

ICANN Transcription
GAC GNSO Consultation Group meeting
Tuesday 10 March 2015 at 14:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GAC GNSO Consultation Working Group call on the Tuesday 10 March 2015 at 14:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-gac-10mar15-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#mar>

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

Attendees:

Government Advisory Committee
Olga Cavalli, Argentina

GNSO Council

Carlos Gutierrez, Councillor
Jonathan Robinson, Chair
Avri Doria, Councillor
Amr Elsadr, Councillor

GNSO Liaison to the GAC:

Mason Cole

Apology:

Manal Ismail – co-chair – Egypt
Suzanne Radell, US

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings
Olof Nordling
Karine Perset
Glen de St Gery
Julia Charvolen
Nathalie Peregrine

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. And good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the GAC GNSO Consultation Group Call on the 10th of March 2015.

On the call today we have Olga Cavalli, Carlos Raul Gutierrez, Avri Doria, Amr Elsadr, Mason Cole and Jonathan Robinson. We received apologies from Manal Ismail and Suzanne Radell. From staff we have Marika Konings, Olof Nordling, (unintelligible), Glen DeSaintgery, 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 ever so much and over to you Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Nathalie. So that I think concludes at least the roll call part of Item 1. I'll take the opportunity from the Chair to welcome you all here including in particular I think Olga is a new joiner to this group. So it's great to have you here Olga. And actually that leads us neatly into Item 2, which is a membership update.

So it would be good to get an update. Normally the membership is as listed up on the right of your screen where its agenda and notes. So you've got myself; David Cake, Vice-Chair of the GNSO Council; and then Amr, (Brian), Avri, Carlos as Councilors; and Mason in his capacity as GNSO liaison to the GAC.

From the GAC we have (normally) Manal, Suzanne, (Anna), (Mark), (Gema) and now Olga. Has anyone got any update as to whether any of the people listed are no longer expecting to participate?

Olof Nordling: This is Olof here. And I think about the only - I would like to send a reminder to (Gema). The others have been on or recently or more or less recently. And well, may have problems joining for various reasons. But I've no indication of

anybody well explicitly saying that they want to leave the group from the GAC side. But I'll take an action point reminding (Gema) because she hasn't been on for quite some time.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. That will be helpful please Olof. And if we can determine whether she has an interest in actively participating. Frankly, I don't think it will do any harm to send a reminder to all but and then you might want to send in addition to (Gema) just to highlight to her she has been particularly absent over the last say six meetings or something.

But I think it's no harm in reminding everyone that they are not obliged and we would like to have regular participation. And I think it would be useful to do the same for the GNSO team.

I don't think it would do any harm to - I think we should perhaps even record - I don't know how easy it is to do but it would be good to show people a record of attendance say during calendar year 2015 and just highlight that if there is any problem with regular participation they are welcome - any member is welcome to step aside and invite someone else to participate.

And the related issue there is that it would be to discuss whether or not we have sufficient membership here with approximately six and six on either side. Before we go into that, let me respond to your hand being up Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes. Thank you. Avri speaking. And even before you got to talking about attendance, I stuck my hand up. I just want to point out that I have had myself on the willing to be replaced anytime. I have terrible attendance and we have three NCSGs on this.

So looking at it sort of at a distance, I basically think that at least one of us should be replaced. I think I have the worst attendance. And I just wanted to bring that up again. So if we've got some mechanism in the GNSO - once or twice I've put out the hey, I'm on this.

I think there's too many NCSG people. I should be replaced. And many voices would say oh, I might be willing. Oh. And then all of a sudden there was a decision procedure I couldn't do on my own.

So it's - I think it's good that you brought this up. I think, you know, it might be worth going back to the GNSO Council and sort of, you know, talking about the breakdown and the distribution of members and so on.

So I keep coming insofar as I can schedule it. I know I've been bad. I probably have some of the worst attendance in the group. And I just want to put that on the table. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Avri. And I've also had difficulties attending at times for a variety of reasons. So the intention is not to embarrass anyone but just to flag it up and remind people that, you know, that it's not an obligation to be here. And your point is well taken that if we can find someone else who is willing and able and perhaps not necessarily a member of NCSG, we should be open to doing so. So thanks for that.

All right. Let's move on then to review the meeting in Singapore and the current - and in a sense the current status. I guess from the - with regard to the meeting in Singapore, there was a presentation to the GAC and a discussion with the GAC, in particular in the GAC GNSO meeting. So I guess arguably it was a presentation to both.

There was substantial discussion and some feedback on that. So that was useful. And as a consequence and you will see from the GAC communique there was support to go ahead for a trial period as intended. And similarly that same point was voted on if memory serves me correctly in the first - was in the first Council meeting post Singapore. Could someone remind me? I think the Council also agreed to do that or is it yet on our agenda?

Yes. It's coming up on our agenda as we speak. So formally as in the formal sense the Council has not yet voted to support the trial period. But I don't anticipate any issues with that motion at this stage.

Are there any other comments or questions in relation to what's happened - what took place in Singapore and Item 2 of - and Item 3 of this agenda? I guess (there's a) recording of what is to happen (still) that we've got the GAC or what has happened we've got the GAC communique and what is to happen we've got the motion on the agenda for the forthcoming Council meeting. That's a week commencing the 16th. Go ahead Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Jonathan. I do have a comment although not - I was not exactly sure if it's pertinent to this point or to the next one in reviewing this group's draft working plan and the way forward.

The documents Marika sent or Manal sent on behalf of Marika was very helpful and then sort of just collecting everything and taking a look at where we are and where we feel we need to go.

The one thing that I - that struck me in the document is agreeing on a follow up mechanism and success measures. And I brought something up recently on the Council to that effect in response to the motion that we are scheduled to vote on in the next Council meeting to approve this pilot.

And I do sort of have a question. I have ever intent of supporting the motion. I might as well just say that upfront. And I hope the quick look mechanism pilot works out to both groups' satisfaction.

In terms of success measures, I did send a note regarding that. And I think the success measures from the GNSO perspective in accordance with the way the motion is worded is a bit limited. And I don't mind that. We'll measure success according to how well the quick look mechanism works on three

PDPs assuming the motion will pass. And I also assume that there will be no difficulty in passing this motion.

However, for this group I'm wondering if we need a bit of a wider look at what these success measures may be. I don't think it's enough to just evaluate the quick look mechanism once it's in place and how well it serves the GAC and early engagement in GNSO process.

But I think it's also important to take a look at the process within the GAC itself and how well the GAC sort of adopts it and whether - and if there are for example attempts at launching a quick look mechanism in response to a PDP but for one reason or another the GAC fails to do so because the process maybe proves difficult for any reason.

So I think this is something this group should probably take a look at and also consider in assessing to what extent this pilot is successful or not. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Amr. If I hear you correctly, I hear a question over what are the success criteria. And then there's a second point who will monitor those. And I think you're suggesting that this group undertakes the work to develop those success criteria. I'm not 100% clear who would then proceed to monitor those. And maybe that's something we still need to discuss. But.

Amr Elsadr: Jonathan, it's Amr again if I may clarify.

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Yes. I think the success measures from the GNSO Council perspective are already set. So the GNSO Council will probably measure the success of the quick look mechanism from the - in accordance to the motion that we will vote on at the next Council meeting.

However, on this group I am suggesting a wider sort of scope in measuring to what extent this pilot is successful or not. So yes, we should also - I think both groups should probably assess the success measures. But I think this one should also look at the process within the GAC. And we can do that with the help of our GAC colleagues and just sort of noting any difficulties within the GAC and actually getting a quick look mechanism up and going. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Amr. That's helpful. Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Jonathan. And thank you all for having me in the group and for the welcoming messages. They are very encouraging. And I think this is a great idea. I always thought that an early interaction between the GAC and the GNSO is crucial for success of any policy that is developed.

I think and I agree with Amr but I would add - I don't know how this can be measured but the challenge for the members of the GAC and the GNSO and this group is to bring the issues that we discuss in the group to all the different group of interest into the GAC and into the GNSO.

The GNSO has its constituencies, which are different, which have different perspectives. And also the GAC has different countries and different perspectives; developed countries, developing countries; countries that participate actively; countries that don't.

So the challenge of us that we are - I'm talking as a GAC representative that the challenge for the GAC representatives in this group is once we see something that it's impacting some of our GAC colleagues that perhaps are not so active that we try to engage with them and try to show them what is going on.

But sometimes in a large group like the GAC it's - that is challenging. So for us that is a success. I don't know how to measure that. But that would be a success item to have in mind.

And as for the GNSO, and I have been four years a GNSO Council member, so I've been there. The different constituencies also sometimes have different perspectives about what the GAC could think about something or how to interact with the GAC.

So I think that one of the success that we may achieve is reaching out to those interested in whichever developed - policy development is being done.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Olga. Did you want to respond to that Amr?

Amr Elsadr: Yes. Thank you Jonathan. And thank you very much Olga. I think that's a very good example of what this group should be looking at. Because my impression from the GNSO, and please anyone can correct me if I'm mistaken in this, is that we're specifically going to be looking at - after three cycles of a quick look mechanism process are done, we're going to look at how well that facilitates GAC early engagement in a PDP process.

What I am suggesting this group does is not only look at these three sort of test cases but also look at attempts by the GAC to launch quick look mechanisms that perhaps for one reason or another fails such as the needed outreach to the different GAC members or any other reason that may come up that we haven't foreseen at this point.

So that is I think what Olga described is very much in line with what I am suggesting we include in our own success measures within this group.
Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Judging by the comments and then the checkmark on - from Olga in response to you, it seems like you're in agreement.

It feels to me like we need some form of action and the action will be to produce a record of this that lays out the success criteria. Does that feel

right? And Amr, are you willing to help with this and sort of lead such an effort? Great. It sounds like you may have Carlos helping you as well. So perhaps a little group of you, Amr, Carlos, Olga perhaps can develop a sort of matrix or map of success criteria. Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. I can help of course. Count on me. It's a lot going on but I am always happy to help.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Good. Well that was a useful introduction into the sort of review of the draft work then and the way forward.

Now as you'll know, we had - and Marika has very helpfully summarized the sort of goal and objectives and deliverables that we had set out for ourselves according to the charter where we've - and you'll see this is in front of you on the screen now and how far we've got in terms of the various achievements to date, which includes the appointment of the liaison, (so have) the GAC members, monthly updates and so on.

Having gone through all of that, I won't read out the list to you but we then end up with some - two categories of outstanding areas of activity. One is in the day-to-day - so-called day-to-day work or day-to-day ongoing coordination between the GNSO's policy development area. And the second is the GAC early engagement in the GNSO PDP of which we have the pilot operating in the first component of that.

So the question really is, you know, what - how do we work from now on is we just in effect added an item, which is monitoring some of our - monitoring for success our initial efforts.

And then the question seems to be is what of these additional items need to remain on the list. Is there anything that's not on the list that should be on the list? And also, do we need to carry on in two parallel tracks or is this a

sufficiently contained list that we can work as a whole group with perhaps little break offs like we've just suggested now?

Must say I'm minded to bring the group together and work. I think we're a little small to break up into these two different areas. But let's hear any comments any of you may have on working methods and approaches. Marika, go ahead first and I see a checkmark from you Amr regarding the possibility of merging the two workstreams. Go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. Actually so triggered by the previous conversation I just wanted to point out as well that as one of the outstanding items as, you know, in the general categories is I think specifically the point that Amr made in relation to the, you know, the recommendations that are currently being developed.

But I think the way it's written there and derived from the charter is really indeed to agree on a follow up mechanism and success measures in how to assess whether indeed improvements that we've been proposing are now being implemented and may still be developed. How do we measure if they're actually successful and what are the criteria for those?

So hoping as well that that's, you know, and the thinking that Amr, Carlos and Olga may be doing that indeed that wider approach (unintelligible) as well as some of the other elements could be factored in there.

And possibly also a working method for doing that because, you know, maybe specifically looking at the example of the quick look mechanism that was - that had been given. I could for example imagine that if indeed the GAC would fail to form the quick look mechanism, a committee and maybe something that they would first like to evaluate themselves internally and determine, you know, why they weren't able to do that.

And based on that evaluation maybe come back to the group with, you know, specific ideas or suggestions on how that may, you know, factor or influence the process or for the Consultation Group to further consider.

So I just wanted to flag that and indeed note just as a point of reference as well of course all this goes in here - all the language (of course) was all derived from the charter, which is also posted on the Wiki page. And I've pulled from there the outstanding items that were indicated at that point in time as, you know, expected deliverables from this group.

And just to note as well the of course if there are any in there that the group believes have either already been accomplished or are no longer relevant is always something that can be brought up of course with, you know, both the GAC and the GNSO if you believe that there are items that either are missing or that are there that are no longer - are no longer relevant or belong there.

Jonathan Robinson: Thinking about the success criteria then. To the extent that we develop them for the - I mean it's really for this existing piece of work for the pilot. That makes sense to probably develop those and then share those as a record.

And in general to - if I understand the point here, of course in general to make sure that we do the same for each piece of work as highlighted where it says, you know, agreeing on the follow up mechanisms and success measures. What of this - perhaps it's worth working through the scope of these. Olof, go ahead.

Olof Nordling: Yes. Thank you. This is Olof here. Just one little thought here and this has been highlighted on previous calls from (unintelligible). And what we haven't done is to even start to have an agreed procedure of how to proceed in cases where GAC's early input is in conflict with the GNSO proposal and a mutual agreement could not be reached.

It sort of begs the question whether this is something that you can do in a vacuum. Or if it really is something that needs to be learned by doing whenever we have such a situation or whether it's useful to foresee approaches on how this should be handled (there) in a way similar to when there are conflicts between the GAC advice and the ICANN Board for example.

So I'm not really sure whether it's useful to more than outline such a procedure without having a real case to test it on. So just a comment or one other point, which is clearly from the charter and outstanding methods to address. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Olof. That's an interesting point. Can you clarify? You said you made a last phrase there, which referenced the charter. Is that something that is referenced in the charter?

Olof Nordling: Yes it is. And it's part of your...

((Crosstalk))

Olof Nordling: ...which - well, Bullet 3 under objectives.

Jonathan Robinson: Good point. Yes. Okay. And that's not strictly resolved any sense or proposed to be resolved under the outstanding work so far. Right. Well it sparked a few hands coming up. So let me go first to Marika and then the queue of (Anna) and Avri. Go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. On that specific point, at least from my perspective I think that is possibly something that, you know, when we, you know, once we've worked through the other stages of the PDP and we have made clear what possible other engagement steps are throughout the PDP, I think then eventually will end up, you know, land at the phase where it's, you know, the GNSO Council that will, you know, adopt recommendations.

And I think at that point it would also be very clear whether something, you know, the GAC made have made a specific advice on something. And I guess in that case, you know, having gone through all those steps, my thinking is that we probably could, you know, foresee see some kind of, you know, guidance then on what should happen.

And, you know, if, you know, for example, you know, the Council or the report should document all the ways in which, you know, the GAC advice or input has been considered, you know, rationale for why, you know, the working group did not agree with the GAC input.

It could also for example be a mechanism whereby, you know, the Council advises the GAC that, you know, they are going to adopt the recommendations. And, you know, even though they may be contrary to GAC advice but for these and these reasons or possible ask a working group, you know, to reconsider if there is, you know, after dialog with the GAC, you know, new information or new indication.

So I think there are ways that it may not be, you know, a one size fits all but I think there - as we work our way through the different stages of the PDP and identify other engagement opportunities or things that we may want to explore. Or add that could possibly also address -- in deed -- those cases whereby even after all - having gone all that to make sure -- you know -- there's already engagement. So there so maybe situations -- whereby -- there is disagreement between the two groups.

And there may be a kind of process that would -- then -- be triggered -- either as a kind of a courtesy to each other -- or even if - and that would be probably more -- in the case -- of engaging with the board -- on that -- would be as well. Should something happen before recommendations get to the board? If indeed it's really -- obvious -- that GAC advice differs from GMSO policy recommendations on a certain topic which -- of course -- we're hoping that

won't be the case. Once we have all these engagement mechanisms in place. As that -- hopefully -- will encourage dialog and mutual understanding. And -- as well -- consensus around approaches to certain missions.

Jonathan Robinson: Just to be clear Marika -- as opposed to dealing with it now -- you're suggesting -- as we work our way through the rest of the list and -- then come back to this point at a later date?

Marika Konings: Correct.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. And -- in fact -- it should probably be considered still outstanding as an objective which has yet to be met. But - okay. Avri.

Avri Doria: Apologies. It took me a while to get to the mute button. I think I have an almost completely opposite take on it -- than Marika -- which has me feeling very uneasy. That I may be in squishy ground. But -- in any case -- I think that as opposed to waiting -- until the end -- that dealing with these areas that seem to be - and -- of course -- it won't be in conflict yet. But seem to be contentious issues early becomes important. If we -- sort of -- say "oh, okay. We've noticed -- at this early stage -- that we have a difference."

Okay. Noted. But if we -- indeed -- have some processes or some method in sight each of these stages to try and - it's not that we can insure it. It's not even that the "early look" opinions -- we get -- are -- indeed -- what the consensus and the GAC will end up.

But -- if we have indications at each stage -- it seems we should have some methodology for trying to understand them. Iron them out then. One of the reasons we're trying to do early looks is so that in that early look. And when someone does an early look, they may see things in a different way. That if you can do something -- about that at that point in time -- you might be able to avoid getting to the contention point.

So I'm - I mean -- obviously though -- at the end of all the stages Marika's right. If we get to all the end of the stages and are still in some kind of disagreement -- then -- a step is also needed. And -- in deed -- agreeing that -- you know -- it is not a "one size fits all." Because each process is different. And the method for ironing out a difference may be different.

So I'm not sure that we don't need to look at it as an integral part of every stage. As opposed to -- just -- as an end stage. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: So I'll just say (aptly) that I'm not sure these two are in conflict because we could look at it at every stage. How to deal with it? But only deal with the - only work on the mechanisms to deal with it every stage once we've dealt - once we've worked out each of the stages because -- at the moment -- we're only at the first stage of the PDP. And -- the questions is -- whether it goes back to Olof's point whether it's a little theoretical at this stage.

So let's hear from Amr -- and others in the queue -- on this and then see where we get to. Amr go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Jonathan. Yes. I took my hand down for a minute because I felt that Marika was more or less covering what I wanted to say. But actually it sort of developed a question in my head. We're still talking about the issue scoping phase. So we're not talking about the part of the PDP that requires actual - actually discussing policy issues. And potentially developing conflicting opinions on what certain policies are.

So what we're actually talking about at this stage is just scoping the issue. And trying to figure out what the different interests in a specific issue may be. And my question is this. That I've always assumed that this is not necessarily a phase where contention may be an issue. Because when someone raises a topic pertinent to a certain policy (cross) is something please take this into consideration. Is this something -- normally that another group or another

(SOAC) or even stakeholder groups -- within the (GSO) would say "no, we should not take this into consideration" when addressing this issue.

That's sort of my question I guess. Sort of get a feel for why there maybe conflict at this stage of the PDP and the GNSO and the GAC also. Keeping in mind -- that part of -- this phase includes - at least what we're proposing in this phase is part of it includes looking at previous GAC advice submitted to the ICANN board. And taking that into account when scoping issues. Even before the GNSO liaison to the GAC presents it to the GAC for a look. And -- possibly -- launching a quick look mechanism the committee's summation.

And -- also just to clarify when dealing with GAC advice -- I'm assuming that's the only conflict -- at this phase -- that we deal with GAC advice. Any other interaction -- between the GAC and the GNSO -- throughout the future parts of this process would -- hopefully -- involve early engagement of the GAC within the GNSO before advice is even considered to be submitted to the board on a specific policy that is yet being developed. So that's just what I wanted to add. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Amr I'll note there's an ongoing dialog with discussion (unintelligible) relating to the fact that -- you know -- the GAC may have taken early disagreements. Or -- indeed -- theaters as an issue of potential scope or not within the remit of the GNSO to address. So -- notwithstanding the fact that -- we are initially looking at the very early stages of scoping of the PDP. It's possible they may still be an interest in inputs. That is counter to where the GNSO might be going. Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Hello. Sorry. I wasn't here. I was talking to myself. I think that both processes -- what Marika explained -- and I would suggest that both are valuable and -- both can -- complement themselves. Every stage of growth that Amr explained that I think it has a lot of value. They will - they're usually disagreement. And -- the value of an -- early stage interaction is that both parties can understand the reasons why the other is not agreement.

One issue -- I think is the value of this group -- is the GAC has a lot of - now -
- luckily -- we have a lot of developing countries as members of the GAC. And
so the challenge -- that we have as chair and vice-chairs in the GAC -- is if
we engage them in all the processes that we are -- revising and --
participating in. And this is the challenge of those of us from (unintelligible) in
the group. And the GNSO has participation from developing countries. But --
also -- has strong participation from companies from developed countries.

So the percept is going to be always different. So this the key issue in trying
to bring information to those - to the GAC and the GNSO. So both parties can
understand the reasons why. And that will diminish as other conflicts and
disagreement. And maybe others can stay. But -- at least -- both parties will
have the full information. And the full picture about what is going on. And
what may happen.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Olga. And I think there's an attempt to capture that by Marika in
the notes. A recognition that early exchange of information understanding is
required. Go ahead Olof.

Olof Nordling: Thank you. Olof here. And I think I'm in (violent) agreement with all because -
- of course -- there would be mechanisms and attempts to iron out
differences. I think what made me a little - bouncing a little was this - literally
as it's expressed when GAC early input is in conflict with the GNSO proposal.
And a mutual agreement could not be reached. Of course we'll attempt to
reach a mutual agreement. But -- then I think -- the focus should be on that
than rather than to develop a process for what will happen next. Because --
then -- we have no agreement. And - I attempted to suggest to put that to a
later stage. I think that was exactly what Marika suggested.

But -- of course -- there should be (unintelligible) which focused on ironing out
differences and to reach a mutual agreement. So -- just -- to clarify what I
intended previously. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. That's helpful clarification Olof. But it's not withstanding that this discussion has been useful to go through. So understood. Let me go straight on to the queue now. Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Jonathan. This is Amr again. Just also a clarifying question on my part. During the issue scoping phase there is a public comment period between the initial - the preliminary issue report and the final one. And then the final one is eventually voted on by the GNSO Council. In the event that it's a GNSO Council initiated PDP and not a board initiated PDP. But -- at this stage -- all the work is -- actually -- done by staff. Isn't that correct?

So would this actually be a disagreement - sort of a conflict point between the GAC and the GNSO or would the staff - the ICANN policy staff be managing the process at this point? And would it be staff that needs to take that input into consideration? I'm just a little unclear on the different roles of the different parties at this point. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: That's a good point. And Marika will attempt to respond to that. Go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. At this stage -- it is foreseen that -- the only thing that would happen as a result of the quick look committee would be a -- kind of you know -- we're interested in this issue. We may be interested in the issue. We're not really interested in the issue at this stage. So we don't foresee that it would -- specifically you know -- provide input on the scope. Which -- of course -- is more than welcome. Like anyone can provide that input.

And the way -- it currently works -- is that the comments that I received as part of the public comment forum. If they go to the nature (unintelligible) comment report. You know, did we miss anything? Did we get anything wrong? You know, other specific suggestions on -- for example -- the

preliminary charter -- or the draft chart -- will -- you know -- make those changes. You know, reflect those as well in the summary of comments.

And also pass -- the rest of the comments -- on to the council together with the issue reports. You know, should the council believe we've missed something or -- you know, often -- comments are submitted are more relevant to the actual working group than the issue reports. So what we often do -- as well -- is make sure to make reference to the comments received as the working group starts to make sure that it isn't lost.

And so -- in short you know -- we would just look at what the GAC would provide and capture in the final issue report. Anything else -- that goes beyond that -- is also provided to the council of course. So should there be any kind of input where the GAC -- for example -- has concerns over the scope of the PDP. And that is something that -- you know -- we'd definitely flag. So that the council could consider that as they discuss the initiation of the PDP.

And -- of course -- there's also the charter drafting team that may be formed. You know -- if issues arise or people believe -- more work should be done on the charter. Again, I think that's where maybe - (unintelligible) would come in.

You know, should the GAC raise specific issues or concerns about the charter? Maybe -- then you know -- an option would be to say "okay" -- in that case -- the charter drafting team is formed. And a specific invitation goes out - - to the GAC -- to make sure that they are aware and invited to participate. As those drafting teams are always open to anyone interested. So they -- again - - have an opportunity -- there -- to be involved in the process. And make their voices heard. And -- hopefully -- their concerns are able to be addressed as part of that effort. I mean that's -- a bit -- how that may work in fact.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Marika. And then to address points on the charter drafting. I don't know if you -- sort of -- touched on that the fact that -- under the PDP

improvements the charter --- a draft charter may be prepared -- by staff -- as part of the issue report. And the council has the option -- then -- to commission a drafting team. Or accept - the charter as proposed by staff. Carlos go ahead.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Yes. Thank you Jonathan. This is Carlos speaking. I like the words that Marika used in the last round. I think we should take note that what we are doing here is (slagging) some issues. And that will bring about harder work. Either for the scoping or for the next stages. Meaning we need better arguments. We need -- maybe -- a narrower definition of the charter. Or the issues at stake. But -- in no way -- are we trying to avoid or preempt the decision level.

I mean if the GNSO brings something to the board. Well they should be aware that the GAC worries a bit about that. They should be aware that - an advice -- and they get people advice -- may come with it. But in no way are we going to solve this issues. It's for the board to decide in the end. I mean we don't want to preempt the level where the board - I mean the GAC have their discussions on very high level issues.

So I look forward for the next steps because we have to keep it practical and narrow. And just - I see it as an incentive for better policy work. Taking into account more issues. Developing better arguments. That is not our task -- or is not the idea of this whole exercise -- to avoid conflicts at the GAC board level. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Well. (Actually) it's a yes and no. I believe - I mean I think -- ideally -- we wash things out through this process. And if a - I think the important point -- from - that I've understood from the GAC's side of things -- is that they don't want this to be a mechanism by which they lose that -- final enshrined -- right to provide GAC advice. And this shouldn't preclude contrary GAC advice being given. But -- providing participants participate in good faith -- it's all our attention that it would resolve things ahead of time.

We got -- somewhat -- distracted. I'm concerned that it tends to. This is a very useful discussion. It helps warm us up really. And get back into the whole issue on how we're working. And so I think it's been very, very useful to go through it. And -- for me -- I feel -- and I hope for others as well but -- the primary purpose of this agenda writes. At this point it's been raised about how we do deal --with the cases -- where GAC early input may be in conflict with the GNSO proposals.

But our key purpose -- here -- was to look at the dropped work plan that had been prepared for us. And -- to start -- to think about the scope of the remaining work which -- of course -- we are reminded will include how to deal with advice or input conflicts of the work. The other items in the scope --I mean -- so let me just come back to that question. I think -- I got an initial sense -- that the group was receptive to merging two sets of three bullets under outstanding items.

The day-to-day cooperation and the early engagements. So I'll first ask that question and make sure that there is - that that is acceptable. Or if there are any counterpoints to that. Thanks for your support there Carlos. And I noted you seemed to be supportive earlier. So -- provisionally -- I think that should be our intention. Is to work through this as a committee -- of the whole if you like -- as a group.

Second point is to recognize that there is a schedule of meetings which in villages - what is it? There's five ahead of the Buenos Aires meeting including one relatively shortly prior to that. So schedule is 24th March, 14th April, 5th May, May 26th, 16 June. That's five meetings. And -- it strikes me -- that what would be very useful is to flesh out those with a provisional work plan. So that's Page Three -- of your document -- that Marika assisted or -- in fact -- prepared.

So that - is everyone happy with that frequency of meeting? Should we be meeting more or less frequently? Is that schedule -- and the timing -- okay as an ongoing mechanism? I'm going to take that you'll let me know if you have any concerns. And I'm going to work on the assumption that it is okay unless you let it be known otherwise.

And -- then I think -- the question we'll be asking ourselves next is -- as we work at approximately that frequency -- is what -- if anything -- you know, what's the priority order of those items to work on I suppose? And I guess we've added at today's meeting -- at least -- one other item. See the list.

And that's the success criteria work which -- hopefully -- that will Amr perhaps and Olga will be able to make some (unintelligible). It feels -- to me, Marika and Olof -- like we'll end up with what -- is a list of items -- that need work on them. A little some groups to pick them up and work on them. And perhaps some order and priority that we can evaluate on an ongoing basis. To tidy up the detail on each of these items.

And -- in so doing -- we're likely to end up with some recommendations - further recommendations to take back or active in Buenos Aires or active areas of work. Marika.

Marika Konings: It is. And I just wanted to note that in relation to - as far as bullet under the PDP work. I think -- you know -- we've already developed -- quite some materials that could serve as -- a starting base there. So -- if it's helpful -- I can definitely look back at what we've already looked at. I know we -- I think - - started several flow charts. So I think we may want to try to follow the model of -- you know -- what we did on the (data) scoping and see how we move that on to the next phase.

As I think everyone knows of us already. One arrow -- you know -- was moving into that next phase. So maybe -- that's a way -- we can try to structure the conversations from the different phase as well. And I can work

with all them. We look through the lesson and maybe make some suggestions. And -- again as well -- reference where materials are ready available. So I think some of the things we have started some work. That said, it may be relevant to move this further along.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. That sounds very helpful. And -- I mean -- the productivity that it enables -- having the structured work that you did previously on this Marika -- is very valuable. And given everything else that's going on, that is referred to in the chats. In particular to the work on the transition.

That should be very helpful to keep us working along. Is there anything more we need to say under this review of the work plan and the way forward at this stage? Given the time and given what we have covered already. I think we're clear on when the next meeting is. We're clear on some of the next steps. We're going to get some help to structure this work plan. We are going to do some work in a small group on looking at the success criteria.

And that feels like a little to be getting on with. Have I missed something? Thanks for noting -- in the notes -- that the confirmation of the next meeting on the 24th of March. Now Marika it just occurs -- to me -- that that is a good point. But -- I think -- I may have a problem with that time. I'm pretty sure I'm scheduled to travel to Istanbul at that time. Who else is impacted by the Istanbul meeting? Want to make sure there isn't a specific problem with that week. That the CCWG is meeting on that day. The Accountability Group -- I believe -- is impacted by that.

Anyone else? (Mason's) going to be on holiday. So -- look -- let's stick with that for the moment. And if (Manal) is not available that might give us critical mass to think about rescheduling that for the week before or the week after. But -- for now -- it seems -- to me -- that we are better off sticking to a schedule -- and attempting to work through things -- rather than awaiting for everyone to be available for every meeting.

Good. I've got one o'clock. It's slightly slow. Oh no, they seem about right. One is about a minute different than the others. So we're just at the top of the hour which give us a neat point to finish off. I'll pause for 30 seconds just to see if there's anything else. Yes. Marika -- provisionally -- the meeting will continue ahead at 14:00 UTC on 24th of March. Subject to their being no other significant issues. Okay.

Thanks everyone. I think there are no more handouts. No. We're good. All right. Thanks. That's useful. It's good to see you all again on the call. We'll look forward to refreshing the membership and getting on with the work -- that we have to do -- for the nice amount of time between now and Buenos Aires.

((Crosstalk))

END