

**ICANN
Transcription
GAC GNSO Consultation Group meeting
Tuesday 21 January 2014 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 21 January 2014 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/gns0/gns0-gac-20140121-en.mp3>

On page:

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

Attendees:

Government Advisory Committee

Manal Ismail – co-chair - Egypt

Ana Neves - Portugal

Suzanne Radel - USA

Mark Carvell - UK

GNSO Council

Jonathan Robinson – co-chair - Registries Stakeholder Group

Mikey O'Connor –Internet Service Providers & Connectivity Providers Constituency

Apologies:

Gema Maria Campillos & R. Perezga, Spain (2 reps alternating)

Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez, Costa Rica

David Cake –Non Commercial Stakeholder Group

Volker Greimann -Registrars Stakeholder Group

Amr Elsadr - Non Commercial Stakeholder Group

Brian Winterfeldt –Intellectual Property Constituency

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings

Olof Nordling

Glen de Saint Gery

Coordinator: Pardon me. Just need to inform all participants that today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect your line at this time and you may begin.

Glen de Saint Gery: Thank you very much, Lori. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the (GAC) GNSO Consultation Discussion Group and on the call we have Mike O'Connor, Jonathan Robinson, Mark Carvell, Suzanne Radell. On the Adobe Connect we have Ana Neves, Manal Ismail. And for staff, we have Marika Konings, Olof Nordling and myself, Glen de Saint Gery.

I think that's all. Amr Elasdri is going to join us later so is David Cake because they are in another call. And Volker Greimann said that he would be a little bit late due to another conflict. Thank you, Jonathan. Over to you.

Jonathan Robinson: Glen, yes if you could record that we do have a number of apologies and/or records for later attendants. We'll note if those people do join as anticipated so we can record them as they join us and also the (unintelligible)...

Glen de Saint Gery: Apologies.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. So...

Glen de Saint Gery: Thank you. I'll do that, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Glen. So as everyone knows, my name's Jonathan Robinson. I'm working with Manal Ismail to coach our consultation group and I think we're making some progress and we have an

agenda, which is largely thanks to Manal's work, which is great, and we have an opportunity to start out with item one, which is to look at our charter.

Previously we had Mikey kindly volunteer (mighty) retrospectively to grab the action items from the meeting. I wonder if we could put that onus onto staff if staff are willing to do that. I think it would be very helpful if we can note in the meeting any actions coming up. It's really just a running track of commitments made during the meeting would be useful.

Marika (unintelligible), how do you feel about working together on that?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Yes, that's fine.

Jonathan Robinson: Good (unintelligible) thank you Marika. I think we should just - we'll just make a running, you know, where we can keep an up-to-date small list of agreed actions and by whom and we can just circulate that to the group on an ongoing basis.

Now, our first item is to, was intended to simply confirm the charter, which as you will be aware a subgroup of us worked on. We put a deadline in I think for Friday ten days ago now perhaps to conclude any input into that charter. And in the interim, we have had some other input. My dilemma as co-chair is that some of these inputs are valuable and useful. So, my temptation of this is to try and include these even though our intention was to put the charter to bed.

I wouldn't mind some input on that and any direct input either on the comments and whether we can try and weave these in. My feeling is

that on a practical basis we can probably work with minor edits to the charter and it shouldn't stop us making progress with a substantive work. So, in principle the two can carry on in parallel and it needn't be that we wait for the charter to conclude before we get on.

And indeed we're probably doing that already. So, I see a hand as a support from Manal and from Mikey in the chat, that's great to see. I'll just pause a moment to see if there are any other comments or input on that.

Good. Well I think, you know, we've already committed to. We will need to deadline because I think somewhere in here we have said we will circulate and maybe someone could remind me and put this charter out to our respective groups, which we do need to do. I don't think there's any absolutely pressing deadline to do so but it would be good to have them see it ratify and/or feedback on the charter.

So, I'm thinking that we probably will need another deadline on concluding this charter but nevertheless we'll try and weave in that input perhaps - maybe I'll put a stab in we can agree a deadline online. So, perhaps Marika and Olaf, if you could record that we A, accept modifying the charter on an annual basis subject to a deadline in the region of one week from now.

Any disagreement or comment on that? Any comment on the, you know, the sort of substance of the inputs on the charter, the recent comments. Anyone want to make any comments on that now or should we leave it online? Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: (Hi all), it's Mikey. I think the one really substantive issue that would be nice to maybe just talk for a minute about is the life of this committee, whether we end at the end of our report or after a review or continue on forever and I'll just voice my support for the trend that was on the list that my inclination would be to end this group when we finished our report and then let a subsequent implementation review group get formed after us. That seems like a theme that's emerging on the list and I'm comfortable with that and if that is the conclusion I can easily add that to the charter as well.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Mikey. There's a couple more hands coming up. One other thing I'll just throw when people are responding is I just want to make sure. I think we're okay. We had a subgroup doing this and I think we've got a penholder or two for charter but just making sure that that exists and we still have that. So, Suzanne, I see your hand is up next.

Suzanne Radell: Thank you and it's with apologies. I'm just now looking at some of the new comments, which I believe have just come in today from (Hemma), and I'm not entirely sure I understand them. There seem to be - so just to know where we are in the charter. She appears to be posing a number of questions, yes, in her comments.

So, is that the idea that people do their best to answer those questions so we can put the charter to bed within one week? Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: So Suzanne, that's my feeling is that, you know, when I read the questions, they seem to be worthy of discussion and potentially attempting to answer properly. Therefore it seems that, you know, although it's not perfectly desirable to have new things popping up now, it can still be worthwhile to try and resolve them.

If you want to add anything, Suzanne, or shall we move to, and I'll just give you one moment to see if you want to come back in on that.

Suzanne Radell: Sure. No. And thank you for that. I will do my best. Again, I'm just trying to scan them very quickly right now. I do think a lot of them can be answered.

Jonathan Robinson: Right. So I mean, we can look in the interim, too, to try and do that, not necessarily on this call but over the course of the next week approximately as we discussed. Let me move over to (Anna). Feel free to put your hand up, Suzanne or anyone else, to come in on some related comments. (Anna)?

Ana Neves: Hi. Well, I just have a doubt about our timeline work because I think here that it supposed that we will be working on this until (unintelligible) it'll be like one year that we will be discussing this issue. So my point is whether the (reversing) is (unintelligible) whatever we are going to have as an outcome of our work, it will only work from 2015 onwards or whether we are going to have there the kind of experiment during 2014. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: That's a really good question. I do know that what we have agreed and you will have seen from the list is that we have put in a - and staff can help me here but I think we are in the process of crafting a budget submission, which would potentially fund this position from in a way that we've described on the list from the next financial year.

Now, when does that next financial year come in? That's around June, isn't it?

Olof Nordling Olof here. That's beginning of July, that's the shit in new financial year from an ICANN perspective.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. So I suppose then -- thank you, Olof -- to answer your question, (Anna), I mean this is really to - it has two components to it. What do we want to do, if anything, in advance of our work? And when I saw the timetable personally, I thought it had merit and I like the fact that it's tied into the three meetings and seem to work well. But I agree with you. The question for this group is, should we be proposing something in the interim?

And perhaps that's something we can work on over the next couple of weeks or so. Is there an interim solution, you know, that we want in place earlier than that? And is that feasible without all the parameters scoped out or do we handle it a different way? How do we handle a situation in the interim?

Any comments or thoughts there? So I've got hands up from Manal and Mark and Mikey's comment in the chat that the dates were somewhat arbitrary. I must say that may be the case but when I read them they made sense to me. I could see that although it was (slightly) longer than some of us might have envisaged to come to a final solution, it struck me as a reasonably sensible course of events.

But let's hear from Manal first and followed by Mark.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Jonathan. Yes. It's truly a good point by (Anna) (unintelligible) agree, we should be investigating some ongoing

(unintelligible) how (unintelligible) going (unintelligible). I'm not sure we can conclude this on the (poll) but we can (unintelligible)...

Jonathan Robinson: Very sorry to interrupt, Manal, but it's certainly too faint for me. I don't know how it is for others. If there's anything you can do to raise the audio on microphone or anything else, that would be great.

Manal Ismail: Is this better or?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. That's a little better.

Manal Ismail: Okay. I was saying it's a good point. Maybe we can try to discuss it further online. I don't think we will be able to find out an ongoing (unintelligible) on this (poll) but again it only makes sense that we keep the work going, even prior to the (bunch of things), which might take some time, so.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Manal. Yes. So I'm hearing respectively talking about the interim online and just to so everyone so we frame the discussion, interim has two components. One is funding, which of course we now understand will possibly be in place from July. And the second is your scope of role because if we're still working on the scope of role.

Mark Carvell, you've been patient. Go ahead, Mark.

Mark Carvell: Yes. Thank you, Jonathan. Hello everybody. Well, I'm wondering if we can move forward on some elements here of what we're constructing. The final proposals are going to be reviewed and approved in Los Angeles as I understand it, but I think, you know, before then perhaps at Singapore we can initiate the consultation, the liaison mechanism.

If we can agree in Singapore that from London we have an opportunity for the GNSO to brief (unintelligible) on what is coming through in terms of policy development. We've started the enhancement, if you like, of the relationship and the flow of information about the policy development processes. So I wonder if I could just sort of (unintelligible) that as something we might consider as something that we move to as quickly as possible.

I think it'll be a good signal to the community, it's been as we noted on the last call quite a long time for this initiative really to start gravitating to action. I think if we waited to Los Angeles, I don't think it would look that good. When I think the general agreement that a liaison from the GNSO to the (GAC) is something that's a key element and have to be put in place at an earlier opportunity.

So, that's my suggestion in terms of interim moving forward at the earliest opportunity. Subject to finessing these proposals in around within that timeline running through to Los Angeles. But let's have selection in the interim, which is going to help us all I think. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Mark. Personally I'm sympathetic to that point but Manal I think your hand has come up again so let's hear from you if that is the case.

Manal Ismail: Yes. I'm sorry to be asking for the talk again but I seem to be having trouble the audio. I hope you're hearing me now. I was just going to ask about the charter. Have we concluded this agenda item? Because I'm more inclined to have more pressing deadline for the comments and not to spend the whole week again commenting on the charter.

Maybe we can look at the comments but with a more pressing deadline. Otherwise I believe we're going to spend the whole week on the charter and then our next (poll) again might be again on the charter. I haven't gone through all the comments because I was on the road but, as you said, I do agree to looking into the comments but I hope it doesn't take us the whole week.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Manal. So you, I mean, technically you're right. We are still on this charter point and (unintelligible) I'm just trying to think why I (unintelligible) to go down this slight deviation of the liaison. I think because it comes up as one of the points suggested as a maybe because (unintelligible) charter deals with timeline. In any event, your point. Let's address your point and then I think I heard two things.

And so, let me try and see if we can agree to this. There is agreement to recognize that some final input might be possible for the charter but we don't want to find the whole group's effort derailed by only that effort. And so Manal, you're suggesting bringing forward the deadline to that. So perhaps we can make it as early as Friday this week, which brings us to sort of three-day deadline for final input and revision of the charter.

That would be one suggestion. The second is that we initiate a new track on the email list and that new track deals with interim proposals as consistent as possible with our longer-term proposals for a GNSO liaison to a (GAC) to a liaison or liaison process to the (GAC) between now and when we resolve how we handle ongoing interaction as part of our overall work stream.

So those are the two concrete suggestions that I think I'm hearing coming out of this discussion. Now, are you comfortable with the deadline of Friday this week to conclude discussion on the charter? Great. I see your hand is up and (Anna) as well.

So we'll work to that as a deadline so for Marika and Olof action one is review recent comments on charter, conclude discussions by Friday this week. That's 24th or so, and second is that we open a new thread online and look at an immediate action of how we potentially put in place some form of GNSO liaison to the (GAC) subject to the work of this working group and essentially an interim proposal. Okay, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Sorry. I took it off mute. Two question basically. The first one on the charter, are we also expected or (unintelligible) incorporate some suggestions made or is the team that was developing or has developed the charter, will they look at the comments received as well as any further comments that come in and provide a consolidated charter following Friday?

So I think there was some confusion over this version where I think we assumed that the group was holding the (pan) and I think some part that we were holding the (pan). I see, I think Mikey's already volunteering to carry the (pan) so that may clarify (unintelligible) agree with that.

And secondly on the interim solution and it's also a point I made in the chat. I think one thing to take into account is Olof already did a little brainstorm on some of the questions that would need to be asked, you know, before going down that road and I think one of the big questions

is as well is the liaison really the best solution for what both groups trying to achieve.

So that may be a first questions to work through. I know everyone's very eager to already maybe put a solution in place but I think at least through our brainstorm we came up as well to say, "Look, maybe we need to take a step back first and really try to outline what are the objectives from both sides from the GNSO as well as the (GAC)." What are we trying to achieve and then trying to work our way down is indeed the liaison the best answer to those objectives.

And in the mind map we also tried to include some alternative approaches that you may want to consider or think about in addressing this issue. I mean, some have already suggested that a liaison maybe a group of people, not necessarily one person depending on the topic or, you know, maybe it's more of a (unintelligible) dialogue or maybe it's the chairs have actually engaged with each other not a separate liaison.

So again, I know we're probably keen to move forward but maybe helpful as well to think through some of those questions instead of immediately go through some kind of interim solution that in the end may not actually achieve the goals that the groups have set out, so just trying to balance that. And somebody also mentioned in the chat and just for the record as well. So should you decide that you want to have a liaison as a one person in place more quickly way, of course, we can also check even if, you know, before the special budget request has been put in and hopefully approved we could still see as well if there would potentially be funding available for someone to participate in the meeting in Singapore.

But again, you know, some of the questions we've identified in relation to the discussion as well, you know, how would such a liaison participate in (GAC) meeting. They'd be invited to all the meetings, only open ones, can they talk or not? So, I think there are still some things to work through to really make sure that we have a common understanding of even what such an interim role would entail and from a staff, you know, side we'll just do our best to help with that and, you know, in any way we can support such an effort.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. I think that's very helpful. Thanks Marika, and I see there's some comments from Suzanne and Manal in this. So I think the way we could focus discussion here online is really on we might title the thread interim solution for GNSO liaison with the (GAC). It's really not necessarily an individual person but of course that's maybe one solution.

So perhaps it's worth to address the point that Mark and others may make on the urgency. I think even if the worst case scenario we would come in Singapore and say, "Look, this is our proposed time scale. However, we have also considered an interim or shorter-term solution and found that that was either not productive or here's the proposed interim solution."

So I think we could probably pick that up and see if there is but I take your point, Marika, and others do seem to as well there is a risk with doing things quickly, we do them less well (unintelligible) the need for urgency and coming up with something. Okay, so I think we are somewhat clear on where we go with the charter and with how we try to see if there is an interim solution over and above the two that will

arise out of the main work streams of the group, which brings us somewhat neatly onto item two.

Sorry, Olaf, I see your hand is up. Go ahead.

Olof Nordling Thank you. This is Olof for the record and just very quickly perhaps it's a good idea to include somewhere in the charter that, well, the striving for a final solution doesn't preclude any interim solution regarding, for example, the GNSO liaisons to the (GAC). So, not saying that we shall do it but that's very (unintelligible) potential for it. (Unintelligible)...

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Olaf. So Mikey, if you could note that in your holding of the pen because it doesn't record (unintelligible) as commented in here. Thanks, Mikey. Okay. I'm going to try and nudge us to move on then. We have in the course of our discussions recognized that there are really in essence two work streams we want to work on and that's one is the PDP process and the opportunities for engagement during that process, either reviewing the existing points of engagement and checking how satisfactory they are and/or initiating or introducing new forms of engagement, and then second, this concept of some form of regular liaison interaction and communication and these are our two work streams and we've in the course of discussing these have produced two - a pair of co-leads for each group and that's Suzanne and Mikey on the PDP group, on the PDP work stream and myself and Manal, the co-chairs of (unintelligible) group to work on the regular liaison communication, which strikes me as somewhat neat.

Olaf, is your hand up for a new item? If not, if you could just drop that down. Any comments under item two here and then I think the group moves to confirm those co-leads. I haven't seen any opposition, I don't

think, online so I think providing there are no objections now we can simply take that as read and begin to work in earnest on those in conjunction with the remit of the charter immediately.

All right. Seeing no objections and have none on the email, we can confirm item two then as Suzanne and Mikey on the PDP and myself, Jonathan, and Manal of the regular liaison and communication work stream. So Mikey, in assisting with our thinking on this, I think you produced a PowerPoint diagram, which was subsequently edited by Marika, which was helpful to circular flowchart on the PDP process.

And I believe you requested the opportunity to either talk to or through that to enhance the understanding of the group, I assume. We are prepared to do that and could do that. I'm slightly mindful of the fact that we don't have that (unintelligible) in attendance but the opportunity exists now to do that, Mikey, so let me hand it over to you and if you - and be aware that others may be relying on the recording to understand this meeting, so as you present it, they will have the PowerPoint but if you could bear that in mind as you talk. Over to you, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Jonathan. It's Mikey. I'm also a little mindful that we're 30 minutes into the call and so would be happy to wait on this one partly because of the time and partly because of the people. I think if I could just take a second and see if I could check in with Suzanne. Maybe the two of us could get on the phone together just on a sidebar and sort of work through this together and come back to you at the next call because I think Suzanne's probably been busy doing other things and hasn't had a chance to really go through this. It might be better to just

let us get it straight between ourselves first, and then revisit this next week.

Jonathan Robinson: Suzanne go ahead.

Suzanne Radell: Thank you for that and thank you Mikey, with apologies to everybody, I have not had as much time to sort of focus in on the details, so I would value having that opportunity to have a private exchange with Mikey before we come back.

I'll freely admit, although this is embarrassing, I shouldn't do this, but I'm going to, I am not apparently as visually inclined as I am inclined toward the written word, so I feel like almost there has been a lot of material that has been circulated in graphic format. It has taken me a while to kind of work my way through it. I would appreciate having a little bit of extra time? Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: I think that would be great Suzanne. I know that lots and lots of people have a preference for the written word. As you can tell I'm the opposite, so I think that between the two of us if we could step through this together and then make it so it works for both perspectives, we'd have a better document to review with the group in a week. I'm happy to do that, especially if you have a little time yet this week Suzanne?

Suzanne Radell: Yeah. I do. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: Cool.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. That's great. Nevertheless, our next item will consider the relevant documents for each work track so we can, if there are any

comments or input on this, you know, despite of the fact that Suzanne and Mikey are going to take some time on it, that would be great. Before doing so, let's make sure we hear from Mark whose hand is up, Mark?

Mark Carvell: Yes. Thank you Jonathan and thank you Mikey and Suzanne for leading on this. It is a lot to digest. I just want to say that what is important I think to capture here in both individuals and the narratives is what happens where there is GACK input and its summation is a divergence? How does that progress through the interaction and the (a zon), or whatever the mechanism finally is decided in order to either resolve that, or let the divergence persevere possibly to, right up to the board.

So the board, first of all is confident that the GNSO and the GACK have been hashing this issue out, the whole explication of the policy development as involved the GACK in a satisfactory way, but also it hasn't necessarily reached a point of absolute agreement. I'm not sure from scanning the visuals how that is taken into account.

I mean if the objective is to avoid any divergence all the way up to the board vote stage, I think we need to make that clear. There may be some GACK colleagues who feel well they still reserve the right when it goes to conclusion, the policy development goes to conclusion at board level that they still reserve the right to give advice to the board.

So I just want to--maybe it's there. Maybe I'm sort of expressing undue concern, but I guess what I'm asking for is a sort of clear explication of what happens when there is divergence of views? You know, is there a point at which the divergence is reviewed and then the decision is

taken to drop the policy development proposal all together, to drop the policy and end it, or to as I say, to maintain the momentum further inaction between the GACK and the GNSO all the way up to the board, and the board receives something that says well, the GACK had concerns about this.

The GACK, for example, I'm just trying to imagine this scenario, the GACK still has concerns about this, the GNSO responded to this, the board it's now with you to feel, you know, to take advice, further advice from the GACK, whatever the process might be at that point. I'm still not quite clear in my mind what would happen if, as I say the GNSO/GACK interaction has been set that there is an absolute agreement.

As I say, first of all isn't there a cutoff point, you know, the policy stops, development stops or does it continue right around to the board decision level where there is still the opportunity for the GACK to provide advice? Does that make sense? Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: It makes a lot of sense. I think it's very much on topic. Although, it may be ahead of where we are now. Mark let me not respond myself, although I have some thoughts. Let's hear from Suzanne and Mikey and Manal I think was the order in which those hands went up. So, good Suzanne, followed by Mikey, and then Manal.

Suzanne Radell: Thank you Jonathan. Thank you Mark. I actually think these are really, really good questions, but I take Jonathan's point, I actually don't think we're quite there yet. My sense is that we're in the process of building bridges. I actually use the word in plural. It's not a single bridge, my sense. It's multiple. Right now we have this situation, we're grappling

with a situation where the GACK is structured to give advice to the board.

We have the opportunity to provide input to the GNSO today. I think the GNSO feels strongly that that input is built in, right? So do the policy staff. We are, for a variety of reasons, and I'm going to be very diplomatic here I hope, not taking full advantage of that at this point in time. What I had understood this group to be doing is trying to find ways to make that a more affirmative, a more positive sort of creating a checklist if you will.

It isn't just set the GNSO announces a PDP, and therefore de facto the GACK has an opportunity. We know that doesn't work. I do think we have to start crossing these smaller bridges first, because we haven't even found a way yet for the particular time, you know, moments in time in the life of a PDP where the GACK can provide input. I think we need to first identify that and agree on that to test it out, and then you could perhaps very early on, perhaps test the proposition what if the GACKs early input is inconsistent with what the GNSO has determined to do?

I think you're quite right to flag this Mark. I just think we need to tackle it in sort of a sequential manner. Then I think once we get to the big issues, which is what happens if the GACK and the GNSO simply have to agree to disagree on a particular element? The GACK still, according to the bylaws, would have the opportunity to provide advice directly to the board, but the GNSO surely has its opportunity to communicate to the board as well. To me that's a step down the road, but I think that has to guide almost everything we do. I hope this makes sense. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Suzanne. Let me hand over then to Mikey who had his hand up next, followed by Manal.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Jonathan. It's Mikey. I think Mark has put his finger on the key question. I agree with what Suzanne said as well. What this document represents is essentially the process as it stands today. My thought was that what we could do is come to sort of a mutual understanding as to what we in the GNSO do today. Those of us who have been through the working group process a lot can describe that in a lot of detail.

Then see where those opportunities may exist. This is a slightly more detailed view of the process than the one that we were starting with. I'm hoping that by getting one layer more detailed we're going to find some nooks and crannies where input can be provided. I think that one really important point to remember is that the working group process is almost always characterized by differing views, especially at the beginning.

The goal is to come to a conclusion that addresses everybody's views. The process is pretty good at that. So to the extent that we can figure out ways to leverage that, at least in my mind, the goal would be to march to the board with arms together in most cases. I think the process can help us do that. I agree we're a little early in the game. The current version of the diagram is the state as of today. The thought being that we would probably add some things to that to describe how the interaction would get woven in between the GACK and the GNSO. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Mikey. That was good input. Manal over to you.

Manal Ismail: Thanks Jonathan. First, I do agree to the importance of the point raised by Mark, which is also stressed as a concrete deliverable from this group in the charter. Actually, Mikey already answered two of my questions, which were where is this from the table, because I was challenged trying to match the boxes with the earlier table that we had. It seems that this is a bit more detailed and that's why I could not really match both.

The other question was to confirm that this describes the current status without any new proposals, it doesn't take into consideration any proposals yet; so this is also good to know. I think if we try to have like one document that we can focus on commenting on might be helpful. Again, Mikey already covered what I was going to ask, so thank you Mikey.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. So thanks Manal, thanks for Mark for kicking that thread off and for others for responding. I mean my two cents worth on this and I think this is hopefully important and relevant is that, you know, as it stands at the moment we have a formal construct, that's the ICANN by laws, which give us certain rights and responsibilities within the ICANN model as the GNSO and the GACK. The work of this group doesn't, at this point, have any bearing on that and is not in business to do so.

So, really in many ways this is more about effective working relationships than fundamental changes to structure. I guess this is relatively close to what Suzanne said is that actually this is as much about how we effectively interact and the mechanisms for doing so, more so than any fundamental change to our, if you like, legal rights

within the ICANN model. That said, I would hope that if we get this right we will need to rely much less on those formal constructs, and more on these, well not that they'll be informal, but less by-law constrained mechanisms.

Nevertheless, either of us can ultimately resort to our position within the bylaws, so it doesn't change that. I think in the interest of getting through this meeting in the timeframe, we should probably move on to Item 4, which is just, in which we may find relatively easy or not, but that's to look at the actual documents for the two different work streams.

Before doing so, Mark I see your hand, oh your hand is now down; by all means come back Mark if you would like to on any points, but aside from that I suggest we then move on to just, I guess the point on this item on the agenda, Manal you may wish to comment here, but is really to either agree that these are the primary documents that are going to be used to develop the work within these two work streams.

If possible to remove one or more of them, or at least to continue to work with as limited a number as possible. I suppose we've really got two in each case, because really Marika's edits to Manal's, to Mikey's document are, it's one in the same with some edits on it. So Manal if you would like to comment on this agenda item, and then others as to the documents we've got and if these are effective, and if we are happy and willing to move ahead using these as the basis for our discussions. Manal?

Manal Ismail: Yes. Sure Mikey. Sure Jonathan. Thank you. The intent here, as you rightly mentioned, is that we agree on the material at hand. First of all,

we would like to make sure that we have not overlooked any material that was shared on the mailing list. Then see if some of the documents are obsolete. By other documents I mean if we have the circulated slides, maybe we should focus on the one with Marika's comment, which I think has everything that was already circulated by Mikey.

I mean to focus down on the exact documents that we should be looking at and commenting. This should make us more effective and not distracted where to comment exactly.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Manal. I didn't see whether Suzanne or Marika came up first, but maybe I'll defer to you Marika, so that in case you had something you wanted to add about the documents or the nature of the (unintelligible). So go ahead Marika and then Suzanne.

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika. Just to know, at least I currently understand two different documents in relation to the PDP, so the document is on the screen. As well as Mikey's slide. I think at the moment, as I understand it, now Mikey can correct me if I'm wrong, the slides are really intended I think to show the current process and how it currently works and what current opportunities exist for GACK engagement or involvement in the GNSO/PDP.

I think there were already some questions asked in there as well as, you know, why may certain things not work as they were envisioned, or what may be some other avenues to explore? The documents on the screen I think is at this stage at least more comprehensive because it also tries to incorporate basically the slides that are at the end of this document, in which I think Suzanne put forward some ideas or suggestions on how engagement may be explored.

I think the document tries to actually ask about the questions, as well as to clarify what is maybe meant or intended with those proposed additional steps. I think coming back to our previous discussion; I think maybe some of the comments that Mark made would also be good to incorporate here. I think the idea behind this document is really to walk through the existing engagement opportunities, determine how these are currently handled.

First, identify whether those current engagement opportunities, you know, why they are not working, is there any tweaking that needs to be done to those existing engagement opportunities in the PDP? Then basically ask okay having looked at what is currently existing, what is missing, or what needs to be changed, or what needs to be added? I think it's in a way a kind of structured approach, really goes step-by-step through the PDP process.

For that, I think it will be very helpful to, you know, have Mikey go through his slide so everyone is indeed on the same page of how things currently work, or the idea is that will hopefully give some insights or get some discussion going on, you know, what can be improved or how should we improve it? Whether that's within the existing mechanism, whether additional mechanisms or steps needs to be explored or developed.

I think that's still really open. There is a real attempt to try to capture what currently exists in addition to what I think Suzanne put together in her slides and see how, you know, where that matches or where there is currently a disconnect. So at least that's my perspective on the two documents as I currently understand.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Marika. Also, critically how might either party respond to those inputs or changes anytime? Suzanne?

Suzanne Radell: Well, thank you and thank you Marika. I think you said it exceedingly well, that's my understanding as well that we're trying to capture what the current situation is, where there are gaps. So there are opportunities, but they're not being taken advantage of. Why is that? I do think the questions are really, really helpful. They should be our starting point. So I like the way you presented it. Perhaps we can get to a point where in the very near term we don't have the competing slides if you will? I know that's not the intention to compete. We have sort of a single set where we can all agree.

I did also just want to offer an observation for colleagues, not only my GACK colleagues, but our GNSO colleagues, I very much value the input from HEMMA, from Spain, the excerpts from the GACK working method proposal. I did just want to exercise a little hesitation here. That documents has not been reviewed and agreed by the GACK as a whole. So it's a document written by Spain, as I understand it, in the capacity as chairing this particular GACK working group.

I found that while a lot of the material is very straightforward, it has not been approved and cleared by the GACK as a whole. I think we may want to take it off our list as a working text, but I think it's useful for this group to know that there is this very complimentary exercise underway inside the GACK. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Suzanne. That's helpful. It does beg the question from me, I wouldn't mind any comment or input. So we've now confirmed these

two work tracks. We seem to have a pretty good idea of the documents and how we might like to work with those. We would try and form in both cases, it seems to me, I think I'm hearing this, a form of master document that records the key points, the questions and the answers as they start to form that will then ultimately be the basis of the report of that group.

Are these work tracks something, which the whole group deals with, which is what I think I'm starting to understand? We're not going to break off into two separate work groups. I think really we've just got two people in each case who are prepared to lead, hold the pen, match the work on, but for the most part the actual work and the discussions take place in our main group? Is that a common understanding?

Suzanne Radell: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Suzanne, thanks Mark and Manal I see your hand is up.

Manal Ismail: Yes Jonathan. Thank you. I fully agree to what you have said. I was just going to further add to what Suzanne has mentioned. The ongoing working group on GACK working methods is dealing with too many (unintelligible) details that are also very GACK related. I don't believe this is going to be within the scope even of our working group. We're merely talking how the GACK engaged with the GNSO. Probably there are some internal GNSO, as well as GACK internal methods. We definitely do not want to get into such details, which I believe are out of scope of this working group. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank Manal. So what I think I'm hearing that is in both cases, for both work streams we will need a form of leading document. We

appear to have that in the form of the engagement in GNSO/PDP table. The other documents form either background illustration and/or information; we don't really have that on a day-to-day work stream at this stage.

So it strikes me, and if I'm putting out as a suggestion, we need a similar, tabular format document that of course will be informed by things like the existing mind map diagram, but really a form of table that seeks to raise some points, deal with the questions that arise and start to formulate some answers. I wonder if this is something I can ask very competent but possibly starting to feel like over worked staff members to assist with? We have the one table that really originates with Marika. I'm wondering if an equivalent table might be possible for the other work stream?

Marika I see you're supportive of that and in so doing are probably in effect volunteering to offer your support in a practical way by making the table as a (unintelligible). So that's very helpful. It means we can have both the two tables, plus the supporting documentation. We should note that although the excerpts from the GACK working method is helpful supporting documentation, as is Mikey's presentation, that excerpt from the GACK working method is not yet an official document.

I guess it fits and to that extent into the category of the document I circulated earlier to our list today, which was, you know, the draft output of our working group, but nevertheless provides a useful background illustration to thinking and detail. Good. Are there any other comments or inputs that anyone would like to make on this call about anything really under the next Item A or B? For example, is an

hour sufficient duration, are we making adequate progress? Is there anything else you'd like to see happen or not happen?

Personally, I'm feeling pretty satisfied with where we're going. We're engaged. It could be better if we had others on the call, but they did let us know that there were clashes and issues. Any other comments or input that anyone would like to make? All right, hearing and seeing none, then we do have a schedule agreed for the forthcoming calls.

We know that doesn't suit everyone, but we've done, I think a passable job of trying to accommodate everyone's requirements. It's encouraging to see we've all got our heads down and are trying to make progress including timeframes and so on. Mikey I see your hand has come up.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I'm just going to hijack this channel for a personal question to Suzanne. Suzanne do you have some time right after this call that we could just steal this Adobe room and the two of us do a little opportunistic putting our heads together? Is that just out of the question?

Suzanne Radell: No. No. That's well within the realm of possibility.

Mikey O'Connor: Cool. Well, Glen if you could hold the call open and the Adobe room open for the two of us, and anybody else can ride along if you want. That would be fantastic.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Great. Well, what we will do then is we will close the formal proceedings, but keep the line open to the extent that it's possible. So if I could ask the recording is now stopped, and the meeting is formally

brought to a close. I'll use this opportunity to thank everyone for their active participation and look forward to working with you on list and at the next call. If we could stop the recording now and bring the meeting to a close.

END