ICANN
Transcription
GAC GNSO Consultation Group meeting
Tuesday 10 June 2014 at 13:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GAC GNSO Consultation Working Group call on the Tuesday 10 June 2014 at 13:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-gac-20140610.mp3
On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#jun
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar

Attendees:
Government Advisory Committee
Suzanne Radell - USA
Manal Ismail – co-chair – Egypt
GNSO Council
Jonathan Robinson – co-chair - Registries Stakeholder Group

Apology:
Ana Neves - Portugal
Avri Doria – Councillor – NCSG
Mark Carvell - UK

ICANN Staff:
Marika Konings
Olof Nordling
Glen de St Gery
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: The recordings are started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Sylvia). Good morning, good afternoon, good

                        evening, everybody and welcome to the GAC GNSO Consultation Group

                        meeting on the 10th of June, 2014.

On the call today we have Manal Ismail, Jonathan Robinson and Suzanne Radell. We have apologies from Ana Neves, Avri Doria, Mark Carvell. And from staff we have Marika Konings, Olof Nordling, Glen de Saint Géry and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

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

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Nathalie. So we have three agenda items and I do apologize for the late sending of the agenda but I hope, Suzanne, you had the chance to have a look at the agenda. And if you don't have any comments on the agenda we can start immediately with the first agenda item so...

Suzanne Radell: Sure, let's just do that, Manal. Thank you.

Manal Ismail: Okay. So the first agenda item, which is related to the work of the work track 1, is the document that states the draft requirements and proposed selection process for the GNSO liaison to the GAC. Of course we have to adopt the whole thing but I think most importantly we have to agree on the listed responsibilities of the liaison as well as the - how this would work in practice in terms of the GNSO liaison attending GAC meetings, conference calls, working groups and so on.

So I'm not sure if you had the chance to go to the document. And I would welcome any comments or feedback from your side if you have any. Again, I'm sure this would still need to be approved and adopted by the - by our constituencies, the GAC and the GNSO. But as we agreed, we have to share with them something that we already agree upon so.

Olof Nordling: This is Olof. I'm on the call now.

Manal Ismail: Okay, welcome, Olof.

Olof Nordling: Thank you.

Suzanne Radell: Manal, this is Suzanne.

Manal Ismail: Go ahead, please.

Suzanne Radell: Sure. I think it looks quite good. It's very comprehensive and yet it's also very
                  concise. And I think it lays out the details of what the working group has
                  considered and believes to be appropriate so I think you're quite right, we
                  need to get it out there and start the dialogue and see what people have to
                  say. So I think it's ready to go.

Manal Ismail: Okay perfect. Because I already wrote the five bullets that has to do with the
                  how the liaison would be attending the GAC meetings. And I'm not sure if this
                  already goes along the thinking of other GAC colleagues on the consultation
                  group. I'm sure we won't be able to finalize on this call because it's only
                  yourself, Jonathan, and me. So maybe we will give a chance for other
                  comments and feedback probably by Friday if this sounds reasonable?

                  And I think afterwards we can - I'm not sure, do you think we should be
                  sharing this with the GAC or should we just rely that there is already a link to
                  this document included in the briefing notes.

Suzanne Radell: If I may? Suzanne again, for the transcripts.

Manal Ismail: Yes, please.

Suzanne Radell: You know, one thing I'm very hesitant about, because I think we all know this
                  is a challenge, is both of our constituencies kind of being overwhelmed with
                  work at the moment and with paper. And quite candidly my impression, and
                  it's just one person here so please just abuse me if you think I'm overreacting,
                  I think the IANA transition and accountability processes are becoming, if they

haven't become already, the very highest priorities for many, many parts of the ICANN community for London.

And then as we work down the chain obviously those of us who are members of this working group assign a very high priority to this. I'm very glad we have the time allocated.

And I think perhaps if we can send out - get links into the GAC agenda to these documents people have the opportunity to read them in advance or to pull them up as we get to this agenda item because I think there is so much coming into the GAC that we have the working method documentation coming from Spain; we have transition; we have accountability; we've got the geo names group; we have the ccNSO meeting, I mean, there just seems to be an awful lot.

So perhaps if we worked it into the agenda as a link those who have the time and the interest can read in advance; those who don't can read as we have our meeting. Does that make sense?

Manal Ismail: Yes I think it's fair enough. And we already have the link to this in the briefing note that I've already circulated and I think is going to be within the material for our coming meeting. Yes, and I fully agree with you there is already a lot on our plate so. And we can get into those details during the discussion itself so.

Suzanne Radell: Right.

Jonathan Robinson: Manal? Jonathan, with just a couple of quick thoughts. I...

Manal Ismail: Yes please.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. I agree with you and Suzanne. We need to get this out. I think we need to tell the group that we will send it on Friday; it needs to go out sooner

rather than later. We won't wait until Friday to have comments but I think it needs to go out on Friday.

And I think we should do is make sure for the full watermark (unintelligible) draft so before that goes out it should have a draft on it regardless of where the final draft comes from -- you or me, either of us -- and probably in PDF form to make sure it's not - well, I don't know about that, certainly with the draft across it so it's clear that there is scope for input.

Certainly my expectation is that the GAC may well want to have input at least to discuss this whole issue of attending meetings, closed meetings, and all the rest of it. (Unintelligible) as a GNSO feedback in relation to this I think we've probably taken it -- I agree with Suzanne -- I think we've probably taken it as far as we can within the group and I feel pretty confident about (unintelligible).

I mean, clearly I also worry about the volume of work, that's a big deal. And the potential dominance of transition and accountability and other issues. If it's possible to get a direct link to it on the GAC agenda or at least a direct link to the briefing note that then, of course, links to this, then that may be a neat way of doing it.

But certainly I agree with Suzanne in principle that direct links to any materials, whether it's the briefing notes, the presentation, and possibly this as well, would be very useful. So, yes, that is my two cents worth and that it's largely pretty much (unintelligible).

Manal Ismail: Okay thank you - thank you, Jonathan. So I think we are all in agreement so we will be waiting for further comments on this document until the - until Friday and then we can adopt this draft to be directly linked to the GAC agenda and other reference material in PDF format.

So I think we can now move to our second agenda item which has to do with the PDP work track. And I'm a bit confused here as to whether we have reached a concrete proposal for how to get the GAC early engaged within the PDP - the GNSO PDP process. I mean, we have discussed this and we agreed on the importance of early engagement as early as Phases 1 and 2, as early as the issues scoping and issue report.

But I mean, I'm missing the concrete proposal that we are taking back to the GAC and the GNSO. And I think the diagrams that Marika provided are very thorough and very detailed and would help us suggest something concrete. And I also was guided by your comments, Suzanne, in deducing things to the GNSO graph and having circles to indicate the phases and the stages. And this is what I was trying to do with Jonathan when we were compiling the slides for London.

But having said that I would like to hear from you how you would like to have this presented in the slides or at least first as we are speaking about the document in the document at the first stage and then we can see how to present it in the slides. So, Suzanne?

Suzanne Radell: Yes, thank you, Manal. Suzanne here for the transcript. I do think that we have, unfortunately, not been able to spend as much time together on this and so my apologies for that. Amr and I continue to struggle with being able to connect with each other.

So I'd like to put something out on this call and then I'm happy to follow up, Manal, with a more extensive suggestion/proposal if you will. I think...

Manal Ismail: Yes.

Suzanne Radell: ...the idea of presenting just the first two steps is a good one because, again, I'm concerned about how much material our colleagues can digest. I think if

we try to present the entire package it will seem a bit overwhelming. And that's just, again, one person's view.

So I would like to focus to have the chart that shows the entire, you know, every circle, do a red dotted line around the first two: issue scoping, issue report, because we haven't explicitly - we've agreed to do something quite explicit, which is to survey GAC members as to whether the briefing materials that are currently available, the methodology that is currently used, is helpful, sufficient, triggers what needs to be triggered for the GAC to actually pay attention to issue scoping and preliminary issue reports.

I think you and I and Jonathan and everybody would seem to know it doesn't appear to be because it's not triggering GAC comments on preliminary issue reports. So I think we should start with that and maybe leave it at that for the moment because I think your slide does an excellent job of indicating we are looking at all phases, right, we're - as a working group. But right now for this meeting we're concentrating on the first two steps.

So I wonder, that's my first proposal, would others on this group - and I can put this out to the group in an email - would others agree that for purposes of presentation in London we show the entire chart of all the circles and we indicate that we're at the beginning stages?

This is what we're concentrating on now because we have a survey and because we think it's important to establish on the GAC side what does it take to make sure the GAC is prepared to comment on a preliminary issue report.

And on the GNSO side I may have to work on these - the issues questions section if I could maybe take a crack at merging somehow what's in there now, which is a combination of comments and questions from several of us. And maybe get - establish more clearly on the GNSO side if we need to give GAC more time - a larger window. Is that problematic for the GNSO? I

confess I don't know. You have some, you know, quite discrete rules that guide you as you start this process.

So I guess that's what I would like to understand from you and Jonathan at least on this call; does that make sense to not hit people with the whole chart but to chop it up so that we focus on the first two steps in London. Why don't I pause here and give you both a chance to consider this.

Jonathan Robinson: Manal. Suzanne, if I may?

Manal Ismail: Yes please. Go ahead, Jonathan.

((Crosstalk))

Manal Ismail: And I can see Marika's hand up.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so I'll speak and then Marika may have words of wisdom as well, but a couple of thoughts. One, Suzanne, as you articulate, that's very sensible, very pragmatic (unintelligible) it makes sense.

It also makes sense because (unintelligible) is how to encourage GAC early engagement (unintelligible) which is why (unintelligible) PDP process but also in terms of where we should be concentrating our efforts it makes sense.

Manal Ismail: Jonathan, if I may, can you please raise your voice? Can you please raise your voice a bit?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, no problem. I'll do that, no problem. Is that any better now?

Manal Ismail: Yes. Much better.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. All right, okay great, I'll put the microphone to my mouth. What else is there? So that's early involvement is that communication of the first couple of steps. I'm very reluctant to - I think one of the things is - what is - which is a problem we've still got to grapple with is what is the impact of GAC involvement at those points? And Suzanne touches on that a little bit one of which is (unintelligible) impact refinement.

Now one of the key things we're facing is a - in the GNSO is other pressures, not only the pressure to effectively engage the GAC but also to make the PDP appear to form efficiently. So that's the major other external pressure. GNSO doesn't do its work fast enough so to the extent that we are - we take time to listen and absorb or wait for the GAC to come to its position there's another competing pressure there. So that's an important point we'll all have to bear in mind.

And there was one other one which I've lost my train of thought so I'll come back to unless Marika picks up. So let me hold off there, let Marika (unintelligible). Thanks.

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

Marika Konings: Thanks, Manal. So this is Marika. Two points, I think the first is that as I noted before we've actually updated the graphic so they now match as well the color coding that ICANN is using and also using the term "initiation" for the second phase which is more - I think more appropriately reflects what actually happens in that phase. So I'll share those with Manal and Jonathan so those can be included in the presentation.

To Suzanne's point on, you know, GAC involvement in the first phase of issue scoping and I think it's something I tried to point out as well in the - on the email is that in that part of the process it is really input that is then basically sent to staff who incorporates that as part of the preliminary issue report.

So I think as well it's very important as, you know, should we go into further detailed discussions on, you know, how GAC involvement may look at that stage I think it's very important as well to point out what actually happens in that phase because it's not necessarily that that feedback is directly to the GNSO but that first public comment period is intended to provide input on the preliminary issue report mainly looking from the aspect of the scoping, you know, is all information that is relevant to the issue included in the issue report there is anything missing that a PDP working group would need in order to examine the issue.

And also potential advice to the GNSO Council on whether or not to initiate a PDP on the topic. And I guess that may be an area where the GAC may have a specific view that it would want to share with the GNSO Council at that stage.

I think it's important indeed to distinguish or, you know, try to focus on what the exact objective of the current public comment period is and I guess that may, you know, lead to discussions as well on whether that's sufficient or whether anything else should be envisioned. And as Jonathan mentioned as well, you know, what impact that may have on the timing perspective.

Because I think from the one side, at least from a staff perspective, usually when, you know, people ask us for more time to provide public comments, you know, we do provide that especially if, you know, from groups where we know it's important to include that in the report so I think from that aspect it wouldn't be an issue.

But of course it would be good to know if that indeed is forthcoming and not necessarily holds up the process while at the end of the day then still nothing is being provided. So I think that's where indeed we need to balance, you know, the need for input and sometimes align for additional time.

But again I think - and that's something I chatted briefly about with Olof when we spoke about this issue, you know, something the GAC may want to consider is looking at a way of a kind of maybe standardized responses at that stage of the process where you could, for example, say well we looked at this issue, you know, at first sight; we believe there's no public policy implication or anything we want to highlight at this stage.

However, you know, this doesn't take away our right to do so at a later stage or, you know, give you more information at a later part in the process. But at least I think would give a flag of okay we can at least move ahead.

And I guess another answer could be, well, we actually do believe there are certain implications so we do need more time. You know, we may not be able to complete that within the timeframe you've set for that first step so, you know, you may want to decide to wait for that or not.

But again I think it's a kind of, you know, we may be able to look a different ways in which the GAC could raise flags that may fit within the timeframe of both I think GNSO context as well as a GAC timeframes hopefully so that may be something further to consider.

And I think then similarly if indeed the charter was helpful that I did the more detailed chart on, you know, pointing out what the different steps I can do similarly for the initiation phase so it becomes clearer as well what - the role - the current roles of the different parties involved in the PDP are and that may also facilitate, you know, further discussions on where the GAC would fit in or needs to fit in or could fit in either in the current model or whether, you know, other mechanisms would need to be explored.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Marika. And, yes, I definitely feel the detailed diagram was extremely helpful and would be helpful to have one for the following phase. And before giving the floor to Suzanne I would also like to - I had a quick comment and a direct question exactly to what you have mentioned, Marika.

First, I think, Suzanne, we have - we had an initial agreement to focus on the first two phases which is the issue scoping and the issue report. So I think you can consider this agreed and we can proceed accordingly. I'm not sure if you want us to remove the whole diagram and only focus on those two phases or have the bigger view and just have like you mentioned a dotted red box around the phases we are focusing on.

On the question I had I noticed that the early phase we're talking about is this mainly accomplished by the staff. And I was going to question how are we going to involve the GAC that early. It seems to me that the earliest opportunity for the GAC to give input is when the issue is being put for public comments or am I mistaken? I'm not sure.

So, Suzanne, if you can kindly wait for Marika if she has a direct response to this because I think this would help our discussion forward and then I give you the floor immediately.

Suzanne Radell: sure.

Manal Ismail: And Marika, please. Okay, thank you Suzanne.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. So indeed - well the earliest response or earliest input the GAC could or can have in the current process is actually request an issue report yourselves.

As you know there's a mechanism for advisory committees to request issue reports, you know, as the first stage in the PDP. It's something that I think until now only the ALAC has actually availed themselves of but that is also an avenue that's open to the GAC if you believe there's a certain issue that should be addressed through policy that is not being handled, you know, currently by the GNSO that would be a mechanism that you could use.

But indeed as part of, you know, if an issue is either initiated by the GNSO or the Board or another advisory committee the first current existing opportunity to provide public input is indeed through that public comment forum on the preliminary issue report.

Although it may be important to note as well that of course, you know, as staff gathers information on the issue we will also look at, you know, statements or opinions or advice that other groups may have put out on that topic and would definitely include that as well in an issue report.

So should the GAC have a specific opinion on a certain topic and that is publicly available that is the kind of information we would definitely try to include or, you know, if we've missed it that's what we would hope as well that, you know, the GAC would point out to us and say please make sure that that is included in your report as its finalized.

Manal Ismail: Okay. Thank you, Marika. Suzanne, you've been waiting patiently. I'm so sorry, go ahead, please.

Suzanne Radell: No, no, no, no worries, Manal. Thank you. Suzanne for the transcript and thank you, Marika. Actually I think this has been rather helpful. I have struggled a little bit on the request for the issues report because you are quite correct, Marika, to point out that it is a tool that is equally available to the GAC.

Historically of course the GAC has never availed itself of this tool. And I'm not entirely sure what would prompt the GAC to do so. So perhaps what we do with this particular part of the slide is to indicate that it's a mechanism open to anybody. It is typically used, or has been typically used, and this is where I would recommend we make some changes to the current method for seeking input piece, to indicate historically if it is possible.

Can the staff tell us how many of these requests are GNSO self-generated? And how many generated by outside sources whether the Board or ALAC? It would just be good for people to know historically this has been the trend; this is the practice.

And I completely take your point, Manal, that perhaps we are not understanding that when this occurs all of the work is undertaken by staff. And maybe, as Marika, I think, sort of, was hinting, is there a way we can kind of have some sort of a review mechanism that simply indicates without getting into any detail whether the GAC thinks there is or could be a public policy aspect or not.

That's all a simple - a simple like if it's for example sometimes some of the very nitty gritty business of, you know, communications between registries or registrars that may be very straightforward business operation that really is of no interest or the GAC certainly couldn't add very much value.

If it's a more obvious sort of policy issue such as the IGO-INGO and then clearly the GAC would say well actually there's a public policy aspect because we've already - we've got invites on this subject.

And maybe all we would have needed to have done then at that point is to confirm that the SSAC was well aware and it was being taken into account in the preliminary issue report.

So I kind of take from what we're saying here this very first step maybe we sort of presented as more of a pro forma and that's not where we want to energize the GAC per se.

It's the real first step as you said Manal is perhaps the preliminary issue report. Why don't I pause here and make sure that I'm hearing what people are saying and I did want Jonathan to know I could not agree with you more.

And I like the idea of, you know, while we need to increase or facilitate GAC engagement you all need to become more efficient. So we've got to make sure that we are aware of these countervailing pressures and that we're striking the right balance.

And I think we should say so to our respective communities that this is going to be challenging because we have to honor and respect these different objectives.

Jonathan Robinson: Manal can you put me in the queue when you get a moment please.

Manal Ismail: Yes, okay, thank you Suzanne, we've got Marika, Marika's hand is up and then I will give you the floor Jonathan, Marika go ahead please.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika just very briefly in response to Suzanne and maybe to clarify because the issue scoping phase does include the preliminary issue report and delivery of the final issue report and as well as we've updated the headings now because having the second stage of issue report was a little bit confusing because what it actually does or what the second phase actually is, is to vote on the final issue report.

So we've decided to change that now to initiation because that's probably more appropriate and re-captures what happens there if the council then votes on whether or not to initiate a PDP based on the information in the final issue report, as well as, you know, the formation or adoption of a drafting team to develop a charter or the adoption of a charter, which really marks the commencement of the work.

So the actual - what we're talking about currently -- the issue scoping phase does contain, you know, the public comment on the preliminary issue report so I just wanted to clarify that.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Marika, Jonathan please go ahead.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Manal, a few points. I feel like we're sort of converging in a relatively common place here, which is good. I think you asked the question about whether we retain the overview diagram and in my opinion I think where we're heading is that we should retain that comprehensive diagram.

But then as Suzanne indicated we could put some red dotted line or some other way of homing in on the two phases that we are concentrating on. To that extent Marika offered to potentially I think do some improvement on the second phase in the same way she's done on the first in terms of expressing it as clearly as possible. So I think that's desirable and would be good.

I would like to check with you Manal and Suzanne to some extent I mean clearly one of the other issues is and this is partly covered by the survey, it's partly covered by our presentation is both making the GAC as aware as possible of existing options.

And indeed even taking it a step further there is an element where this isn't all about the GNSO modifying and improving it's processes it's partly about the GAC responding or thinking about its process so that it is able to effectively engage.

So I don't know how delicate that message is and I know there's got to be a willingness to adapt and change but I think we've got to try and get the message across that it's got to go both ways so there's a sort of meeting in the middle.

And one thought I have on that, which I think I heard Marika suggest earlier is (reflect) a form of multiple choice type questions. So rather than it's just these kind of - maybe this is more about the pragmatics of the work but rather than just be these bulletins going out and this works began or this issue report.

It's maybe even breaking it down into and these are the five options you have right now please respond with one of them and -- delay, give more detail -- whatever they might be some sense.

So that may help but maybe just as a simple tool. Anyway I'll stop there but I think - I feel like we're getting somewhere just we've got a couple of challenging communication points in all of this as well, thanks.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, thank you Jonathan and let me try to make sure I've got everyone's input here. I think we have more like if we break down the issue we have more like four category of problems.

The first one is to make sure the GAC knows all the available mechanisms. The second one is to have some initial response from the GAC as to whether the GAC intends to provide input and is concerned with the issue or not. The third thing is how this the consequences, Jonathan as you mentioned earlier once the GAC intends to provide input how this would affect the overall process, what is the consequence of the GAC input, what if it doesn't go along the lines of the GNSO views, would it delay the overall process of I think all this goes into the consequences.

And primarily this is in a best case scenario where we are talking about just one PDP. The finally we get into the road in general and what was then mentioned about to many PDP's running in parallel and how would this fit into the GAC agenda and I can see Suzanne's hand up so Suzanne please go ahead.

Suzanne Radell: Thank you, Manal and thank you, Jonathan. I think you're quite right I couldn't agree with you more we do need to stress that this is a meeting in the middle, right. It's both parties need to find ways to adjust.

Manal I like your overview I think you're quite correct. If, you know, you were to go to the GNSO page today and you look at the current work projects there are quite a few and it can be a little bit daunting.

So I think you're right, I like your idea of the very, very first step the very first thing we could fashion a questionnaire. When we get to the second step I think this is where we are in the lucky situation of being able to marry this part of our work plan with the first part, which is the day-to-day stuff.

So I think we need to perhaps could we consider that we - the reason we stopped here is because it's already quite a lot for people to understand. It may not seem that much but I think it is, I don't think people are very familiar with how the GNSO has done its work particularly.

So if we stop here it's a way of saying look we need to do a reality check. So on the GNSO side this is how things work, this is what we've been motivated by, we're eager to work with you but now we need to understand what are your work methods GAC.

And so when we say well, you know, we're floundering or we're overwhelmed then this is where I think we can call upon the new experiment of a GNSO liaison to the GAC is this a time if the GAC can signal that well yes we think that this is really important.

So for example anything related to Whois, right you're going to get an automatic government response that says whoa I know there are public policy issues there, a lot of them.

Is that where we could consider saying so let's use our experiment of the liaison and maybe we organize a conference call or, you know, we have a dialogue so that there's some exchange instead of a sterile, you know what I'm saying is the GAC going to ever do anything and when can we expect it.

Some kind of a dialogue that maybe socializes the issues or sensitizes things. So I'm trying to think it's not anywhere reflected directly on the PDP part but I think it's kind of implicit (unintelligible)...

Jonathan Robinson: Suzanne, it's Jonathan sorry to interrupt it's (unintelligible) but I just wanted to agree with you I think you're absolutely right and I think (unintelligible) potentially effective way of using the liaison and in a way, you know, you're right there are 10 or 12 or 15 GNSO work tracts.

But it's possible that with some effective dialogue those are reduced down to three of interest or whatever, some limited number and what - at face value it seems intimidating or overwhelming but the right term of engagement it may be broken down into a much easier fight.

So I apologize for jumping in but I just wanted to mostly just agree with you and give you support I think you're in the right place there and I think absolutely we can be putting that to trying to gather together with the work we've done so far and just to tidy that up and present that to (unintelligible) we'll be in a good place.

Suzanne Radell: Thank you for that I'm grateful because I do think then that it kind of shows that we're trying our best to be very practical here.

Manal Ismail: Yes I think this is an extremely helpful discussion. So I can see Marika's hand and then Olof, Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika and to also looking at this (unintelligible), you know, I think that public comment on the preliminary issue report could be a mechanism in need to (unintelligible) the GAC that this is an issue that, you know, the GNSO is planning to undertake work on either because it's initiated the work itself or the board has asked for it or another advisory committee.

And that may be kind of as all of that turned at a quick look input at that stage I think would really be helpful from a GNSO perspective just to know whether, you know, this may be an issue where the GAC has brought our interest and, you know, we'll definitely need to keep an eye open for when or if further input is received or make sure as well that we engage on the topic on a regular basis or, you know, know that there is no immediate interest and there may be less need.

But at the same time I think it could also then serve for the GAC as a trigger mechanism to start further work on it because, you know, the next real opportunity to provide input is, you know, once the council then decides to initiate the PDP it's for, you know, when the working group commences to actually reach out to all the SO's and AC's and ask for their opinions on the topic.

So I think that's really where, you know, at least from a working group perspective they will be looking to the GAC and say okay at that stage we really would love to hear them, you know, what the GAC view is on this topic and, you know, what is the kind of data or information that is available, you know, what are the kind of recommendations that the GAC is thinking of.

So that can be used as early input in the working group deliberations, you know, together with other input that is received from SO's and AC's and as well (according) to the address so that, you know, either, you know, it is incorporated and accepted or if there is disagreement that a response is provided or a rationale is provided to the GAC why, you know, the working group decides to go in a different direction so that can be part of the dialogue.

So I think it's a, you know, at the end of the day I think we're looking here at a continuum of ensuring our engagement and coordination and dialogue and to make sure that indeed I said, you know, both parties can work with that, you know, within the boundaries of how we currently work and our working methods.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Marika, Olof go ahead please.

Olof Nordling: Yes thank you, well continuing along those thoughts I believe that we should also...

Manal Ismail: Olof can you please raise your voice a bit?

Olof Nordling: ...okay do you hear me now, hello?

Manal Ismail: Yes this is better, yes this is better.

Olof Nordling: I have that in there I tried to adjust it but continuing along those thoughts when we come into the GAC's handling of matters I think we should - well that may not be the (remit) of this particular session group.

But one should consider whether there is a need for additional tools and processes within the GAC for example to have a triage committee in order to prioritize incoming matters to the GAC, which could then undertake this so called quick look and come back with another response.

This is well something that the GAC will - is not likely to be very, very concerned about or vice versa this is something high profile from a GAC perspective to make that kind of judgment and we don't have any such tools really today.

Another aspect would be to develop (repertoireship) and team leads, which is used to a certain extent within the GAC but just a few thoughts that well whatever we come up with here would need to be reflected in perhaps some kind of additional structures within the GAC as well.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Olof and yes I fully agree that we need internally within the GAC some mechanism to have this quickly looked into and decided and I think this

could also help us when we receive the monthly engagement one-page summary that we also receive.

But again there is no mechanism within the GAC to have this looked into and decided whether it is of interest to the GAC or not. Suzanne go ahead.

Suzanne Radell: Thank you, Suzanne here for the transcript. Actually Olof I think you're raising a very good point and it rather goes to Jonathan's point about needing to meet in the middle.

I think this is a very important message Manal that you and I and (Anna) and other - our other colleagues on this working group can convey to the GAC. Way back when -- when I first started the GAC used to have a multitude of working groups.

And they were - they eventually became sort of the point people for the GNSO and for the CCNSO and for the RSAC and the SSAC and they were - they actually started as working groups.

We eventually dropped that as you know because it was seen as some kind of a GAC liaison with some misunderstanding as to the role of that GAC person. And also quite candidly having been the GNSO liaison it was overwhelming because I had no staff support at all.

So we do need to be mindful of that and this is something that ICANN perhaps can be thinking about as well how to increase the support on the GAC side because members just like the GNSO community everybody has a day job in their government.

And everybody has, you know, a different kind of portfolio and different obligations during the day. So I think right now we have rather a, you know, some good initiatives underway but we need to perhaps complement the existing working groups with a larger number.

Drawing in more GAC members but perhaps drawing on more ICANN support. So I do think it's an excellent idea and since we do have a GAC working methods working group and the BGRI I think we can surface these proposals at least surface them in London if we don't reach complete agreement I think it's a good way to go, thank you.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Suzanne and yes definitely we need to take note of those suggestions and bring them up in our discussions in London. So I think we have a little bit more than five minutes and I think this discussion was extremely helpful for the PDP work track and would also help us come up with the slides for London.

So Suzanne have you had a look on the slides and how would you like us to proceed with the part on the PDP or whether you would like to provide comments on the overall thing the slides on other parts as well, go ahead Suzanne.

Suzanne Radell: I thought everything looked very good and I obviously know that Omar and I need to try to get together if we can. If not we should do this separately to weigh in to add a little bit of meat to the slide.

And I would look to Marika and Olof to perhaps help but just in the very near-term I think from the notes that Marika plans to revise the slides for you and Jonathan I wonder if I could also look at those revisions very quickly at the outset as well because we need to - I'd like to help feed into the presentation and into the slides.

And I'm more than prepared to talk to this issue if that would be helpful to you and Jonathan during the London meeting.

Manal Ismail: Okay I think we also have two concrete suggestions from (Anna) over email and those were her comments. She commented that option E is not elaborated on the presentation and having the second look on the

presentation ideally found that when we mentioned option E we immediately got into the survey and did not describe what this option was meant to (unintelligible).

So maybe we need one slide to describe option E before getting into the survey. The other point here it was that option F is complementary to option E, she was making sure that option F is complementary to option E and not a stand-alone option.

Which I responded affirmatively but I think maybe we need to explicitly mention this in our slides that option F is complementary to option E. Option F is the GNSO PDP liaisons, council liaisons and option E is the GNSO liaison to the GAC.

So we are primarily talking about the GNSO liaison to the GAC and the option F is going to be more of complementing and being more of a resource a director resource to the liaison. Marika I see your hand up go ahead please.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika, just a question based on your conversation we just had on the PDP track and I think this question is probably for Suzanne. Do you think at this stage it would be helpful to be, you know, including them the new graphic and, you know, clearly marking, you know, which is currently the focus of our conversation.

And maybe just calling out and clearly marking them as ideas some of the things we spoke about now just kind of, you know, the quick look the, you know, triage, the, you know, making sure as well seeing there's a continuum.

Is it helpful to just, you know, briefly have some bullets on that that may, you know, at least get people thinking or at least give a kind of heads up in which direction we're currently thinking even though those are not firm recommendations yet or do you prefer just not to mention anything at this

stage and only, you know, talk about the phases we're focusing on for now and come back to, you know, more concrete ideas at a later stage.

Manal Ismail: I personally think that we should be sharing those ideas but I can see (Suzanne's) hand up so I'll definitely defer to her, Suzanne go ahead.

Suzanne Radell: Thank you Manal, Suzanne here, thank you Marika. No I do think - I like your idea I think we should put some bullets in. If you and Olof would be willing to do that in draft so that we can then work together very quickly over the next week.

So if I could impose on you let me thank you in advance for that idea. I think it makes a lot of sense and I would like to see the revised PDP chart. I think it would be helpful that we can then kind of reach agreement fairly quickly as to what we're going to present and how.

I have one teeny suggestion to you all, I've been meaning to say this before and my apologies for being tardy. You know, we know what the letters and the options all mean because we've been looking at this material for quite some time.

I don't think the broader communities are going to understand A, B, C, D, E, F if I may say. I think we need to find some other way to represent those ideas or characterize them.

I don't mean to sound like a stick I just think we're going to lose people inadvertently over something as silly as A and F. So if you put yourself in the shoes of a person who is not tracking this work at all and you get to the third or fourth slide it says A and that seems reasonable.

And then the next one you see is F. I don't think that is going to make a lot of sense to people. So I think it's okay to talk about we've reviewed a series of

options and these are the ones we are presenting today and just label them or re - I don't know.

It's just a suggestion I just think we run the risk of people saying what are they talking about, where is option B do you know what I mean?

Jonathan Robinson: Suzanne I'm (unintelligible) with you and I'm sure we'll talk about that I'm not worried about that. I think you make a very valid point but I'm more concerned that we talk (unintelligible) absolutely agree with you I don't even know which are E and F sometimes.

So how anyone knows (unintelligible) so I think we'll sort that out.

Suzanne Radell: Yes this is minor I mean it's really minor it's just a suggestion.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Suzanne yes and like Jonathan I fully agree with you because sometimes even we ourselves forget which letter corresponds to the (unintelligible).

So I think we are almost at the hour and I really believe this has been a very, very, very helpful discussion and we have (unintelligible) of these so I very much appreciate this discussion.

So if no one has any comments or there no further requests for the floor I think we may be concluding at this point so.

Woman: Thank you.

Manal Ismail: Seeing none and hearing none thank you Suzanne thank you and thank you Jonathan very much for getting out of your way and dialing in while you are traveling. So but this has been extremely helpful.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks to you all.

Man: Thank you very much.

Woman: Thanks bye.

Woman: Bye-bye.

Manal Ismail: Bye Marika bye-bye.

Coordinator: Thank you very much (unintelligible) the recordings.

END