

**ICANN  
Transcription  
GAC GNSO Consultation Group meeting  
Tuesday 29 April 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 29 April 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/gns0/gns0-gac-20140429-en.mp3>

On page:

<http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#apr>

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

<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/>

Attendees:

Government Advisory Committee

Manal Ismail – co-chair - Egypt

GNSO Council

Jonathan Robinson – co-chair - Registries Stakeholder Group

Amr Elsadr – Non Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG)

Apology:

Suzanne Radell - USA

Ana Neves - Portugal

Brian Winterfeldt – Councillor

Volker Greimann – Vice Chair

Coordinator: And at this time the recordings have started.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening and welcome to the GAC GNSO Consultation Group meeting on the 29th of April, 2014. On the call today we have Jonathan Robinson, Manal Ismail and Amr Elsadr. We have apologies from Ana Neves, Suzanne Radel, Brian Winterfeldt and Volker Greimann.

From staff we have Olof Nordling, Marika Konings, Glen de Saint G ery, and myself, Terri Agnew.

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

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Terri. And welcome to colleagues present and those who will be picking up this meeting on the audio.

There is an agenda published and it's been circulated to the list that was kindly prepared by Manal ahead of our meeting. I thought it might be useful to briefly run through the action items or administrative and practical issues, as well called them, from the last meeting and just make sure we're clear on that.

So I'll just run through those very briefly. They were circulated on the 15th of April. We have four meetings scheduled, including this one, between now and London plus an additional meeting on Tuesday 17th of June which is in essence a sort of wrap up and preparation for the London meeting.

We have yet to fill the slot by - vacated by the GNSO counselor, Mikey O'Connor. And to the extent that he had a role as a team lead I think it's our intention to accept Amr's gracious offer of taking over that team lead slot but then we'll have to backfill Amr's position as a participant in the group. And so I'm expecting something imminent from the GNSO.

Manal, I think if you could confirm for the record your understanding of any changes in membership from the GAC point of view?

Manal Ismail: Yes, thank you Jonathan. For the GAC it's just Carlos from Costa Rica is the - not representing the government anymore so he won't be able to participate to the working group. And I still have to work with Heather on a replacement.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks, Manal. So we can expect hopefully a replacement in due course. And then the way we worked last time with these issues was we said, from memory, and I think it's a practical way of working is that we would make certain agreements notwithstanding the fact that there was limited or low participation subject to not having any opposition by the end of the week of the call.

So I think we'll take that same approach now meaning that members of the group have until the end of the day on Friday the 2nd of May, this week, to come back to us on any decisions or courses of action agreed on at the meeting. And in so doing we can both guarantee forward momentum but also not exclude those who have been unable to participate in the meeting itself.

So we made a proposal not to further open up membership at the last meeting but it is - it's not absolutely closed but for the moment for all practical purposes we will not open up the membership. Manal, you have, as I checked a moment ago, rechecked the GAC membership, and we can expect a proposal from you on - to replace Costa Rica in due course or a nomination.

We have the Board meeting so - the ICANN Board meeting this week at which point we may get an outcome on our budget request. And then we move really into capturing and defining the deliverables and the schedule for London which Marika and Olof duly did. And I think we will come back to that under Item 1 under the main agenda.

And we made a suggestion, which I think we hope to reinforce at this meeting the possibility of - between telecall meetings of the work stream leads to try and keep the progress moving. I mean, it's really evident that if we are to do anything we're going to have to meet as regularly as possible and keep momentum on the list and then maintain open the possibility of experimenting with certain solutions and proposals as we go.

And then - the possible documentation of each item in the linking between items in the day to day cooperation and how they affect the overall process.

So for the avoidance of doubt, Marika, it would be great if we could either - to the extent that these items have been dealt with, remove them off the list and to the extent that they haven't we might as well retain them on the list and add to them anything that comes out of the meeting today to maintain a rolling list on that basis.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Marika. So moving then on to the main agenda first option is to discuss and/or adopt the proposed work plan which was circulated on the back of the previous meeting. And that included a schedule for meetings - and did it - yes, it include the team lead meetings although we don't have a time of day for that at this point - a time of day or a day for that so that's something we could take a little - take some thought on.

So I'll pause for a moment there. And, Amr, I have no idea if you've had the opportunity to look at this timeline and the sort of sequence of events. I know, Manal, you have had but if there's any comment or thought on that. Amr, please go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Well thanks, Jonathan. This is Amr. Yeah, I just - I did go over this timeline earlier today. And I just wanted to note and point out to everyone that although I did just volunteer to replace Mikey as a co-team lead on the process track I do have some commitments that will limit the time I can do this work between now and May 15.

I haven't looked at this timeline and the schedule involved. I see that there is a lot that we need to do between now and that date. So this is basically over the course of the next two weeks. I would hate to think that I'm going to start

this volunteer duty by slowing folks down. And I wouldn't want to do that at all.

I will try to keep up as much as I can but I just wanted folks to be aware that I may have some trouble over the next couple of weeks ahead of time. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Amr. And that's noted. I think we have to be understanding of that position obviously and just accept best efforts in the interim. And perhaps others listening to the audio or on list can be encouraged to, you know, help especially in the short term fill in for when you are unable to over the next week or so.

Right, so we have - we've got the schedule for the meetings. I think that's relatively uncontroversial. It's the same time as we have had so far. And there's the schedule for the team leads meetings. I mean, maybe it's best as a starting point to simply do this literally on the - at the same time on the same day on the in between weeks. It seems - is there any concern with that suggestion?

I mean, I know we've really only got - we've got just a couple of people here but I suppose that excludes Volker again. I wonder if we could maybe shift it slightly. I mean, one of the reasons for this time is to make it at a time that's tolerable from the East Coast of the United States through to the East Coast I think is where - of Australia which is where David is and cover that very broad time zone.

Thanks, Amr. We'll see - okay so, Manal, yeah, you support it. So the only question then is really whether it continues to exclude Volker and whether there's a way in which if we brought it perhaps forward by an hour, which would make it 1200 UTC we might just be able to accommodate Volker. So maybe a - let's stick with Tuesday, Marika and Olof, but let's give perhaps this slot and a slot or two on either side of it to offer on a Doodle poll.

Marika Konings: Jonathan, this is Marika. Volker is actually not a team lead; I think it's Suzanne who is the other team lead from the GAC side.

Olof Nordling: Indeed.

Jonathan Robinson: Understood. But he's still a participant. And given that there's sort of, you know, the challenge is with participation I agree, team leads are - oh I'm sorry, I understand. Yeah, I understand. I missed that of course.

So really the intention is really for the team leads to meet at that point and keep things ticking over isn't it?

Marika Konings: Correct.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah.

Marika Konings: I mean, one of the questions was - or at least an issue that I foresaw was more that the to team leads on one subject would need and talk through things and the other team leads but I don't see any reason why that cannot be done together because I guess that ensures as well that where there is crossover, you know, that can be incorporated. And I'm sure everyone has very good viewpoints to share in any case on both tracks. So...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, that's an interesting one. The fact that they occur at the same time or are proposed to occur at the time doesn't mean that they need to occur together; they could just occur in parallel or together. And maybe that's something we could - but if we've got the slot booked it gives the opportunity for either.

Olof Nordling: This is Olof. Well, it of course puts you and Manal any difficult predicament whether you should be join one or the other or both of them. So perhaps...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Good point. Well that's a challenge. Maybe the thing to do is to run them in sequence then; why not 1300 UTC and one at 1400 UTC. It does put out a two-hour block then but that might be the most sensible thing to do.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Fourteen hundred UTC won't work for me because we actually have privacy proxy at that time slotted in every week.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay.

Marika Konings: But 1200 and 1300 could work.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, it does mean there's a three-hour run as well. Manal.

Manal Ismail: So maybe we can start the earlier slot and then get Suzanne to join the later one. But do we really need two hours for this meeting? I mean...

Jonathan Robinson: That's a good point. It may be just two half-hour slots. So why don't we book the hours locked in? That's a really good point, Manal, why don't we just booked the hour slot in and we could do it into half hours. That makes sense.

Marika Konings: Yeah, and this is Marika. So are you happy for us to basically just use, you know, the same conference bridge for the two calls? And, you know, when people join in they can just listen in for a bit and, you know, when we stop at the half-hour continue to the next topic? Would that work so we just have one invite for the team leads, you know, Tuesday's 1300 UTC and...

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...I'm comfortable with that Marika and colleagues. I mean, actually to be honest with you I had yet not got to the point - and it's not to have a lack of transparency but whether we, you know, how formal is even needed to be whether this was just a telephone call.

But let's assume that for the moment that we do more or less everything the same, run it at 1300 UTC, have it in two half-hour slots where we do the one track and then the other. And to the extent that either myself or Manal want to attend the whole thing and/or the team leads want to participate in each, you know, listen in on each other's sessions that could work quite well.

So providing there's no other comment or objection, thanks, Manal, I see the tick from you. Amr, go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Jonathan, this is Amr. Yeah, I was just going to say that I like the idea of a one-hour call with two half-hour slots for each work track. I was also going to suggest that the team leads from each track attend the entire hour to just sort of - I think it would be a useful in identifying potential overlaps between the work we are doing and just keeping everybody on the same page so just not to be working, you know, separately. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, I think that's very sensible. So let's assume that - thank you, Amr. Let's - Olof, your hand is up.

Olof Nordling: Oh well, yeah, just to concur with Amr here. And it makes it also quite easy we have team leads meeting with an indicative agenda that we have the first team lead for half-hour and the second for half an hour. And should it be that the first one is shorter well if all are present well it's easy to switch to the second part of the agenda.

So suggest we call it a team lead's call and have the suggested agenda for Team Lead 1, day to day work stream; and for Team Lead 2, PDP work

stream, 30 minutes each which may change depending on that matters to address.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, I'm good with that. That sounds fine. So it sounds like we've sort of - and Manal is as well and Amr is as well. So it sounds like we've come up with a plan. So perhaps we could document that is our first sort of outcome from the meeting then please. I think you've pretty much done in the online notes anyway.

All right well that nails Item 1 on our agenda. I think we then go on with our next two items on the agenda to discuss in sequence first the proposed way forward for Work Stream 1 and then what could be for Work Stream 2.

I think, you know, really the proposal here is to do the substance of the work between these main telephone calls and essentially ratified or verify and review during these main calls every two weeks.

That said I am just wondering if there are - I mean, so there's a - I'm just not sure how much substantial work we can do now given the limited participation and the fact that we don't even have all of our team leads on call.

So although we've got the opportunity to do so maybe that there's a limit to what we can cover now. Manal, please go ahead.

Manal Ismail: Yes, thank you, Jonathan. Actually maybe we can even agree on the structure and of course have this confirmed with Suzanne later. But, I mean, for the day to day - and I don't know whether you agree to this - we have six options. And I was (unintelligible) that maybe we can target finalizing two options per call.

I mean, we work between the calls on finalizing those two options and then on the call we just wrap up or fine tune or whatever and have those signed off then. If agreed then share with the GAC and the GNSO after the call just to

keep them up to date on what's going on so that they don't get surprised somehow at the meeting.

But for the PDP thing - and I understand the suggestion also came from Suzanne that we cluster of the issues by phase and start also addressing them in groups.

I tried to go through the documents before the call and to map the table format of documents to the phases that were identified on Mikey's slides. But actually I failed to find the four phases well defined and separated. So maybe we can end with three phases and hands go just for each call we have like two options and one phase of the PDP to finalize.

But again I'm flexible if there are other options or if I've misunderstood the table and they could be - it could be divided into more than three phases. Thank you. If we have the table we can just - we can just go through the table and see how we can group or categories the issues. I mean, for the day to day it's straightforward with six alternatives or options. But here we may need to identify where the group - how the grouping could work. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Manal. So I know Marika is ready to speak and has put up the table in the Adobe. But just to be - make sure I am 100% clear than on the day to day we have these nicely separated out areas, A-F, which if I'm understanding you correctly we are in a position to simply now start to work through and structurally there's no change we need in order to start to progress our work and answer the questions. Just to clarify that we feel we've got the right structure for dealing with the day-to-day ones at this stage.

Yeah, Manal, go ahead.

Manal Ismail: Yes, exactly. This is what I meant for the day to day, I mean, for each (option), Marika and all of very well described each option so and less group members have any comments on the description then this is - should be

confirmed how this mechanism achieved the objectives again unless members of the group have any comments then again there is nothing to be done for this.

But then comes the potential issues or questions that need to be addressed. And this is where we need to focus our work on the potential issues, on the pros and cons and ultimately whether this option would be mutually exclusive with other options.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah. Exactly. That's very...

((Crosstalk))

Manal Ismail: So those are the - okay thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Sorry, I cut across...

Manal Ismail: Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: ...but I was just simply responding and affirming. Yeah, so it's potential issues, pros and cons and integration with the other track. So as far as we're concerned there is no substantial - there is plenty of substantial work to be done on this that's not on this particular call. However...

Manal Ismail: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, okay thanks Manal. Just wanting to make absolutely sure I'm clear on this because I haven't had as much time as I might have liked to go through it and also make sure I understand your perspective. And I see Amr is agreeing in the chat as well which is helpful. Thanks, Amr.

So then moving on to that point you raised quite rightly about the PDP which Marika is ready to respond to I think, let me not say anything and then, Marika, and lets you respond first and see if that gets us to where we need to be.

Marika Konings: So this is Marika. So I actually have a comment about both because one suggestion on their day to day cooperation would be as indeed we don't have a lot of people on the call today to actually brainstorm or contribute to what is in the document at this stage would be and maybe to send out to the mailing list first of all, you know, the specific questions where we're looking for feedback on.

And I think the first question is indeed are the objectives and expectations that we've outlined here for the GAC and GNSO, you know, are those correct? Is there anything missing? And, you know, if we don't get any response we assume that what is there is appropriate and correct.

And then secondly are there any options that we haven't added to this list that we should be adding? And then thirdly to kick off conversations on, you know, as Manal suggested, taking two options at a time maybe what we could do is actually, you know, cut out Option A and B and put those in a separate Word document and possibly also paste them in the email if the table allows for that and push those out to the mailing list already encouraging people to provide input and feedback.

And again I think for - for all then we can spell that out as well in the email that, you know, what is in there currently is what, you know, Olof and I have come up with hardly based on feedback and discussions from this group; partly of, you know, experience (unintelligible) with some of these options to date.

But this is all, you know, free for all to add, change, criticize, augment so none of this is set in stone. I think it's really, you know, the way it's written is

really to try to kick off conversations and hopefully get some further input which then will also help us identify pros and cons for each of these.

But again I just want to emphasize that none of the other parts of the - of each option are, you know, written in stone; those are all open for further considerations or ideas or options. As said we've just outlined some basic ideas from our perspectives but hoping that there may be other things that people would like to see added or explained or clarified.

And then on the PDP and happy to have a closer look at that because I suspect what may be the case is that looking at, you know, the big stages of the PDP - and that's maybe how Mikey broke it down is, you know, the phase where you basically initiate the PDP or request an issue report; that's one.

And I'm presuming the drafting phase - the drafting of the issue report than the actual working group phase and then the decision-making phase both at the Council and Board level. Maybe those were the four natural phases that Mikey identified.

And I could have a look at that and if it's helpful break the table up in that way so it's clear, you know, which parts belong to those different stages of the overall PDP process.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, Marika. And I know Amr is waiting to come in. So first thank you, those are very practical suggestions on that day today. I particularly like the breaking down into two options at a time. I think it'll make it more bite sized. And at the moment the document looks quite intimidating to contribute to; it's pretty big. So the suggestion between you and Manal on the breaking it up into smaller bite sized chunks sounds helpful.

I think Amr may have wanted to come in on this - on the day today. So before we return to the PDP let's see if we can give Amr a moment here. So, Amr, go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Jonathan. Yeah, I did want to make one comment on the day today track. I was personally really hoping that we might get some feedback from the crowd in the room at the meeting in Singapore. I don't recall getting any. I think there were a lot of comments in support of the work that we're trying to do and folks seem to be happy with everything.

That we didn't actually get any feedback on any of the questions - the six objectives that we're trying to reach. And while we think about trying to get some feedback from this group on that I think it might be worthwhile to also perhaps circulate these beyond this group to the GNSO and the GAC and just try to sort of figure out if anyone out there has any idea on something we might have missed or not.

It might've been a bit difficult to come up with this in the room in Singapore seeing that a lot of folks were seeing this for the first time. And perhaps it might be worthwhile to give them a little - people a little more time to go over it at a more leisurely pace and try and think of something we might have missed. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, I must say I - Amr, thanks, that's a very good suggestion. And it was - so I think when Manal possibly or Marika was talking previously that was going through the back of my mind. And it's very attractive to potentially make sure that it does get greater both circulation and by-in.

Can anyone on the call see any concerns without? I mean I think we are due to, at the next Council meeting on 8 May, give an update as to the work of the group. But I suppose the question is how does one circulate this? Do we push it out through the Council? That may be the best way of doing it then the councilors themselves can distribute it to their groups if they - as they see fit.

Any thoughts on that - yeah, I see you support that as an idea, Amr. Manal, do you think you would like - is this likely to help or hinder our progress if it

gets pushed out? I guess it's optional anyway, it's really just making it - it's a possibility. But any thoughts on that in terms of circulating more widely for input or do you feel more comfortable keeping it within the group at this stage?

Manal Ismail: No, actually I'm (with) sharing anything that could be shared, I mean, the sooner the better. But regarding the structure of the document, the objectives and the (unintelligible) we have I already posed this question on that GAC list and on our consultation group mailing list.

And I don't think we received any substantial input if any actually. So I'm a bit reluctant that we start again talking about the structure of the document options we have. I mean, had someone - if someone had any comments on this I think they would have expressed this several times before because...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: In other words, just to check that with you, Manal, really what your view is then is that we're now looking to build on - build within that structure on the detail answers and some of the key populating the documents.

Manal Ismail: Exactly. I'd rather go into substance. And again it's open; if someone says we still have a seventh option that we have missed we can incorporate this. But I would be reluctant to hand our substantial work on getting an answer on the structure and the objectives and the options. Because we have posed this question on both lists before so uncomfortable to start populating the table as the document stands.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Well I think what we're saying is no harm in seeking wider input as long as it's channeled back into the group and we manage it that way. And let's do that. Amr, go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Jonathan. This is Amr. I just wanted to agree with, Manal. I don't think that this should delay our work at all. I was just thinking - and I wasn't suggesting that we look - we certainly don't look for solutions beyond this group right now to the objectives that we have listed. I don't think it would hurt to, while we start working on these, to just holler out to just members of our respective groups to just see if there is anything we've missed; we might end up adding a seventh or eighth objective as our work goes on. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great. I've got it then. That sounds sensible. And then just to check Marika's suggestion of breaking this down into sort of more bite sized chunks and essentially two options at a time, which I think has come up also in discussion with Manal, I mean, that seems like a good idea as well doesn't it?

Checking whether you've got - yeah you've got that recorded anyway Marika, as a draft outcome from here. Yeah, and I see - I'm just noting back to the previous time we put out our outcomes of the previous meeting we did ask - and that was very helpful, Marika, to confirm that there is a deadline for feedback on this sort of actions coming out of the meeting so, yeah.

Okay good. So that sounds like we know where we're going. Let's return then to the PDP track and just make sure, yeah, from memory Mikey broke this down as much visually from practically - as practically into those four quadrants.

And, Amr, you made a point of moment ago that you thought that, I mean, Marika, I think you said you could see how it might divide readily into the four phases. And I guess what we're then looking to do is break the table down into three or four distinct chunks in the same way.

Manal.

Manal Ismail: Yes thank you, Jonathan. Actually I tried to break it to the four phases because this was what we had in hand. But I'm not really pushing that we

strictly have four phases. If it could be done only in three phases I think it would be better for two reasons.

First of all to finish that PDP worked with the day to day work because we have six options and we're going to do two at a time so we're going to have three iterations here so we might as well have three iterations for that PDP, of course if this works smoothly.

And second, because if we target three calls then we will be highly dependent on the very last call which is a couple of days before the meetings in London. So I would be more happy if we can schedule things to be finished for (unintelligible) over three calls, I mean. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, Marika, you were picking up on that.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I basically looked back at Mikey's table or presentation and I think he basically identified the four phases as the first one being the identification and launch phase which is really indeed the request for an issue report, you know, the chartering effort, the initiation of the PDP.

Then the developing of consensus which is the working group phase and refine and endorse which is more, you know, final report, sort of deliberations and approved and implement which is more Board vote phase and implementation.

And there he as well put labels on, which in his view, are, you know, best, better, good times for input basically I think really boiling down to that the earlier there's input the better that is.

But again take, you know, nothing taken away from that I don't think there's an issue either in looking back at the table - and I think it may be helpful there as well to actually start numbering the different elements and I think

specifically looking at those, you know, that have been identified as specific opportunities for input and breaking them down just in three parts.

And I think then we can still keep in the back of our minds that - because these are ordered chronologically in that PDP phase that everything that's really at the outset is where, you know, in principle I think we're looking for the early input and where maybe the focus should be on where effort needs to go.

Then those phases that are later down in the process where it may be less helpful or less effective to have input. So maybe that is the way forward. I can still, you know, but maybe headings and they are so it's clear in which phase of the PDP these steps take place; number them and then maybe indeed in principle we just break them down into three parts.

But of course if, you know, we move quicker through some of those, you know, we can catch up and have more time maybe at the end to circle back to some of the items. That may be another way of looking at it.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, okay so sounds good. You've taken on board the point - the practical point of what Manal was suggesting in terms of timing between now and London. And I see you party made some notes there anyway. Amr, you wanted to come in on this as well.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, thanks Jonathan. This is Amr. I love it when Marika says what I want to say because she always does a much better job at it than I do so thanks, Marika. I think she went through most of what I want to say.

Regarding working on three or four phases though and whether they are more - indeed more than (unintelligible) not, I think these - the work we are doing on this track can be grouped into four phases. As I think Marika pointed out earlier one in solving more around the issue of what phase we want around the chartering of a PDP working group phase, one around the working

group itself, and then one more towards the Council deliberations and Board vote.

And the way I see it is that right now where we are is that we are more - we are already more at that later phase in terms of how the GAC interacts with GNSO policy development or GNSO policy development process. And what we're trying to do is move it away from that last phase and toward the first three.

So the bulk of the work is actually going to be on these three phases in the beginning. And so if we are concerned about the scheduling and moving the two tracks simultaneously together hand-in-hand then I think we might have a good shot at doing that because like I said, the bulk of the work probably will be on the first three phases.

I probably need to take a closer look to see to what extent we might need to work more on the fourth phase. But personally I think the first three phases are what we really need to work on. And that should move along nicely with the day to day work track. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. It sounds like we are converging to a similar place. Let me leave space for Manal.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Jonathan. Just very quickly, I mean, we've already identified some issues that needs to be addressed. And I don't see much of them at the very end of the table so this might well goes along with what Amr is saying we'll be focusing our work on the first three phases which comes naturally.

But if Marika or Amr could help me just to, I mean, I'm aware of the four phases as mentioned by Marika and as reflected on Mikey's slide. But I couldn't really Mark them in the table. So if we can just quickly, I mean, the first phase, I mean, probably starts with the request for issue report.

And I'm not sure whether this would end by the creation of the working group or - I'm just seeking clarification if we can very quickly go through the table and identify the beginning and end of the four phases.

Jonathan Robinson: Marika, could you want to respond to that?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I mean, if I look at - in Mikey's table basically the end of the initial phase would be at the initiation of the policy development process. But again that's currently not a specific phase identified here because that's normally, you know, that's a Council decision and there's no opportunity as such for that in, you know, for other SO AC, I mean, input that is provided is actually as part of the preliminary issue report public comment forum which you see there as well.

So basically here it would kind of and after the rejection of PDP requests and by advisory committees. Then the second phase of developing consensus in line with the Mikey's table would be developing a charter for the PDP working group; the working group - there are couple of items for the working group in there. Let's see what comes up for that.

And then basically indeed until the initial report which is at the end of that phase and then the Council deliberation phase is refined and endorse phase as identified by Mikey. And then after that you have the Board vote which is approve and implement phase. So I think that's where at least following Mikey's thinking in his graphic that's I think where he sees the different phases starting.

Again, I don't think it's a very hard drawn line. And again I think we may want to look at as well, you know, what we're currently doing with the table is look at existing opportunities and how those can possibly be enhanced or improved.

But at the same time I think we need to keep in the back of our minds as well, are there any additional steps that should be built in, for example, in part of the process that are currently not covered. You know, I just mention as well for example initiation of policy development process, you know, should there be an opportunity there for example for the GAC to formally advised or formally provide input to the GNSO before they take a vote, you know, just to give an example.

So I think that something as well we need to keep in the back of our minds. And as we go through this and gather input and take comments to already think about those kind of things as well are there any steps that are currently not foreseen as either an option or possibly even a requirement as part of a PDP to really make sure we have a very efficient mechanism to obtain that early input in the process.

Jonathan Robinson: Manal, is that a new hand? Did you want to respond and to Marika?

Manal Ismail: Yes please. Thank you. So this was extremely helpful. So again as expected phase 4 would then start with the Board work which doesn't have any potential issues as it stands now. And again they shouldn't be our focus if we are talking about early engagement.

So we might then be focusing on the first three phases. And as Marika explains now then we should be not only looking into the questions to be addressed are the issues to be addressed but also the column that precedes the questions which is GAC - I mean opportunities for GAC early engagement.

So I think we should be working on both columns proposing new enhancements for early engagement as well as addressing the issues listed under the questions column.

But again, I mean, I know we already have Amr with us on the call but we should be mindful that Suzanne is not on the call and she probably needs to agree to what's been discussed. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Manal. Olof.

Olof Nordling: Yeah, thanks Jonathan. Well just to extend these thoughts of what we need to do is have a new column so we identify clearly the phases. And well since it's about the GAC engagement in GNSO policy development process I think Manal is spot on.

When it has left of the GNSO well, it's still in the GNSO policy development process, formally speaking. But we do have mechanisms that are quite formal and quite strict on that Board level. So I guess the focus is indeed on the first three to have early engagement.

And also we should probably clarify the columns in this document a bit. GAC proposed engagement while I think we should call it proposals and then potential issues rather than questions on the last two columns.

Proposals for change or additions or deletions, any kinds of proposals could be considered of course but just to make it clear to people when they want to comment online or online on the list. So, yeah, just a few thoughts around this.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Olaf. And I see Manal has put a checkmark in the box. And I think this is - in the chat area. I mean, I think this is a very important point actually both that we have sort of slightly dropped the nomenclature of the early engagement and actually this is the fundamental driver as well as I'm concerned and my understanding of this consultation group's exercise.

You are very right to point out that to the extent that it comes in later in the process there are formal and structural mechanisms by which GAC input can

be taken. And indeed in some ways that's part of the problem, the fact that it comes so late in the process which again loops back to the point of the early engagement rather than simply engagement.

And I think, you know, the points you guys have been making and we should be mindful to recognize that that's covered by the umbrella of early engagement.

Speaking of being mindful, I mean, I feel we've had a very productive conversation but we're coming up towards the top of the hour and I have and I suspect others may have other commitments. So providing I don't see any objections I think we've managed to capture quite a lot of this in the - and capture it well in the notes that has been diligently taken by Marika I think during the course of the call.

And our item 4 was - on this agenda was about mapping the work stream deliverables onto the work plan. And I think that's naturally likely to happen in the course of the actions we're taking here.

So my sense is we've made some reasonable progress at building a common understanding of how we intend to work through these things and created that and captured that in the form of a set of actions.

Let me see if there is anything else that anyone wants to add under any other business or, you know, something that's been missed along the way?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. A question on the London meeting. Do you want to go ahead with the same approach to the informal session on Sunday evening at the end of the day? I don't know how that may conflict; I know there's a high level meeting being scheduled and other events going on.

I know that we're in the process of trying to confirm the GAC GNSO slot. But I presume we still want to keep the informal session as well if possible?

Jonathan Robinson: Well, I will add - I'll leap in with both feet and give my two cents worth right away. I mean, I felt that both our meeting with the GAC was useful as was - and it seems to go down very well the interaction. And maybe given that it's a high-level meeting we may even want to broaden it a little bit in terms of the involvement.

But in any event the sort of cocktail thing we had on Sunday night seems to work very well. So personally I'm supportive. I thought that it was a good function. We had good attendance. And it seems to follow on well from the formal meeting.

And I see support from Amr and a hand up from Manal. Manal, go ahead.

Manal Ismail: Thank you. When, I mean, the high level meeting, if I understand correctly, is going to be on Monday so I don't think it would conflict with our regular meeting day if this was what was meant I the question.

Jonathan Robinson: Olof.

Olof Nordling: Yeah, very quickly. Well formally speaking the high-level meeting is scheduled to start at 10:30 on Monday and conclude at 5:15 pm on Monday followed by a reception. So that's the schedule for them; whoever they may be, which is not only GAC members but other governments that will be invited as well. So...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: So my memory is that we had on - in Singapore we had on Sunday our meeting with the GAC and then we had our follow-on meeting with the drinks and so one in the late afternoon early evening Sunday is that - that's correct isn't it so it's really my error in sort of in any sense linking it with a high-level meeting. But it doesn't appear that there's a clash there.

Olof Nordling: No clash confirmed.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. Well I think if you could capture that as an item then, Marika, as a final item propose similar format for London meeting as Singapore, in other words substantial portion of the GAC GNSO meeting to inform and ratify decisions made, you know, or progress coming out of this group, work coming out of this group and second opportunity to engage in formally later during the same day.

Good, well that takes us very neatly to the top of the hour. So I think that concludes a useful discussion, some decent output and an opportunity to make progress. And I guess the only other thing to mention is that then it's up to particularly the three of us but anyone who can who's involved either listening to the recording or has participated today to sort of evangelize and encourage participation in the work of this group so we can make as much progress as possible.

Okay thank you everyone. Thanks for your participation, contribution before and during the meeting and look forward to working with you in days and weeks ahead.

Marika Konings: Thanks.

Olof Nordling: Thank you.

Marika Konings: Bye.

Olof Nordling: Bye.

Jonathan Robinson: Bye.

Terri Agnew: Thank you everyone for joining today's meeting. (Emily), if you could stop the recording.

END