC involvement. It's all very well saying well here's an opportunity to get involved but what is the impact or consequence of that?

And came up with some practical suggestions on how to - how to handle that, including support, reactions, possibly a triage committee on the GAC and so on and agree to add these into presentation, which I'm not sure - maybe someone can confirm for me if they are aware if these have been added into the presentation at this stage or not?

Right, we need to check for that. Right, so the agenda looks at reviewing the - welcome, David, if you can hear us in the Adobe Connect room. David Cake has just joined.

The agenda looks at reviewing the presentation for London looking at any refinements to the work track too and then thinking about where we might go post London. Marika, your hand is up, please go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Sorry, I was a little bit slow to react on your question. And just quickly looking at the presentation but we did include a slide, although I don't see the number now but I can sync the presentation so you can see the one where we actually indeed highlighted some of the ideas being explored indeed leaving it as just suggestions at this time and no concrete proposals yet. But those ideas are mentioned here.

Jonathan Robinson: Perfect. That's exactly what we intended. I notice that David says he can't hear anything although I think we are - we have got people using the Adobe Connect audio so it's not the - there's necessarily a fault of that.

All right, I'll - Ana Neves asked in the chat, "What is the GAC Triage Committee?" Ana, really this is a sort of suggestion that came up on the last call and anyone else feel free to add to this - but it was really the - we were looking at - in a discussion on the last call what happens. It's all very well saying these are - here are the opportunities for intervention but what's the consequence or what might happen there?

And one suggestion was that the GAC has the (circle) Triage Committee which is typically (unintelligible) processing - early processing of information or a situation so the proposal was that the GAC would have some sort of committee for dealing with output from the GNSO that it wasn't just falling broadly on the GAC but actually it was processed with a view trying to identify implications or public policy concerns or so on. Olof.

Olof Nordling: Yes, just to continue along that track. I mean the remark that it - such a triage committee doesn't exist for the time being within the GAC but it does within the ccNSO. And for the purpose of prioritizing matters arriving to the ccNSO and while in a sense that's done by chair and vice chair in GAC.

But well the proposal here was to have a triage committee that specifically could deal with assessing priorities and make it first on matters coming from the GNSO and make the judgment that, well, this is important to the GAC; this is - implies public policy. This, on the other hand, does not.

And something in between, this may - and also to assess some kind of processing for these matters. So it's - for the time being it's just a suggestion, an idea.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, thanks for that further clarification, Olof. Just to note your voice...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...if you are speaking again just if you can make sure the microphone is close as possible, the volume is set right. And also there is some background noise so someone hasn't got their mic on mute who isn't talking so just to remind people to have your microphone on mute.

Next up we've got Suzanne. Suzanne, please go ahead.

Suzanne Radell: Thank you, Jonathan. Thank you, Olof. I did also have some suggested edits for that. This is sort of our next to last page, yes? I was wondering if we might - I'm sorry to impose on Marika. Marika, you've done a stunning job, again, with the presentation. I wonder if we could paginate the slides so that there may be questions coming from the room while we're making the presentation and people might want to bounce back and forth.

But in the slide deck I have it's the next to the last page, the Ideas Being Explored. And perhaps what we can do is modify that bullet slightly to say, "GAC consider creating a triage committee to assess priorities," or something like that to indicate we're, you know, we're looking to colleagues to help assess how best to make these assessments.

And then if I could close with just a question? Will we be going through the slide deck sort of page by page? I had a few edits to suggest but I defer to you, Jonathan. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Suzanne. I'm just noting that Avri and David have got some technical problems with audio so want to just pause a moment and see if we can't make sure - can I just check, David or Avri, can you hear me?

Sounds like they're struggling to dial in and weren't - I must say I notice on the - I don't know who else is on the Connect audio but I was connected both by Adobe Connect and on the telephone which I'm now using. And my sound came in and out on Adobe Connect. So I wonder if whoever is running the Adobe can just check that there is audio there as well?

All right, we will go through the presentation. And Marika has kindly volunteered to - welcome back, Avri. Avri, are you on Adobe Connect or are you dialed in?

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, that's Avri here. Yes, so Suzanne, my view is we should probably page through the presentation. And there seems to be a fault with the Adobe Connect audio so we now have Avri on the audio and I think we should page through it.

My sense is that the presentation could do with a sort of overall - I don't want to take anything away from Marika and your compliments because I'm

Marika's - one of her big fans, she's been tremendously helpful in working with me. But I think the presentation could do with some kind of overall polish up but that's the last step. I think getting the substance right is the most important. So it seems to me that going through a walk-through on a slide by slide basis will be sensible.

So I think that would be useful then if someone else controls that. I'm not sure who - can Marika or someone from staff confirm to me who controls the walk-through of the presentation? Are you able to do that?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I can move the slides so...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: All right, please do so when asked and then we'll just seek comments. So the first is the background. I think the background - my personal view is that those couple of bullets are a little wordy and could do with a bit more other detail that's the background because we lead straight into Work Track 2; we don't say, look, we've got two work tracks and so on.

So we could do a little bit more work on introduction so that'll be my two cents worth. That's a note to improve the introduction and context setting. But, you know, there's no issue with the content.

So what I'm going not do is, everyone, I'm just going to ask Marika to page through the slides and please put up your hand if you have a comment on a slide in question. Here we go into Work Track 1. And clearly, as I said a moment ago, I'd like to see a bit more introduction to describe that there are two work tracks, how we're approaching it and so on. But in essence we cover this here how we're dealing with Work Track 1. Next.

Now we go onto the detail of the GNSO liaison to the GAC and the objectives. Next. Can we just clarify what the red - why one line is highlighted in red and then go - if I could ask for clarification from Marika perhaps?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. That is actually not my highlighting but I suspect that those may have been the changes that Manal made on the version that I had circulated and she possibly did that just to highlight what she had added but that is just my assumption.

Jonathan Robinson: No problem. That's fine. That's what I thought so that emphasis will go just to be clear these are the most recent changes. Avri, go ahead with any question or point.

Avri Doria: Yes, it was on the previous slide, I believe. And perhaps it was just me reading it correctly but a recently departed GNSO councilor just does not sound right to an American ear.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Be careful or you'll become a recently departed GNSO councilor.

((Crosstalk))

Olof Nordling: Rest in peace.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Avri, I appreciate the point. And that's the kind of thing that I mean, overall there's a kind of polish that needs to be done. We know what we mean but it might not be understood. Thanks. Marika, I know you're going to take note of these anyway. So if we could move forward? And next?

Here we talk about the practical working of - what our expectations are. And really, I mean, this is about trying to make sure that it's absolutely understood so that when it comes to the GNSO and/or the GAC supporting this

appointment to the liaison there's no surprises later that - so I think we need to really make the point home on a couple of these.

In particular probably the most sensitive issue, I suspect is - or at least making it clear that the intention is to be relatively well exposed to GAC meetings which are, in part, can be closed. All right, next.

And here's the desired outcome. Noting that in this case the detailed specification, I mean, might want to highlight this, Marika. So if you could note here when we approve the detailed specification we effectively also approve the appointment and removal mechanisms. So I think we should probably say, "Including appointment and removal mechanisms," or something to that effect.

Next. Explanation of the GNSO Council PDP liaisons and how they might potentially be extended or utilized to support the liaison to the GAC. I'd certainly want to clarify the last point and/or write it differently because we're not expecting ad hoc interaction via these liaisons for the GAC; it's really what we envisage there, I think. And anyone is welcome to correct me if they see differently.

But I think what we envisage there is in the event that it's a specialist topic and a specialist knowledge is required that liaison to the GAC might bring in that PDP liaison to assist with more expert and knowledgeable input, that's what we mean by that last bullet.

Next slide.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I had one comment on the language highlighted in red. I think we probably may want to emphasize that of course these liaisons - their primary function is actually to be the liaison between the working group and the GNSO Council. And this is a - may be a secondary support role they have or a new role that would be added to their responsibilities.

Because this may make it sound to some that this is a completely new thing we are creating while I think we're actually saying these people already exist, it's more that they can serve as a resource to the GNSO liaison to the GAC.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Marika. And I think the use of the word "primarily" is the problem there so we tidy up the wording there to make it clear what we mean again.

Detail on how this might work in practice. So this is a sort of, in many ways, these slides from the specification. I think these can be trimmed down to get the substance of the point across and make them more - anymore presentation friendly format. And I'll work with Marika, I guess, and Manal to tidy this up from that point of view.

Next. That's a good point. This seeks support to move ahead with this option. I mean, technically it's not a massive change but it is a good point. So to the extent that this document is linked to the previous one but it makes sense to seek the formal support.

I welcome Manal. I see you just joined us in Adobe Connect. I'm not sure if you've got audio at this stage. There is a note in the chat indicating that you'll need to dial in or be dialed out to.

David Cake: Jonathan, just a question on this.

Jonathan Robinson: David, go ahead.

David Cake: Do we have - have we sort of worked out what the details of the process of obtaining that formal support are? Like we'll be moving a motion in the GNSO Council, we'll be...

Jonathan Robinson: That's a good question there, David. I think what - the way I've seen it is that what we need to do - and perhaps it's is get the - obtain the support via a discussion and no serious objections.

There isn't a motion as such to go ahead with the recruitment. What I do think there'll be is a motion to appoint the liaison. So that's the process that I think we're going to go through rather than having a kind of two-motion process; motion to go ahead and motion to appoint.

So there will - I certainly think there's got to be gating, a final gating, which is the motion to appoint. But at this stage there isn't - there certainly isn't a motion on the table in London as you'll probably be aware...

David Cake: Yes, yes.

Jonathan Robinson: ...for - to go down the route of - seen more as a discussion item. Do you have any concerns with that?

David Cake: Not really but it would be a good idea not just - I mean, obviously we can, I mean, obviously we can do all of the - move a motion or whatever but as an (unintelligible) motion of appointment I think that's reasonable and at this stage - but, I mean, we should determine what that process of appointment is going to be, you know, can, you know, have a formal process where we canvas for potential appointees or what.

Jonathan Robinson: It's detailed - well it's not immensely detailed. There's a set of proposed - a sort of steps in the specification which is something we should discuss. We're in fairly unusual territory here, I mean, in the sense that - but have a look and see what you think and if you think it can be improved that's clearly what we should be discussing.

And in terms of going into the sort of GNSO-related detail my expectation - I'm just making sure there's - certainly covered in the Wednesday meeting of

the Council. I'm not sure if it's covered anywhere - I guess it would be in any preparation discussion for our meeting with the GAC. But the principle place where this is covered is in the Wednesday meeting at this stage.

David, does that sort of answer your question and thoughts? Now, by all means look at the specification as it currently stands which has been in circulation for...

David Cake: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: ...and give any thoughts on that appointment process if you think we could improve it. Or - without - my concern is that we don't make it unduly complicated but we've got to make it...

David Cake: Yes, I'm just wondering do - should we be engaging with that in the meetings this week like should we be running the Council through what that process is and should we be doing likewise with the GAC. But I mean, I guess we leave that to - we can decide - we can talk about that GNSO side otherwise and similarly leave it to the GAC to work down their process.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, I mean, certainly I think both groups should be - and the intention behind getting the draft specification, which is why I've made a note to make sure that goes to the Council is that that should be in circulation ahead of the meeting and we can highlight that as part of the presentation.

If you go back a couple of slides where we say that our intention is to seek support for this which - yes, seek to obtain GAC and GNSO approval to proceed with this option, approval of detailed specification. And if you remember on that slide that's where I said, "And the appointment mechanism."

David Cake: Yes. I mean, that's - and on the GNSO side I should be - of course we need a - the GAC to also approve them attending meetings and so forth.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, exactly. So that's the purpose of this is to get this - to both have circulated it in advance in writing and then to present it to the combined GAC GNSO meeting and say, look, this is what the intention - speak now, question, comment, give input. And clearly depending on that input, I mean, I suppose from our group's point of view we might hope it is not opposed and it is generally accepted in its current form.

But to the extent that there was substantial concerns or opposition we may have to accept going back and revising the specification and not necessarily getting the approval. But especially given that the GAC is in session I think it would be highly desirable.

And I'm speaking on my own behalf here, I'm open to any other comments on this. But my sense isn't particular from a GAC point of view but almost as much from a GNSO point of view it would be good to move this to the next step especially since the idea is to try and have identified and appointed someone by the time the LA meetings comes about or at least the very latest to appoint them - well I guess we want to appoint them before the LA meeting so they can travel to the LA meeting.

David Cake: Yes, well hopefully well in advance of the LA meeting so that they can be on the same sort of travel schedule as the rest of us.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, exactly. Okay, well thanks for that. And anything you can do to help either refine and improve the specification or appointment process and/or talk with colleagues in the GNSO or the GAC for that matter about this would be much appreciated, David.

David Cake: Yes, no problem.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great. Moving - yes, thanks for capturing that in the actions there to review the liaison specification and provide any input update or to the extent that you believe it's relevant persuasion of others that this makes sense.

All right let's move on then to the next slide please. And then this is of course the third area of interaction. And this is really starts to talk about how we provide notifications to - at present really and recognize that what we're starting to think about is some forms of alternatives.

And that in particular when - I think in the last bullet when we talk about further feedback and input from the GAC is desirable in order to expand on this option. I think we're, in a sense, referring to either anything that comes up in the meeting and in particular the survey. So here's - if we don't do it elsewhere here's an opportunity to highlight the survey. Yes, which is what we go on to right away next which is logical.

And exactly and then the final bullet indicates that having undertaken the survey we'll further review the results and it'll impact how we deal with early awareness. I mean, my hope I guess is that - and I don't know if others of you concur with this - but my hope is that in part by producing the survey we highlight where notifications take place already.

Because clearly, as we've discussed on a number of occasions, part of this is about awareness of what goes on at present and part of it is about improving what goes on at the present some sort of combination of the two.

Okay, next slide. Yes, and just a reminder then of the action there. Next slide. Suzanne, your hand is up. I'm not sure if it was prior - of a prior slide or this one but go ahead in any event.

Suzanne Radell: Yes, thank you Jonathan. Suzanne here. And apologies - a possibly stupid question. But, Marika or Olof, could you tell me, do we have a timeframe for

the survey? Because if we do it would be useful to highlight that to emphasize, you know, how critical it will be to get GAC members responses.

Obviously it has to - we need to give people some time after the London meeting. But I just didn't know if we had agreed on a deadline. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. As far as I'm aware, we haven't set a deadline and the survey basically remains open as long as we close it. So I think - but I think it's a good suggestion to maybe give people a specific date. And I guess it's, you know, for you to decide what would be reasonable, looking at the workload and time people may take off after the London meeting - what would be a suitable time frame. And based on that, you know, (Olaf) and I can work together to at least get a reminder out and in due time for that (unintelligible) as a reminder, you know, coming out of London so people don't forget about it but still give them time for - we would like to have the results I guess as well for us to review as well as a group.

Jonathan Robinson: (Azad)?

(Azad):   All right, thank you again, Jonathan Robinson and thank you Marika). If I recall from our last sort of mid-summer meeting -- which was Durbin last year -- we were setting deadlines for other purposes inside the GAC and there was a great deal of consternation about any kind of deadline hitting in the - during the summer vacation period. So I wonder - one option might be Manal could ask the GAC, you know, is September X -- you know, we just pick a date mid-September -- is that - can people meet that deadline? And then we just commit to it.

But I do want to express some hesitation about a summer deadline, because my fear is this will simply get put on the back burner. So if we remind people -

and we on the GAC side can commit to sending out, you know, follow up reminders. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay Suzanne. That's helpful, thanks. I mean, I must say I was expecting one of three possible deadlines to put my cards on the table. Either the end of the London meeting -- we got the tab before the London meeting and those have had the opportunity -- so either the end of the London meeting, but I understand there's an issue with doing this kind of thing during the meeting. Or the end of the week after. However -- as Marika points out -- some people go away for that -- or at least take a break in that week after -- so my thought is -- and I'll put this to the group to think about and see whether you agree or not -- is set a deadline of two weeks after the end of the London meeting.

Because I think we want this information pretty soon and I think it'll go stale. So if that would be the case, it would be pretty much the - around about the 5th of July. Now, that beats going into the summer and puts a fairly aggressive deadline on it. What to others think of that? It's a very short and simple survey, I think. So that's really the suggestion that I'll put on the table. Manal, please go ahead.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Jonathan Robinson and thank you Suzanne, yes, for raising this. Yes, it would be hard to set a deadline for the summer, but I think the proposal you made is - I mean, just before people go for the summer vacations. So I think we should give it a try and suggest the 5th of July deadline you are suggesting and see the reaction. I mean, we can then extend a week or so if needed. But I think we should give it a try at least. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Manal. (Olaf)?

(Olaf):   Yes, thank you. It's probably wiser to realize that - okay; we all will not fill out that survey anyway, regardless of how long we wait. So what we need is some kind of reasonably good - as good outcome so we are on stable ground

for analyzing it. I think that Manal's suggestion to, okay, on the 5th or the 10th or something and we have the option, of course, to extend it further. And we on the northern hemisphere -- as many of us are -- yes, well, there are vacation periods in northern countries typically starting with the midsummer coming up next week.

So while we may want to shift it a little to - well, the mid- or perhaps later part of July just to be on the safe side from that perspective, then in - many Europeans leave for holidays in August and that's sort of the main vacation period over here. But - well, something - aiming for a deadline in July - perhaps mid-July with a possibility of a slight extension to that, depending on what results we have achieved that far I think would be wise. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks (Olaf). I have a suggestion - I mean a couple of thoughts. One is that -- to (Suzanne's) point, and Suzanne, by all means respond to this if it's appropriate -- but in terms of consultation, I'm wondering how much - how relevant that is in this context in the sense that this is really about how the GAC members -- those individuals -- feel about whether they get the information on time and it makes sense and so on. I just wonder how much -- once they start to go beyond themselves as GAC reps -- how much this will have any meaning to anyone else. But, you know, I'll stand to be sort of informed by you on that.

Second, my thought is maybe what we do is we put the 5th of July deadline in there as a kind of -with reasonable intention but also as a form of straw man. And if people raise up their hands in horror and say, "Look, this is outrageous; we can't possibly work this deadline" or whatever, we know in the back of our minds we could extend it by let's say a week or two out until the 12th, 15th, or even a little bit longer than that. So how does that sound as a suggestion? Suzanne?

Suzanne Radell: Thank you, Jonathan Robinson. I'm happy to try that. And I don't mean to sound so discouraging. I think there's a larger backdrop here that I believe

GNSO is also struggling with - if my reading of the transcript of the most recent SOAC call with FODY is any guide. There is a bit of a feeling of just work overload. I mean, I think we're all in triage mode trying to establish priorities and in trying to have sufficient time to tackle the questions.

My fear is refresh people's memories -- and apologies, because this is just the way of bureaucrat because their day jobs are filled with other issues and other work and other deadlines -- so at home the first step would be to remind people this is the nature of the current sort of notification system. This is how it currently works. This is what you currently get. We need you to give us feedback as to how helpful that is.

For some countries, they have elaborate -- I know we certainly do in the United States -- I am part of a very, very, very elaborate consolation process internally. So depending on the substance, it isn't just a question of whether this particular form of notification is helpful per se. It's also what do colleagues need in order to assess what our next step might be?

So I was just expressing that kind of hesitation that this might take more time. I have no problem, however, following your lead with that tack of let's ask for July 5 and if everybody rolls their eyes and says, "What are you, crazy?" we then shift to the 15th or the 18th, stressing that it's really important to sort of get this first step done so that in the interim period we can consider, well, if this isn't useful, what would be? What do people need in order to determine whether their country has an interest and whether we think there's a public policy angle. Thank you. Sorry for being so wordy.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Suzanne, that's pretty clear. And just to be -- just as an avoidance of doubt -- I absolutely must stress that I'm fully respectful of the need to consult. And I understand the subtleties there. My only question was whether - how much it was necessary on this particular point. But I understood you clearly and I'm sure others did as well. So that's helpful; thanks Suzanne. Avri?

Avri Doria: Thanks. Yes, I have one issue on any comment period we go into with almost a pre-accepted notion that we're going to extend it. I tend to think that -- A -- that has trained everybody in a really bad policy of waiting until the last minute because you believe it's going to be extended. I think that if up front -- as (unintelligible) was saying -- that we can see clearly that we would need more time and -- while this was a very important issue -- it isn't one with an impending clock of some other precipitating event. I think it might be better to just -- in the first place, in this first instance of getting people to think and talk about this at a deeper level -- it might be good to do the longer period upfront.

But then there is this issue of the termination date -- the end date -- of a comment period that serves as a reminder that one really has to do it. So if we do it longer, I do recommend that, you know, we make sure that we've sent reminders out along the way. But if we think we're going to make it later, I think we should just make it later. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Avri. Just to be crystal clear -- make sure we are -- this is only for the survey. This isn't commenting on anything else. This is (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Yes, I understood that.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, great. Thanks Avri. I - my preference is still to -- and I'll be guided by or seek one more round of guidance here -- my preference is still to force a date on it because I sort of feel that we -- and I know that we're not disagreeing on a date, it's really just how close that date is -- my temptation is to stick with an earlier date, not just to say Avri, we've determined to extend that, but actually we will extend it only if we get feedback that this is insufficient time to do it.

How does that sound? Are we okay with that? Or do you feel that Avri's suggestion to go with a later date no matter what is a - is the right thing to do? I welcome any support for either. So I guess we're flitting between saying

essentially a week or so after the close of - when is the 5th at the moment? The 5th is - is it - one week after?

Perhaps we could go as far as two weeks after -- which is the 12th -- and that's - kind of accommodates everyone. So we set a date of the 12th and say survey completed by the 12th. That gives a little more time; it gives two more weeks after the meeting and puts a firm deadline on it. I'm proposing the 12th as some sort of compromise of what we've discussed along the way here. Manal, go ahead.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Jonathan Robinson. Yes, I think one week after would be very tight - would be a very tight deadline. Two weeks would make more sense. And I think we - I mean, if we go to the very latest deadline, it won't really benefit unless people are really planning to submit something and they missed to do so. So I think if we agree on like two weeks and propose this during the meeting, unless people ask for otherwise, then it would be good to stick to the two weeks.

And then like Avri mentioned, we can send an alert before; one week, maybe, before the deadline or so and see how people would react. I mean, as you mentioned, it's a small survey, so if people are in turned in to fill this, they will have - they - either they will have the opportunity to do so or at least they can request to have a little bit more time to do so and we can play it by ear then. But we cannot predict this up front and set a deadline that would suit everyone. I mean, we have to go by one deadline and then see what will happen.

And this is the deadline we are going to convey during the meeting and by circulating the alerts we can see how things are progressing. If people are really rushing to fill in the survey and the deadline is keeping them, then we can play it by ear and extend it a little bit. But otherwise -- as Olof mentioned -- we cannot really expect that every single GAC member is going to fill the survey. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: That's the other classic thing. We have a test (unintelligible) setting a deadline. It's what do we consider a sort of a success rate that's sufficient to close the survey. I will have to touch on that at the time. I mean, it's very difficult to know what level of participation we'll get. So - but sure enough, if we don't put a deadline on it, we can guarantee that will produce a lower response rate than putting a deadline on. So let's work with a deadline as we discussed and - Avri's suggestion of 20%. Thanks Avri. But let's do that and we'll put a threshold then and see where we get to.

Waiting for additional typing in the chat. Okay, so we - I think we're more or less in agreement on that with a 12th deadline with an understanding that should the response rate be too low -- which we haven't yet quantified exactly, although we have a suggestion that might be around 20% -- we just have to decide what is a satisfactory response rate for us to either close the survey or extend it. But we can come to that as we go.

Our next part of the slide deck moves on to work track two and talks about the phases -- the different phases -- of the current PDP and our initial work focusing on phases - on the early phases of PDP - that's one and two. Let's page through to the next slide, then. And so really our objective here is to make the GAC aware of all the existing mechanisms and provide input in a timely way. Suzanne.

Suzanne Radell: Thank you Jonathan Robinson. I did have a question. And forgive me for perhaps not knowing this as well as I should as a member of this working group. Is it possible on the second bullet - is there a timeline -- a traditional timeline -- for issue reports - preliminary issue reports? Because this is - that would be our first step, unless I'm mixing my steps up.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, Marika will respond to that, I think.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. So staff prepares the preliminary issue reports for public comment and staff usually has 45 days for that, which can be extended upon the request from staff to the GNSO council or the requester. And it's published for public comment and for that we basically follow the current rules, which is a 21 plus 21. I think the PDP manual officially prescribes a minimum of 30 days, but I think we basically run with the current model and I think I've seen that the proposal is that to change that in the near future to a minimum of 40 days.

So that's basically I think the timeframe. After the 40 days we close the public comment forum, staff will review the input received and -- depending on the number of comments received, you know -- we can either turn out pretty quickly in a week or so to have a revised - final issue report with the report of public comments -- or a little bit more. I think again the PDP manual describes that ideally it should be submitted within -- at the latest -- 30 days, but most of the times I think we are able to turn it around a bit quicker. So that's the - I think the typical times frames. Then I think the publications of the preliminary issue report for public comment is currently managed.

Jonathan Robinson: So Suzanne, are you thinking we should try and convey those existing time scales in here or just indicate that there are specific time scales?

Suzanne Radell: Well, however we - thank you Jonathan Robinson; Suzanne again. I do think it would be useful to convey because we are trying to focus people's attention on these very first two steps, yes? And so I think it's important for them to know that there's a window of opportunity here and they need to know what the parameters are.

So if we're going to start focusing people's attention, you know, via the survey; okay, you currently get these notifications. They do not appear to be triggering the kind of proactive response that we would like to see. So we're going to work on that. What will it take? But by the way -- in the meantime --

we on the GAC side have to be mindful of and to respect that there are parameters here. There are timeframes that we need to respect.

I just don't know how well that is understood. And so I think it's useful to draw it out in some way, shape, or form, whether it's at this bullet or - you know, there are some other slides further on when we talk about the phases. So I'm agnostic as to where it goes. I do think we need to have some hint of what the parameters are time wise. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Very good points. And it enables us to do what we've talked about as well, which is balancing the perception in all of this that -- which we talked about on our last call -- that part of this is about the GAC responding more effectively to existing mechanisms and part of it's the GNSO potentially being willing to modify either mechanisms or responses to mechanisms or responses to responses. And it's a sort of - it's a whole give and take dialogue.

Suzanne Radell: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: All right. I'm mindful of the time and in particular that I know various of you probably have other commitments after this. So, yes, thanks for noting on the actions and part of that as well as Marika's just annotating the presentation and just making sure we review - we'll have to review this presentation and go through it; try and refine it (unintelligible).

Right. So our next one looks as the GNSO PDP diagram. This really just highlights the phases of a typical PDP and showing that really what we're doing here is really highlighting the early phases in particular. Yes, that's perfect; that graphic is neat there. It shows very clearly why we're focusing on this, because the whole theory of this is early engagement and potentially being involved before the train leaves the station, so to speak.

Okay, next. And then we go on in detail to talk about Phase 1. And Suzanne?

Suzanne Radell: Thank you again, Jonathan Robinson and apologies for chiming in so often. Marika, this is actually a very minor point, but I anticipate that it might be useful to clarify. As you've pointed out here quite correctly, any advisory committee can request an issue report. I think you might want to also include that -- if my understanding is correct -- the board can also request one or the GNSO self-initiates. It's probably useful to lay out all of the options, just so people know what the drill is. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: I agree with that point; it's a good one, Suzanne. It's setting it in the context and how these things - how these PDPs initiate. Yes, and timing as well is another point Marika I see you've made in the chat. Let's move on to the next slide. (Unintelligible). I was just noting Avri's point in the chat that on the initiation of an issue's report the board can effectively command the initiation rather than request the initiation. Or the - work on an issues report. Suzanne, your hand is up on - is it to deal with Phase 2 or is that the previous hand?

Suzanne Radell: No, it's Phase 2, but I would like to - that's useful to know, Avri. I had no idea. So I just think it's helpful for people to get sort of the landscape there. Minor, minor suggestion; that DT I assume is a drafting team. If we could spell out the acronym and then charter - a charter is for a working group? That's a question on my part. If it is, then maybe we want to spell that out, too. Minor, minor points. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Very good point. That's - it's all about clarity and effective communication and the point's well taken. And certainly I would hope would catch these on a review of the presentation, but sort of polish. But good points. Next please.

                     And here we look at these ideas and we need to make it very, very clear that these are simply concepts that the group has come up with that we welcome any input on whether any of these look particularly attractive or make sense. Next slide, please.

And here of course we provide a nice set of links to all of the work of the group and what's been going on and where we are. Next please.

Woman: That's it.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, so what we need here, then, is a looking forward. I think that's the final slide we need; looking ahead. Where we intend to go and have a summary stroke looking ahead slide. Excuse me. Because it's clear that we'll need to say where we intend to go and just remind of the key decisions that need to be taken.

All right, well that's - having worked through that, I feel better about that that's really helpful to get the comments and input. Of course, there's still an opportunity to provide final input on this, but I think it's incumbent on myself, (Maria), and Marika and all of - and Manal now to polish this up. We'll do so as the presentation team.

And I know that Suzanne at least offered - I don't know quite how we're going to do this. I think the way we may want to do it -- and I'll be guided by you as well -- we may want to highlight who the members of the groups are -- and particular the team leads -- and just -- maybe - I don't know quite how we should do this -- but one option is that we give the presentation as perhaps Manal and myself with opportunities for specific input or comment during the course of the presentation from the team leads. Or if anyone's got a better or different idea, please feel free to suggest it. I know Marika's got to go now and we are hitting the top of the hour, but I'm open to how this is presented or what we do, providing we get the material polished up and in shape.

So if anyone would like to volunteer or feels particularly strongly that they'd like to - for example one option might be to present the different tracks. But let's pick that up online or feel free to drop a note to the list as we refine this presentation over the next few days. My feeling is this is going to be the

substance of the meeting between the GNSO and the GAC. There'll be some other smaller items that need to be covered, but this is going to dominate - we've got an hour slot and I expect this to take at least 30 minutes, if not 45 in order to give proper participation.

Thank you Suzanne for that support in the chat about working with us and whatever mechanics we think is best for getting the material across. Any other final comments or points? Good, well thank you. Everyone's had some input today and contribution, which is great to see and much appreciated. I know in particular this week feels busy, so thanks. I feel that was a useful session. I feel confident with the presentation material that we can get it to a final state in advance of our meeting on the weekend. Good. I think we're done, then, unless there's any last comments.

Good. Thank you all. We'll call the meeting to a close at that point.

Suzanne: Thank you.

Man: Thank you.

Woman: Thank you.

Woman: Goodbye.

                ((Crosstalk))

Woman: Yes, we'll see you shortly.

Woman: (Unintelligible) (Louise), you will now stop the recording. Thank you.

                                END