

**ICANN
Transcription
GAC GNSO Consultation Group meeting
Tuesday 15 December 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 15 December 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-15dec15-en.mp3>

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

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page: <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/>

Attendees:

Government Advisory Committee

Manal Ismail, Egypt, Co-Chair of Consultation Group
Mark Carvell, UK
Jorge Cancio, Switzerland

GNSO Council

Jonathan Robinson, Co-Chair of Consultation Group
Philip Corwin, Councillor
Paul McGrady, Councillor

GNSO Liaison to the GAC:

Mason Cole

Apology:

Carlos Raul Gutierrz
Ana Neves, Portugal
Suzanne Radell, US

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings
Olof Nordling
Michelle DeSmyter
Terri Agnew

Terri Agnew: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the GAC GNSO Consultation Group meeting on Tuesday the 15th of December 2015 at 1400 UTC. On the call today we have Manal Ismail, Jonathan Robinson, Mason Cole, Jorge Cancio, Philip Corwin and Mark Carvell.

We have apologies from Carlos Raul Gutierrez, Ana Neves and Suzanne Radell. From staff we have Marika Konings, Olof Nordling, Michelle DeSmyter and myself, Terri Agnew.

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

Manal Ismail: Thank you and welcome, everyone to the GAC GNSO Consultation Group conference call. I can see that not everyone has joined yet but don't have confirmations. And I think we already passed the time and we have to start. In fact we had a preparatory call, Jonathan, Mason, myself before this call. And we were considering whether or not to proceed with the call. We haven't received much feedback on the documents since the last call. And nothing much has happened since then that would require a discussion. But it was a bit late to call off the meeting. And we decided to proceed and see how we can go from there.

We fully understand the workload and it's a very busy time for everyone so this is totally appreciated. But we are just seeing how we can make progress despite of the busy time. So let me start by asking whether anyone on the call has comments that he or she would like to share on the phone on any of the three documents that we have currently at hand. And those are the quick look mechanism review, the GNSO liaison to the GAC review and the next PDP stages opportunities for engagement.

So do we have any comments? And I can see, Mark, that you have already submitted something just before the call. I do apologize, I didn't have - I didn't

have the chance to read it yet so if that is something that maybe we can discuss now on this document or any of the other documents please raise your hand. Mark, go ahead.

Mark Carvell: Yes, thank you, Manal. And hello everybody. Yes, apologies very much at the last minute I responded with regard to the liaison. I didn't really have anything major to add but I'm very supportive of identifying a designated lead to help with focusing the - ensuring the exchanges are, you know, are consistently visible and efficiently conducted from the GAC side. So I think that was an idea that you first suggested in your response, Manal.

And I, you know, I'm suggesting perhaps one of the GAC vice chairs be appointed for that purpose. And generally I agree with responsibilities of the liaison from the GNSO as set out. I didn't really have any additional points just to underline the objectives really of ensuring effective and timely communication and visibility. I think that's the key thing intercessionally for the GAC side for all GAC members to be, you know, to have ready access to what is going on in terms of engagement following a positive response to an issue which is cropped up and the quick look - at the quick look phase and beyond.

So those are my main sort of key points I wanted to underline in my response. I hope helpful. Thank you.

Manal Ismail: Yes, thanks Mark. Yeah, this is very helpful. And thank you for submitting your comments. And we'll definitely take the time to go through them online and - further comments on them if there is any. Yeah, I agree with you it would be helpful also to have a designated GAC lead on each PDP or each topic. Frankly, I didn't see the necessity to be a vice chair but, again, this is something to be considered. So I can see Olof's hand up. Olof.

Olof Nordling: Oh thank you, Manal. And thank you, Mark, because it's right on the money what the chair and vice chairs have been discussing or will discuss tomorrow

at their regular call exactly how to appoint the GAC leads because it has to be in plural, something like one per PDP because PDPs in the work are - or in pipeline are quite substantial.

So it's multiple leads and it will perhaps exhaust the resources available as vice chairs to do that so it may be a call to others to contribute in that regard on the GAC side. But it's certainly being discussed. So I just wanted to inform you about it. Thank you.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Olof. Yes, I think the GNSO normally have PDPs more than we have vice chairs so we will have to accommodate this. So any further comments on this document on the review of the GNSO liaison role to the GAC? So if we don't have any for now maybe I can move to the other document we have which is the quick look mechanism. So did anyone have the chance to go through this document or have any ready comments for now?

And again, comments would be submitted later online of course. But just for the sake of this call if anyone have something in mind right now that he or she would like to share. And of course we also have the third document on the PDP phases. We have already concluded on the issue scope phase and we have a couple of suggestions also for GAC engagement in the following phases.

So, again, if there are any ready comments for now we would be happy to hear them. Mark, go ahead.

Mark Carvell: Yes, thank you, Manal. Well the only thought I had was with regard to the GAC working groups and in particular the public safety working group which is listed indeed in the comments from back in May. It just strikes me that it might well be appropriate for a working group which has quite a wide remit, such as the public safety working group, to be hooked into the quick look mechanism process at the earliest opportunity because they may become the

conduit really for the GAC to engage if there's an issue which is directly within the remit of the public safety working group that jumps out at that quick look mechanism stage.

So I think in the GAC we would need to work out the dynamics of ensuring that takes place or the working group - maybe other working groups are alert to the potential for them to pick up a particular aspect of an issues paper which will intersect with their work in some way. So it's not just the full GAC committee but actually working groups need to be, as I say, sort of connected up to this process at an early opportunity.

But of course the working group will have to sort of clear its activities through the plenary of the committee -of the GAC I guess so we need to ensure that that takes place so that a working group doesn't have sole sort of visibility on this or sole interaction. There may be - it will be important to go through that sort of GAC step if you like for clarity and transparency for all GAC members to be - to understand what's going on. Does that make sense? Thanks.

Manal Ismail: Yes it sure does. And I think - and let me share my understanding also with you. So the issue comes to the quick look mechanism or the quick look committee just to flag out GAC interest and then the whole thing is assigned to whatever relevant working group.

And again I think this would be done to - assigned to an existing GAC working group or a newly formed working group if this is decided by the GAC. And of course then the lead is going to be the chair of this working group. But I also think even if this is not necessary to have a working group at least we can have a GAC lead on the topic so that the GNSO liaison to the GAC can have a one to one context with someone at the GAC side.

Particularly also that the GNSO liaison to the GAC is not on the GAC mailing list so might not have all the insights of what's going on. So I think, yeah, I fully agree with you and this is more or less what we have in mind. I think this

could go as a recommendation to the GAC. We normally come up with our recommendations at the end and maybe also pose some questions to the GAC and the GNSO to guide them how to decide on this recommendation.

But, yes, I agree with you this is helpful and should be recommended to the GAC to be considered. So any other comments on any of the documents for now? So if we don't have any comments for now, again, we will try to work on the comments we have. And let's agree on a way forward now. So maybe we can plan to work intercessionally or online on recommendation of our consultation group to both constituencies for the three documents based on the comments at hand right now.

We would still welcome any comments you may submit later over email. And of course you will always have the chance to comment on the recommendations when the draft recommendations are circulated on the mailing list. So I think to keep things going and to keep progressing we can work (unintelligible) if members of the consultation group have any comments you can please submit those over email. And meanwhile with the help of the staff we will work on draft recommendations concluded from the call and we will circulate them again, for your review and comments and hopefully this may trigger more discussion at the time.

I think we already have another on the 5th of January. I think we can keep this as is and confirm it as we get closer if necessary and appropriate. Otherwise we can look into postponing it if it is in conflict with other ongoing discussions that have to do with the accountability (unintelligible) is ongoing.

So anything else that we can accomplish on this call? So, Mark, you wrote in the chat room a report (unintelligible) covering what (unintelligible) and what is expected in Marrakesh. Mark, sorry, I don't get your comments, can you elaborate? I'll give Jonathan the floor first and then over to you. So, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Manal. (Unintelligible) check on that proposed meeting in January - January 5. I don't have a record of that. It does seem a little early in the year for whether people are back from holidays or not. Personally I can make it if necessary I think. But I don't currently have a - if we are going to do it I suggest we ask for an invitation to be sent out to the group. I guess I'm assuming it's 1400 5th of January so it would be useful to get an invitation out even if it's just as a placeholder.

Manal Ismail: Thanks, Jonathan. And I don't want to mess things - I don't have the agreed schedule in front of me right now so I'm not proposing January the 5. I was assuming that after (unintelligible) that this is the next meeting. But, again, let's wait and see - check the schedule group have already circulated and then decide whether or not we have this meeting flagging that I'm not sure it's January the 5th, I'm just trying to skip two weeks and look for the third. So but we can check this and get back to everyone on the mailing list.

Mark, sorry to keep you waiting.

Mark Carvell: That's okay, Manal. Thanks. No I - well first of all I have to submit my apologies now if we are going to do something early in January because I have a New Year break that takes me up to middle of January. It's just been so intense actually the last - from October onwards to December with the WISIS +10 reviewing happening now I'm taking a break so that's me personally - just me personally.

I was just suggesting then in February - certainly when my attention, you know, is reestablished back in the office, February a report I guess covering also the consultation group and the progress to the GAC and maybe in parallel to the GNSO would be very timely I think and that would also be the opportunity to provide a reminder of what is already underway in terms of PDPs starting to develop and where the GAC has already expressed interest, for example, Whois and so on and also a look ahead to Marrakesh.

I think it just helps a lot of GAC colleagues who are still perhaps not quite understanding what this means for them and the opportunity that it is providing for them to understand this is what is happening, these are the processes we're putting into play and this is how we're refining the interaction between the GAC and GNSO. And the kind - what we - they can expect in Marrakesh. That was my thought. Maybe that's already - elements of that are already being planned. So that was my - that was the point I was making in the chat room. Thanks.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Mark. And I can see Mason happy to provide the report - he already wrote this in the chat room so thank you, Mark and thanks to Mason. Marika has also very helpfully got us the dates that we have scheduled for our upcoming meetings. I can see one on the 5th of January but, again, if this is in conflict with people's (unintelligible) and other activities that has to do with the accountability we can definitely look into shifting this.

We have to have also in mind the (unintelligible) of sharing documents with the GAC and the GNSO so this should be also taken in mind. So maybe we can revisit the schedule with this in mind and then share a new one on the mailing list. And, again, we can fine tune this as we go. And if we are progressing well in line we might not need the call at all. So any other comments at this stage?

Marika Konings: Yes, Manal, this is Marika. I have my hand up.

Manal Ismail: Yes. I'm sorry, I overlooked your hand, very sorry. Go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Thanks. I was just going to suggest and actually I see someone else that wouldn't be possible then that I don't know how productive a meeting on the 5th of January is going to be. I think from the staff side we'll do our best to, you know, update these documents and have draft recommendations for each of the documents ready. But I don't know how much time people will have over the holidays to look at those. So I was actually going to suggest

that, you know, maybe to start off we may just want to look at the week after the 5th of January to at least give people a bit more time to digest and provide input on the list especially if we're working towards a more online approach for gathering input and it may not be necessary to have, you know, all the meetings that we've listed.

But, you know, I know that Phil just posted in the chat that, you know, he probably wouldn't be able to make a call on the 12th of January so indeed maybe it's something for the leadership team to take back and see what makes - make more sense. But at least from a staff side we can go ahead and now tentatively schedule the 5th of January call and at least get it into people's diaries and (unintelligible) consider whether to go ahead or not with that meeting.

Manal Ismail: So may I suggest that maybe we can do them both, the 5th and the 12th, and then we can see which call would have more attendance and we can proceed with the one with more attendance. Because, yeah, it seems like we're having apologies on both dates so it's difficult to decide right now. So maybe based on the poll results and the developments and where we stand we can decide on this - we can have something tentatively based on attendance after the Doodle poll and then we can fine tune this as we see appropriate when we get closer to the date if this is okay with everyone of course.

So, Jonathan suggests 5th, 12th and 19th so, yes please, Marika, can you add the 19th to the list? Thank you. Thanks, Marika. So any further comments on the document or suggestions on the way forward? So if not then thank you very much everyone for joining. Again we know it's a very busy time for everyone and thanks for everyone who read the documents and everyone who submitted comments.

Again, as I said at the beginning, we'll try to conclude some recommendations from the comments submitted already. We're happy to receive more comments as we go online. And of course again, everyone will

have, again, to review and comment on the draft recommendations when they are circulated.

So, Mark, you're saying GAC needs to agree a process for deciding if it is necessary to set up specific working groups, definitely, yes. Yes, I agree. So with this if we don't have further comments, Jonathan, do you have anything to add at this point or shall we conclude?

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Manal. No, I'm happy with that. I think that we have a plan and a way forward and that makes sense. Thanks.

Manal Ismail: Thanks, Jonathan. And thank you, everyone. And see you online hopefully and good luck with the rest of everything you're doing whether ICANN or not ICANN so thank you all. Can we please stop the recording and the call is concluded. Thank you.

END