

ICANN
Transcription
GAC GNSO Consultation Group meeting
Tuesday 28 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 28 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/gnso/gnso-gac-20140128-en.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.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

Gema Maria Campillos - Spain

GNSO Council

Jonathan Robinson – co-chair - Registries Stakeholder Group

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

Amr Elsadr – Non Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG)

Apology:

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings

Olof Nordling

Julia Charvolen

Glen de Saint Géry

Coordinator: And pardon me, this is the operator. Just need to inform all parties that today's conference call 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 Kandi. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the GAC GNSO call on the 28th of January.

And on the call we have Mikey O'Connor, Ana Neves, Jonathan Robinson, Suzanne Radell, Amr Elsadr, Mark Carvell. And on the Adobe Connect we have the same people. And for staff we have Olof Nordling, Markia Konings, myself Glen de Saint Gery and Julia Charvolen.

If I've missed anybody, please let me know. And otherwise it's over to you Jonathan. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Great thanks Glen. Welcome everyone and...

((Crosstalk))

Manal Ismail Yes I don't think I heard my name.

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Gery: No that's where I got it from...

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Gery: I did miss you. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: So welcome everyone again, including Manal who's - on comparing the agenda for the background to this call. And in fact I think Manal takes significant credit of keeping very much on top of this. I was

slightly wrong footed by the fact that we're coming back together again so soon.

As you know, our future meetings will be at two-week intervals hereafter. So hopefully that gives us enough time not to drift too far apart, yet to catch our breath between the meetings.

We have a charter which we tried to sign off on at least from the group's perspective so that (unintelligible) organizations as soon as possible. And we attempted to do that last time and found that there were a number of things that we wanted to sort of add to reconsider and work on.

And we've done that in the interim period. The very latest version of that charter has only come out just before the call. And thanks to Mikey for the hard work on that.

I sense from what was going on on the email and from my perspective as one of the advocates of a couple of changes, it seems that we've - that (that be) settling on this now. Are there any comments anyone would like to make on the charter before we essentially sign off on it as a group? Suzanne.

Suzanne Radell: Thank you. I did just - with apologies to everyone. I hate to try your patience. I did just submit a proposed edit to the last sentence in the first paragraph. And I think my other GAC colleagues I hope will agree with me.

In my experience it is quite rare actually for the board to affirmatively approach the GAC. So again, it's not meant to be a criticism. It's sort of meant to sort of clarify that this often doesn't happen.

It may well be that the GNSO has assumed it occurred, but it doesn't. So I tweaked it a little bit. You know, it is only at that time when the board might or may, I can't remember. I don't have that in front of me now. I'm on the Adobe screen.

So I just think we want to clarify simply to indicate that it's not a given. That the board will affirmatively reach out to the GAC. That was my whole purpose there. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Suzanne. I've seen it in the email. I have no objection to it. I've seen a couple of ticks come up in the online forum in the Adobe. And I see a hand up from Mikey and Manal. So Mikey go ahead first.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. Yes, I find that fascinating. I'm perfectly fine with the change in the charter. But I'm going to lean on Marika and Olof. I think we do have wired into the process a request for advice from all ACNSOs just before the board votes on policies that are approved by the GNSO.

So I think what we've done is we've identified a whole that we probably need to fill. And I'm fine with the change in the charter. But I see Marika's hand up. She may be able to set me straight on that. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Mikey. That's helpful. And I think you're right. There's two points that the (charter) and what happens in practice. So Marika your comment or response.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. And just to clarify or try to specify what Mikey referred to because indeed, after the GNSO Council adopts the recommendations, these are put out for public comment.

And simultaneously the board notifies the GAC that it's planning to consider the GSNO Council recommendations. And asks the GAC whether they have any considerations or concerns in relation to the public policy that they want to share before the board considers these.

And I think we've (formatted) in the bylaws, it's not exactly specified how that is done. It just says that the board needs to notify what we've done over recent PDPs. And that a formal letter is sent from the board to the GAC notifying them of the upcoming consideration.

But I think to date we actually haven't received any formal response from the GAC to that notification. So as Mikey said, it may be one of the areas where, as going through the PDP we may need to further consider whether that's indeed is working as it should or whether other mechanisms need to be explored. But that is currently part of the PDP and carried out.

Jonathan Robinson: Thinks Marika, Manal and then Suzanne, you'll come back in I expect.

Manal Ismail: Yes thank you Jonathan. Yes, I understand where Suzanne is coming from. Actually I had some comments on the first edit. But the second one makes more sense to me.

I think we're trying here to highlight the problem that the advice should - (comes very late) within the process. The point that Suzanne is making, if I understand right, is that the GAC work doesn't only start when, or at least not all the time, the GAC starts working only when the board seeks advice.

I mean there are normal day-to-day work that has been (handed) out. But the problem comes when the board seeks the GAC advice very late within the process. So I think I've made a lot of (comments). But let me try again.

The first edit seen only then is problematic. But I'm - I do support the second edit Suzanne has made. Sorry, I'm not so good. I'll get my hand down and then try again maybe later.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay Manal, let's give you a chance to come back in later if you need to. I think clearly this is - got to make sure we actually correct, yet at the same time - okay Suzanne, why don't you come in and let's here where you think this should go having heard the input from Mikey and I guess in particular Marika on how it actually happens to date.

Suzanne Radell: Sure. And thank you for that. And I think in the interest of moving forward, perhaps we just bracket this for a while while we do a little legwork. So I will confess to the group, and those who know me probably won't be surprised. I'm - I tend to be very literal, okay.

So in my mind an overture from the board to the GAC is quite explicitly that. It is not a little notice that says oh, by the way there's this activity going on over there.

So it may well be that we need to do a little bit of legwork. So Marika, thank you very much for reminding us. This may have occurred on occasion. But we've looked into this ourselves in quite a level of detail several years ago. And maybe we're out of step.

When we did the joint working group report that was approved in June 2011. We went back through letters from the board to the GAC. And at that moment in time there had only been one what you might call a formal overture with a request for feedback.

And so again, my apologies. I may be too literal here. But when we sort of, and I think I can speak for the majority of the GAC. And I hope Manal that's what I'm trying to do here. Our impression is that an overture is a formal request for advice. It's not just a notification that there is something of possible interest going on.

So again, why don't we just put that in brackets into a little more legwork? I'm sure between as we can find something that's mutually acceptable. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Suzanne if I may, I think I'll insert myself in the queue, possibly as a participant and less as chair. I suppose the challenge we've got to think about here is how much of this is about - it's really, this is quite interesting because we've got to - we've got something in place.

And so I guess our charter should reflect the facts of what is actually in place. Yet at the same time, if it's not effective in some way, we shouldn't misrepresented in the charter. We should be accurate about what actually happens. And then make sure that it is effective or works as its intended.

So just to make sure I understand what you said, Manal from a chair's point of view. If you think you would put this aside. Are you going to come back to it and try and reword it? Or how do we go forward to try to tick off putting in the charter today, at least as far as the group is concerned.

And Marika I see your hand is up. So let me just come to you. Suzanne, response to that what you think should happen. And then I see Marika has patiently had her hand up as well.

Suzanne Radell: Sure. Go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: Sorry Suzanne. This is Marika. Yes, so to Suzanne's point I think that would be really helpful indeed going through the PDP. And (need) one of the areas also identified in the table.

And I'm hoping as well that it will come back in the slide presentation that Mikey had done because I think it would be really helpful to get that kind of feedback indeed on what would constitute a notification from your perspective. Because indeed, you know, we often support, you know, taking the PDP from start to finish.

Including as well, you know, working with the board and what they are required to do. And indeed, you know, providing drafts for example on such notices. So indeed if the language in there is not sufficient as, you know, as it's currently written to trigger GAC feedback or input, I think it would be really important to know so that for future PDP's we're actually able to do so. And reflected in a way that, you know, the GAC can actually work with that.

So I think it's just, you know, just for us to make a note of that that that's one of the items we probably should look further into. Even though it may not be directly GSNO GAC. But still, you know, it's part of the PDP and I think an important part of why the GAC hasn't had an opportunity to currently provide their input directly to the board on PDP recommendations.

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead Suzanne. Thanks Marika.

Suzanne Radell: Thank you. And thanks Marika as well. I actually think Jonathan, you and Marika have put it well. There is an element in the process that involves this. So Marika thinks for the very good example you sent. That is crystal clear.

So we need to go back and perhaps adjust our mindset. I think this is more recent than not. And so Jonathan I like the way you put it. There is something built in. But, you know, apparently what we're realizing is that it's not necessarily the most effective tool.

And that is perhaps a point we need to surface that there is this mechanism. But it doesn't necessarily yield the results we all want. So that's a good job for this task force to take on. Why doesn't it work? You know, what could we do to improve it?

So I like the way you're approaching this. I do think again, it's just wordsmithing, which it's too early for me even though it's 9:15. I don't have an alternative. But I think this is very, very helpful to surface that know of late there is a more affirmative approach. And perhaps we

have simply been so taken up with a new gTLDs, which we have, that we haven't been formally sort of registering these overtures.

So apologies for that. I do think we can just work on the language. And to me it's a minor editing fix. But I do think Jonathan, you're quite correct to say well it does seem to suggest we want to tackle this.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes thanks Suzanne. My sense is that we will tackle it in the word stream that you and Mikey are leading. So I think we will flush it out. And from eyes perspective, from a chair's perspective the most important thing is that the charter is, if you like, actually accurate.

And so that's both important because that's how it should be. And also because it won't provoke any unnecessary responses if it is actually correct. And then to the extent that it's not working from a practical point of view, my expectation is we should flush that out in the work streams. Manal and Mikey I see you both have your hands up. So Manal first.

Manal Ismail: Yes thank you. So I'll give it a second try. I tried to propose some added this, which I would like to know if this grasps our results the problem. (As you say) the timing, (this usually arises) because of the GAC seeks - the board seeks GAC advice only when the GNSO PPD reaches the board at the very late stage of the GNSO policy (unintelligible). I can try to put it in the chat if that is better.

Jonathan Robinson: Perhaps, and it sounds to me like we're of a collective mind that we can tidy the wording up on this relatively easily to reflect the facts. Mikey I see your hand is up, and we'll come to you.

But I'm just wondering if there are any other sort of material points that anyone wants to draw attention to in the charter other than what we might call tidying up this first paragraph? If you could think about that as well. And we'll come to Mikey now.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Jonathan. It's Mikey. I was also just throwing out a proposed revision. I think we're all on the same track in terms of our intent. And so I just threw out a suggestion that we would just add a clause to that last sentence that says only then does the board request GAC advice. A process that appears to need review and improvement, you know, just to sort of capture the point that Suzanne was making that...

Jonathan Robinson: Mikey I'm very sympathetic to that point. But I sort of reacts to that because, and I think that's what the whole purpose of this group is all about. We recognize that advice comes too late.

So I suppose my intent here is I'm thinking that we should try and capture the facts because you're right. I mean only the fact that the advice comes late is a different issue to the fact that the request for advice may or may not fall on hollow ground or be properly heard or appropriately recognized.

So I think - I hope we all recognize that the fundamental purpose of this group is to, one of them at least is to deal with this timing difficulty, the effect that the advice comes late. I quite like Manal's wording. I don't know if anyone else is going to respond. So Mikey if your hand is up to respond to that, Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Yes Jonathan thanks. This is Amr. Well to be honest, I don't see much difference between Manal's wording in the wording that is already

present in that first paragraph of the charter. If Manal would like to point out what the difference may be, I'd appreciate it.

But I tend to favor what Mikey is suggesting. And sort of as well as what you had just said, which is this is really what we're trying to do is figure out how to improve early engagements of the GAC and the GNSO PDP.

You know, the way I see that, I think that first paragraph is fine in doing that. As far as a request from the board to the GAC, I'm not sure if this is something we really necessarily need to address because we're looking for earlier engagement than when this actually gets to the board.

And so I don't know if we need to tackle this issue or not. But as Marika pointed out a little earlier, recently I guess the board has been sending requests to the GAC for inputs. This seems to be a new practice, not an old one. But perhaps I'm not sure if it's something that's going to become standardized. But in general I do like the suggestion Mikey made. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, Mikey and then Mark.

Mikey O'Connor: Jonathan this is Mikey again. I through another version into the chat. I still think we're very much in alignment. So I don't have terribly strong feelings about this.

And I agree with your point Jonathan. But what I tried to do is incorporated in and say only then does the board request GAC advice.

And which is an example of a process that appears to need review and improvement by this group just to capture the thought that you had.

You know, I think we're all pretty much on the same wavelength here. So, you know, we could just leave it bracketed for now.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes I think it's important to move up. So let me see, I see Amr has supported you there. I'm okay with the words you've suggested in the chat. So let's hear from Mark and then hopefully we can - in a position to put this to bed with those revisions, Mark.

Mark Carvell: Yes thanks. And hello to everybody. I just wanted to say yes, I think we're almost there subjects to seeing that final version if you like of the tweaking of the text.

But I just wanted to add that the - or seek assurance that were not losing the sense that the GAC can and often does look at what's going on in the GNSO. So the text where it says it may only be at that time that the GAC turns its attention to the GNSO's work, I think that's a valid point because, you know, we don't have to wait for the board to draw attention to a policy development.

Quite often the GAC members are getting to hear what's happening, you know, the discussions in the margins. And then in the GAC GNSO meetings there may well be issues relating to a policy development going on. But quite often it's towards the end of the policy development process, I believe is the case.

But it's the point about the GAC turning its attention. I think that's a valid thing to attain if we can in the text. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, just if - I'm slightly lost as to where we even got (an up).

It's totally - somewhat challenging to sort of edit this with multiple variants. I think we're going to have to - my suggestion is that we agree a charter, subject to finalizing on the list that last sentence.

That seems to be the most sensible thing to do because it's sort of, it's somewhat difficult to edit it by these various conversations now. And as Suzanne I see your hand is up.

Suzanne Radell: Just a minor comment. Again it's - I think Amr put it very well to remind us that our focus here is on early engagements. So again it's - Mark is quite correct. It's not that the GAC does not pay attention. But that's not the issue.

The issue is are we providing you, the GNSO, with the early input that we both think would be helpful? And currently our sense is at the present time no that is not happening.

So obviously whatever tools are available today are not achieving the desired result. It's not a question of a lack of interest or any of those things. So what is it?

So I do think we're very, very close. We're just trying to set the facts straight. This is the context in which we are, you know, sort of working. There may be these notification mechanisms. I think the point is they're not sufficient. And they don't occur early enough in the process. And then we just move on from there.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, okay. So I mean the important point from my perspective is that we recognize that there are a number of potential engagements that either are working in adequately or are not hitting the targets.

And so somehow or another we've got to - that's to me is the purpose as I said of this group. Let's tidy up the text of the line so it's both factually correct and conveys the essence of what we intend to do.

I guess I have to little comments about alterations I proposed. One was the use of ultimately, further down in the text. I'm happy for that to be left out. The only reason for it was we said specifically solving this problem would result in more efficient PDPs.

And there's a whole lot of work going on within - on the GNSO, you know, actually on the GNSO decides to improve efficiency of PDPs, notwithstanding this issue.

So it was sort of - it was trying to capture that. But I don't think it's absolutely necessary. So frankly I'm perfectly prepared to drop the ultimately point in the interest of getting this signed off.

And the other one I think we've more or less agree that that there may have been inconsistent with the laws. And we've given a concrete example, which we discussed, Suzanne and I and others on (list serve).

It seems to me we've got something subject to refining the final refine of that law - of that first paragraph 4 which Mikey's proposed a final version even in the chat now. We've got something which we can sign off on as a group.

I just want to test with you all where this goes next because I think what we do at that stage, my understanding is we agree that's the charter we intend to work to and commence our work on that basis.

But we do send it out then back. So we transmit that back to our respective groups for notification and I guess perspective input and variation. We can't consider it absolutely final. It's subject to a form of ratification by our respective groups. Is that a common understanding of those on the call now?

Suzanne Radell: I would think so.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Suzanne. So I see a couple of other hands coming up from Amr and Mikey and Manal. So that's our understanding. And we settle it within our group. We communicate it to our respective organizations.

We may find that there is additional variation or input on the back of that. But I guess we should - my suggestion, just purely practically, is that we should, will certainly we should continue with our work. We shouldn't wait for that.

And maybe that's the essence of the communication that we intend to work along these lines subject to any material input from the respective groups.

All right, Item 2 then is to just agree on the working documents of each work track now. As you know, we've got the two different tracks. The so-called PDP work track where we intend to (spec) through the PDP process and look for either examples of existing engagement

processes and/or opportunities for new or therefore improved or new engagements.

And that's represented in a set of slides and a table describing the GNSO PDP process with opportunities for GAC engagement be led to by a Mikey and Suzanne.

And then a second work stream, which is this mechanism for day-to-day cooperation for which a table has been prepared by staff, Marika and Olof in the interim. And we now have that as a working document.

So any concerns, objections or otherwise with those as are working document? Hearing and seeing none, we'll proceed to work with those two work streams, which are shared with all of the group but led respectively by Suzanne and Mikey and then myself and Manal.

Now what we didn't complete at the last meeting a week ago was an overview of a set of slides with input options that have been prepared by Mikey. And I think discussed after last meeting between Mikey and Suzanne.

So in essence this is a presentation to our group by Mikey and for the record, but with I think both historical and very recent input by Suzanne and others as we shared it on the list.

So why don't we hand over to you Mikey to walk us through the process in relatively short order. And we can see how that educates and informs the group and creates opportunities for discussion. Over to you Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Jonathan. It's Mikey. I'm going to take you through a document that if we sort of went at normal speed would probably take us in an hour or two to get through.

So I'm going to, instead of spending a lot of time going into the content, I'm going to just give you sort of a chance to see what's in it. And I think that there is plenty of work for us to do here.

So let me just jump right in. Basically this slide show is built around this top-level description of the process. And the difference between this and the one that we have been using up until now is that it's a bit more detailed.

And so I did a whole series of slides, one per step here. So the one at the very top is highlighted in blue. And that indicates the part of the process we're working on, which in this one is identify and frame and issue.

And then Suzanne and I talked about the table that was running in parallel, and agreed that it would be nice to put the table in this chart together. Because the nice thing about the table is that it's much more, to use Suzanne's term, literal. It's much more a written document, and thus can be a lot more precise in its meaning.

So the next page by convention is simply the table that we've already been using. I just added it to this slide deck. So that's just a sense. As you go through this slide deck, I'm going to go very fast. You can see that what happens is there's a picture and then there's a table. And so that's just a sense of what's going on. Sorry to blink this back but I want to sort of roll back.

And, you know, it's Suzanne's got a good point in the chat which is that the written word is more understandable in many cases and again just to emphasize it's also often quite a bit more precise. And for both those reasons I think it's good to have these together. The thing that's nice about the picture is it sort of gives the overview.

And I think one of the big points that Suzanne and I came across in our conversation was - follows right on from that last conversation about the charter which is that there are a lot of places in this process which could trigger conversations with the GAC - between the GAC and the GNSO quite a bit earlier in the process than perhaps happens now. And to amplify another point that I think we just heard there are already trigger points in this process that we're not maybe taking as much advantage of as we could.

And this first stage is a good example of that, there's - this process is built to allow the GAC and anybody else for that matter to identify and frame an issue for consideration by the GNSO. And one of the things that would then happen is that we would go through this whole process based on that input from the GAC. So if you want early engagement or an example of early engagement I think that this first stage is the earliest if possible or early again engagements and so right from the start I think there is things to explore.

And so that's what the table starts to get to if you look on the column to the right the way this table is structured is there is a series of questions that have been posed. And there's no way we can get through all this material today, I just want to point out that those questions are

probably the focal point for the work and then we'll circle back to that explanatory drawing and fix it once we've completed our work.

But I think asking questions like these, making sure that these are the right questions and enough questions and then answering those questions to all our satisfaction is really the core of the work that at least this work stream is going to be doing. And so Suzanne and I have to sort of have to structure how we're going to actually chug through all of this series of questions .But I don't think that's going to be hard, it's going to be a fair amount of work.

But you can see that right off the bat, you know, there may be triggers here and one of the things that Suzanne brought up which I thought was a really interesting idea is that may if something has something to do with international law or, you know, sort of the focal point of the GAC that surfaces in this early stage we should, you know, we should check and that should be a trigger to talk to the GAC about that. So anyway that's a little bit of an editorial side.

Let me just very quickly run through the rest of the pictures. What happens after the - somebody - anybody in the world identifies or frames an issue the next thing that happens is that there is a formal process to kick off the first stage. And that process varies depending on whose doing the asking. And so the middle of that picture is sort of indicating that what happens is somebody frames an issue, the staff may advise on that and then request an issue report.

Depending on whether it's the Board, the Council or an advisory committee the rules are slightly different in terms of how the Council

handles it. And right there front and center is the notion that the GAS and Advisory Committee could certainly request and issue report. And in the case of the Advisory Committee requesting it I am going to turn to Marika - does that require a vote by the Council? I know in the case of a Board request the Council does not vote, it simply goes to the next stage.

I'm not sure whether an advisory committee requested issue report requires a vote or not. We don't need to get in that now and get disconnected instead of just muting. So not a big deal Marika but that's the sort of thing we're going to want to work through and make sure that we understand because that's not something I just know for sure. Presuming that the issue report then gets - well here are our questions, isn't there a stage that would be specifically good for the GAC and this is back to my little editorial.

But then presuming that it does get approved by the Council - I can't imagine why it would not, then there's a preliminary issue report that's prepared by staff and there's a public comment period. And so even when the GAC does not request the issue report there is an opportunity for the GAC to comment on an issue report, even at this very early stage. Now let me just check the chat - Mark is asking is there a gene sift prioritization process at this identifying framing?

Yes to a certain extent, although the volume isn't so high that Mark that at least in my experience there hasn't been much of a shifting going on. It's more a shifting as to whether it's in or outside the scope of the GNSO that's generally the focus of that conversation. But...

Jonathan Robinson: If I may make just a brief comment there, I suppose that the sifting is two-fold. In general there isn't a volume as you rightly point out.

The second is that it's subject to a certain threshold both to the Council. That said that threshold is very low and as far as the Council is concerned may be an issue for future discussion, but at this stage it's set - the bar is set deliberately low. That is for the most part if an issue is requested for an issue report the work gets done in order to frame it properly and check it out at the outset and so it's not a high barrier to overcome. Thanks, sorry for the interruption Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: No worries and part of this is, you know, just zooming quickly through a - as you can tell a fairly elaborate process.

But you're darn right and there is - I've put a little arrow on the screen that sort of points to those thresholds. And that kind of documentation will tend to wind up in these pictures rather than in the text often. So I'm going to do that just to annoy (Susan) - Suzanne and keep our working relationship as on the right track. So let me carry on here - get my little arrow off.

So again here we go on the questions, there's a bunch of questions here - this is the stage, just as a reminder where there's the public comment on a preliminary issue report and there are a bunch of questions, including a comment from me which I think we'll probably all tend to agree around which is midway down that says look, you know, the earlier these comments come in the easier it is for me especially as a working group chair to ensure that that conversation is included in the conversation of the working group.

And there is a very formal process whereby the working group logs every single public comment and addresses every single public comment at each stage in its work. So if the GAC were to put in a public comment on - even on the issue report stage these would be logged and dealt with during the process.

So again I don't want to belabor that - on we go presumably let's presume again that the public comments come back and it's time to initiate the - this is the stage at which the Council has a higher threshold as you can see up at the top, let me just point that out to you - to actually start the rest of the PDP process is somewhat more elaborate process and has higher thresholds.

And there's also another interesting point which is if you the GAC - and this is written into the rules - if you the GAC request an issue report - or request a PDP - an issue report and with GNSO reject it there's a process by which we are required to meet with you, try and work it out, etc., etc., you know, this is a pretty summarized version of the process. So there's quite a bit of process to ensure that you as the GAC are heard and that your requests are not dismissed lightly, so that's just another little highlight for you.

Again more questions, you can see that at each stage of the game there are questions all along the way - oh Marika I see your hand go up - go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika, just to note on the issue report requested by advisory committees I think most of the time or at least the requests we've had to date were socialized before the committee we actually make that request.

So I think at least we've seen that with requests received from the ALAC which I think today have been only requests for issue reports we've received from an advisory committee. They were discussed and deliberated before they made the formal request, again as a way to communicating and making sure that, you know, both sides understood where the issue was coming from.

And as well making sure all the information required was available for the GNSO Council to consider at the time it would take a decision on whether or not to initiate the policy development process.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Marika and I've sort of answered my own question, we do vote on advisory committee request to group (reports) and that's what that reconsideration process is all about, so anyway that's sort of what's going on there.

And again here again we have more questions and I think plenty of opportunities. You can see in the second half of this page this notion of triggering that Suzanne and I talked a bit about is starting to appear. I inserted some of these along the way as I did this draft this week. And I think that this is - at least for the thread that Suzanne and I are leading, this is - asking and answering these questions is really at the heart of the work and so I'm pretty excited about how far we are already.

Then we get into the part of the work that I spent a lot of time on which is sort of the working group part. And so there are a whole bunch of - you can see the steps in the middle - initiate calls for volunteers, applications for membership, conducting the meetings, etc. I don't

know if I hold the record but I've certainly chaired a lot of these. And so my interest in this working group - the work that we're doing is to be your resource when it comes to how these working groups work because I've spent a lot of time on a lot of working groups and have a bunch of opinions on that.

And again we have a series of questions, you know, and this is where we start to trigger the unofficial liaison possibility or maybe people participating as individuals or, you know, all sorts of things. The working group work, although it's bounded by very well-established process and procedures, there's quite a bit of flexibility within that and if there's a need for a less formal or some other mechanism for the - for representatives of the GAC to participate in a working group I'm really interested in trying to figure out ways that we can accommodate you.

Because we accommodate lots of stuff and it just has to be possible to do that. So anyway we do a bunch of work and we get the team established. As the team is getting established here's another public comment period. You can see that if you - if you look at the little code around the edge of this diagram these are the four places where public comments and statements from advisory committees and supporting organizations are requested. So at a minimum there are four places in this process that you can - you as the GAC can provide formal input to the working group process.

And my bias as a working group chair is that the earlier phases are much easier for us in the working group to accommodate. You know, when we get to the very last one, the one that the arrow's pointing at the working group has worked for a year, the conversation has been very nuance, the policy is pretty baked and it's harder to

accommodate. But that's not to say it can't be accommodated. (Jema) has her hand up so (unintelligible) and...

Jonathan Robinson: (Jema) has her hand up, so (Jema) you know that and...

(Jema): Hello thank you.

Omar Kaminski: ...ten minutes to the hours, so just.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, yes I will go as quick as I can - go ahead (Gema) - (Jema).

(Jema): Thank you, sorry to be late to the conference call, I just wanted to roll back to something that you were saying before about GAC participation on the working groups. I think this is a very delegate point.

I myself am participating in a GNSO working group but I'm doing as an individual or as a representative for the Spanish as a representative of the GAC. This is something we have to work out at the GAC because it's not the same that one individual joined that working group and spread his opinions or her opinions because those opinions might not be the GAC position at the end. You may be able to notice some public policy issues but your view on those public policy issues may not coincide with that of the GAC at the end.

So I could be - I think it could be safer for the GAC if we within the GAC decide on how to organize that participation in GNSO working groups narrowly or subsequent stages so that that process is useful. Just note that I wanted to make and also I take advantage of having the mic now because I have to move to another conference call at 4:00 o'clock that issue is one that should be studied thoroughly at these

working group. I've seen the work done by (Mike and Olive) and I think it is very well targeted.

I trust that this methodology could be a good communication channel between both organizations - that's all for now from me, thank you very much.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks (Jema) and I'm going to push ahead as fast as I can, Omar can I indulge myself and park your comment or is this something urgent that you really need to jump in with? Go ahead if it's...

Omar Kaminski: I don't really need to, I was just going to respond through (Jenna) on one point and also note that I need to join her on the other call.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I think one of the tricks that this particular conversation is there's actually no way that we can do real work on this particular call. I really wanted to just quickly give you a heads ups - I mean there are a million issues in here that we get to work on.

So let me just - I am sensitive to Jonathan's point - and Jonathan if you want we are - we have more agenda in front of us. Would you rather need to stop at this point because I think the point I was trying to make is that there is a lot in this document that you all should familiarize yourself with and we're going to undoubtedly spend some time on the list sort of working our way slide by slide through this and so I could stop here if you'd prefer Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: No Mikey as much as I think that we're going to lose people so I think we probably should. Clearly the most critical thing to do is just

spend a couple of minutes talking about our expectations from both work tracks.

I mean this presentation seems to hit the mark in a lot of ways and it forces us to sort of step through the issues, I think it's given people a good sense of things. So probably we should concentrate the last five minutes before everyone has to drop off on - it seems to me we accept the table with is Item 4 and I take it as red unless anyone says so.

So yes thanks Mikey for that, I think we should just move on and try to close up a little on Item 5 and note at least Item 6 is important. But we'll need to plan the cost as to Singapore and think about how the GNSO and GAC might interact and what proportion of that interaction might be covered by a report from this group. So let's take Item 4 as red - I see a hand up from Olaf - Olaf please go ahead.

Olaf Nordling: Yes very briefly this is a little overview that Marika and I have prepared and I would just like to invite comments on it because the step-wise approach trying to first of all identify your objectives then the alternatives you have and then proceed from that. So Marika and I would very much welcome any comments or additions or edits to that one on the list, thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Olaf and just to be absolutely clear this is the second work stream to be sort of led by myself and Manal and for which a sort of initial framework has been prepared as agreed at last meeting by Marika and Olaf, so yes let's hear any comment or input onto that structure and that method and then the risk if it's acceptable as well as it stands or we tweak it and use that. I would quite like to hear any suggestions if I have them - Manal you have a couple of questions.

Manal Ismail: Yes but I can - I'm just holding the for everyone to please come out and we can take them online - I mean over email.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes understood, it would be great to make sure that - if you could make sure that that comment from the chat is (framed) online and also we do pickup on that I see as a first structure and the approach. So let's pick that up and form some discussion on that, that would be great.

We have a couple of weeks before the next call and I wonder - this last item really sort to understand expectations and I guess ID sets some form of targets as to what we might reasonably achieve by the next call. I don't know if there's any comment on this or thoughts, I mean clearly we're going to try and stabilize the position on the two work flows and the mechanics we're getting through. And second of all then to start to step through them, Mikey I see your hand is up.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Jonathan, this is Mikey I think my co-chair has left the call so I'm going to make commitments for us in her absence.

I think what I'm going to go ahead and do because of the structure of our document is so focused on those questions is I'm going to go through and structure the document so that there are questions and answers and then I'm going to draft answers to as many of them as I can just to give something for the group to think about and to discuss. Just like with the charter, I won't have a lot of editorial pride but I think the answers to those questions will lead us to a very interesting and useful discussion. And my goal was to have those done by the next call.

Jonathan Robinson: That's great and I appreciate that goal, maybe that throws down for the other work stream. And I think we're not quite as far ahead as you or Mikey in making sure that the questions are properly structured as the comments and in the chat for at least for now suggest.

And I should just remind everyone that while the chat is a very helpful mechanism and technically is recorded and available it will be very helpful for those who do you know, more substantial questions in the chat if I could please ask you to get those out onto the email list as well that would be great. Mark I see your hand is up.

Mark Carvell: Yes thank you Jonathan and just a suggestion to follow-on from Mikey's much appreciated offer, this frame of the question I think is incredibly valuable process and I'm really impressed by how much you're capturing so far.

And my suggestion is that perhaps as you Mikey take this further and maybe want to consult us as you proceed with this, you might want to start to identify critical questions that the meeting in Singapore between the GAC and the GNSO might discuss. The question in the column that jump out as critical ones merit or would form the backbone if you like potentially of the discussion. Because they would provide I would have thought tremendous focus for both the GNSO and the GAC when we come together in Singapore, so just a suggestion.

And while I'm on the mic just to say come the week of the 17th of February I'm out of London in Geneva all week on with and IGS business the IGS consultations, so my phone will go dead basically at that time. And if we're looking at potential sort of timelines and

deadlines the next couple of weeks is pretty good for me. Then I'm going to be out I think all of this, you know, leading the UK delegation in Geneva. So and then I'll come back and then I can certainly pick things up.

But I just want to flag that and Anna may have the same problem because I know she and I quite often have the same international commitments, thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes thanks Mark and thanks for a very constructive suggestion. I think again if you could just remind us anyone who's got difficulties either by an apology to not be able to attend the meeting.

Just an indication that you are in a black hole for a period of time so that we, A, respect and understand that, and B, are able to perhaps contain any substantial decisions in your absence if and where possible. And I'll just make one remark about Singapore, I think that's a very constructive suggestion. I think it's almost - I have a slightly different take on it where I guess it's related.

Is where we have - when and if we have areas where we think it would be particularly beneficial to highlight, you know, and it may even be with the group as big as that we want to make them into more binary choices rather than open ended discussion. But certainly I think that's a constructive thing to be thinking about. What are the problems or questions that either work stream is focusing on would we like to bring out to the larger forum and in a constructive a way as possible.

I really like that suggestion, so and Manal back to your point as well which I think is important. But I suppose that we've got to be careful of

this is with all of us is that we don't sort of run before we can walk and I would suggest in the chat that we report where we stand where we've got to and indicate where, you know, stress some points but also in particular we need further input. And I guess also openly recognize where there's still further work in the group to be done because we don't expect to be complete by then.

I'm anxious just to bring this to a close but I see Mark your hand may still be up or may have been put up again, so just to make sure - okay it's gone down. All right everyone well I think that was useful, we got a little bit bogged down in the beginning on the charter work but that's at least we can put that now to bed and we seem to have a reasonable indication of where we're headed next, so that's good news. So I think we'll bring it to a close more or less on time and thank you all for your attendance.

I know it crept to us rather quickly and we'll see what we can do now over the next couple of weeks before the February 13 I think it is meeting or whenever the next two weeks Tuesday - two weeks from today. Okay thanks all, look forward to sharing ideas with you (on list) and meeting with you in two weeks' time.

Man: Thanks Jonathan.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Many thanks Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you everybody, thank you.

Woman: Thank you.

Man: Thanks.

END