

**ICANN
Transcription
GAC GNSO Consultation Group meeting
Tuesday 11 February 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 11 February 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-20140211-en.mp3>

On page:

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

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

<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/>

Attendees:

Government Advisory Committee

Manal Ismail – co-chair - Egypt

Ana Neves - Portugal

Suzanne Radel - USA

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:

Mark Carvell – UK

David Cake – GNSO vice chair

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings

Olof Nordling

Glen de Saint Géry

Coordinator: As a reminder, today's conference is being recorded. If anyone has any objections, please disconnect at this time. Please begin.

Glen de Saint Géry Thank you very much Terri. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the GAC GNSO Call on the 11th of February. And on the call, we have Manal Ismail, Ana Neves, Suzanne Radel, Jonathan Robinson, Mikey O'Connor, and for staff, we have Marika Konings, Olof Nordling. And we have rather a strange situation today because our new staff member, (Terry Agnew), that I would like to introduce you to is actually the operator on this call, and next week, she will be a part of our temporary secretarial staff for the GNSO.

Mikey O'Connor: Welcome Terri.

Terri Agnew: Thank you, it's a pleasure.

Mikey O'Connor: That's great, very cool. This is Mikey. That's excellent news.

Terri Agnew: Thank you.

Olof Nordling: This is Olof, the gravitational pull of ICANN.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Terri Agnew: That's right.

Mikey O'Connor: Super, absolutely super.

Terri Agnew: I'm very excited.

Mikey O'Connor: Well we are glad to have you. That's terrific news.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, it's Jonathan speaking. Welcome everyone and especially Terri. It's interesting that we've managed to pull you into our little vortex, which is great news. I would first like to acknowledge my co-chair Manal, who without him I think we would have a substantially less structured and organized agenda and meeting, so really thanks Manal. I think (unintelligible) ahead of this.

I think it does highlight for me the challenge to make sure that we keep the momentum in between meetings, because it's very easy with everything else that goes on in between. So if I could ask all of you to help ask your co-chairs and those (holders of the pens) and work streams to try and nudge this along. We are all pretty committed to trying to achieve something, but it's very easy to have 101 distractions in between meetings.

I guess before we start, it's appropriate just to ask if there are any comments or questions about the agenda and then we will proceed to work our way through it. Okay, so seeing none, I think we will proceed them directly on with it.

Our first objective is one we started off at the last meeting, which was to attempt to sign off the charter, and bearing in mind at that point we will then distribute it back to our respective organizations indicating that this is the charter that the group has settled on. Are there any comments or questions on the charter before we proceed to sign off on it?

So we don't have a formal process for dealing with this and I think probably the most logical way to do it in my mind is just to ask if

anyone objects or would like to abstain from signing off on the charter. If not, we will record that those of you who are present have voted to support the sign off of the charter.

So anyone who would like to object to signing off the charter? Anyone like to abstain from signing off on the charter? All right, so I think we can record that everyone on the call has supported the charter and this has received the good airing on the work group mailing list and has been up for discussion on at least a couple of occasions previously.

So I feel we've done it justice and with that, Mikey, thank you for all of your help on this and Suzanne I know you were involved as well. So let's agree that if you could provide us with a clean copy Mikey, we will PDF it, turn it into a PDF format, and circulate that to our respective groups. Thanks staff, thanks Mikey.

So our next item deals with the day-to-day work track and really as you all know, we have two different tracks of work. One deals with essentially how we might best manage day-to-day interaction or regular interaction between the GNSO and the GAC, and the second one specifically is effective interaction between the GAC and the GNSO (PV) process.

So first off in Item 2, we talk about the day to day work track and then we have a working document that was circulated I think prior to our previous conference call even that provides us really with a structure through which we can work. And I guess that really is our working document and I will pause for a moment in case there are any comments on this.

And I am simply aware that we may not have spent a lot of time looking it through, but is there anyone who would like to make any comments or add anything about this, our working document.

Olof Nordling: Jonathan perhaps - its Olof here. Just a few introductory words perhaps which may look a bit complex, the whole thing, but it really was rather (unintelligible) process rather than anything else. (Cross this thing off) first trying to identify what kind of objectives or expectations we do have from both sides. And agreeing on that, then considering what options are there for a liaison function or anything similar to simplify the day-to-day interaction. And then, matching the two, trying to see which one fulfils the objectives and expectations the best and then selecting that one.

So it's a four step process that may look a bit overwhelming if you start looking at the first page only, but it's really the idea to find out do we agree that the sort of the (unintelligible) and expectations first of all, and the secondly, well what are the options and trying to match them to each other and then to make a decision on that basis while you are watching it. So just a few words of introduction.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, thanks Olof and I don't propose to go on a detailed walkthrough through this but it does help to - I know you and Marika diligently prepared this and essentially it's analogous to the work on the PDP work track where we try to put it in some type of tabular form which helps assist in any decision making on it. So my sense is that this is something we've got to pick up more or less offline for the moment. We haven't really taken it any further, so Suzanne your hand is up. Let's see if you have any comments or suggestions here.

Suzanne Radel: Well thank you. I do have a comment. I want to thank you know Olof and Marika for pulling this together and to kind of pick up on something Olof said. I think he is right. It looks complicated, although I think they have usefully kind of tried to reduce it, right. To drill down to the key points.

I guess my question is for all of us as a group, because I'm just thinking out loud. How is it that we want to present this material to our respective communities? Because you know, we have some options. We could either present it as is and invite colleagues to help us fill in the answers and fill in the chart or we tackle this or try to and try to do draft responses. I'm just mulling over how we present all of this material.

The charter will go out now, I understand that, but obviously, our goal I think is to have a fairly good face to face in Singapore, yes that would focus on this work. Quite honestly, we need to draw more people in and I think we need to sort of attract broader interest in both of our communities to actually do the work.

This is an enormous amount of work and so I'm just curious. You know I wanted to throw that out there so that we can cast our minds ahead because I think it's actually only a scant time weeks from now. And maybe we don't resolve this today on this call, I just wanted to make sure that we figured it out. Visually I think it's useful, but it also can be very overwhelming.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Suzanne. I saw - I know Manal is in the queue. I've put myself in the queue with some thoughts on this afterwards, but I think Marika responded directly. So maybe Marika if you do want to respond

specifically to Suzanne, and then come in and then we will go to Manal.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Again, maybe talk about what I think the staff intention was or I think our expectation (unintelligible) to the document that would actually indeed be for this group to work through these questions and that the actual - that this would basically document the conversations which would then result in an end recommendation by this group to the GAC and the GNSO for consideration.

But this would serve as the kind of document or explain the thinking of this group in coming to these recommendations. At least I think that was from the staff perspective our thinking behind developing this document and the way it is laid out, so it can be updated as conversations progress and information can be added, indeed like tracking our conversations and thinkings.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Marika. Let me go straight to you next Manal.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Jonathan and thank you Marika - all for pulling this together. I was just going to suggest that we actually follow the steps that Olof was describing. I believe we need to try to answer both questions that are listed in the document and we can take them over email. I mean we don't have to be editing in the document; we can try to answer those over email. And then, we can reflect this into the document and then start working through the table, the metrics that are on Page 2.

I full agree with Suzanne that we have to take this back again to our respective groups, but I also think we need to really brainstorm and have some consensus to present at Singapore. So I think we have to

go through the exercise, see where we agree, and where we need to seek more input. And in all cases, present everything in Singapore.

I mean even if we are going to be more for one option versus the other, I believe we still need to highlight that we have investigated those options and we came up with such pros and cons and we concluded that this might be the best way to go. But again, I think we need to present the whole thing. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Marika and Suzanne for your questions and thoughts from Marika and Manal. I guess my input on this - I put myself in the queue with a couple of thoughts really.

First of all, we are running an open email list and recorded conference calls. So to the extent that any member of either the GAC and/or the GNSO wants to track our work, it is transparent to them. And maybe, that highlights that we should just in updating our respective organizations make it clear that there is visibility of anything that's going on.

With that said, I think - my thinking certainly is - I guess my assumption rather than even my thinking was that we would work through this ourselves. We specifically didn't call ourselves a working group because of the connotations of procedure that that would imply. But in essence, I expect that the work is for us to perform at the first iteration. I'm not saying that we go away and do it and come back with a fait de complete, but I'm definitely in the camp that there is - we need to iterate through this you know one, or two, or three times.

Whatever is necessary to try and chew it over properly so that we can make some recommendations which are then palatable to the GAC and the GNSO or not, but we should have given it some reasonable work first before we expose it formerly other than by our organizations preserving our work before we expose it as a form of recommendation or for discussion. Yeah, so that's my two cents worth as it were Suzanne so I think we've got some work to do in the interim before we formerly share it.

I will just note that you've put a checkbox by Manal there, so it seems like that's our (unintelligible) if you like, comment in pen, but you know Suzanne please come back in if that doesn't meet your expectations or there is more to be said. Other than that, I think it sounds like we have reasonable support or common understanding of that way of working.

Thanks Suzanne, I will note your checkmark as well. So we are relatively clear and on common ground there, which is good news, so I don't think there is a whole lot more to be said about this now. It is incumbent on us to get on with trying to answer this and begin to populate the table. And from memory, I think Manal and I are the penholders on this particular work stream, so we've got to - it will be our job to start to work with you and the rest of the group to populate this.

Our first sort of formal bullet under this section is really what's - another document that's been (helpfully) prepared by Marika and Olof is a first draft of a community request form for financial support. Well travel support to be clear, not financial support. For financial support to support the travel of a liaison from the GNSO to the GAC, a so-called reverse liaison in historic GAC terminology.

And this is a document that is being prepared as part of a formal submission into the ICANN budgeting process for which there is a deadline. And the intention here is that this doesn't preempt the output of this workgroup, but actually, simply anticipates one outcome. And in the event that the outcome is for such a liaison, it would be a shame if the outcome was for that and we hadn't taken up the cost of applying for it to be funded.

So that's the motivation here. I will open it up for any comments or questions on that. Personally, I've read it and the document seems to read well and cover the requirement. It may need - we have got until March 7, which is reasonable time, but Manal go ahead.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Jonathan and thanks again Marika, Olof. I don't have any comments on the document per se, but I would like to poll whether it is possible or maybe we need to check if it's possible if the request is approved. Can it be effective a couple of weeks earlier just to see whether we could cover the London meeting or does it have to start with the fiscal year, which starts in July?

Jonathan Robinson: Marika, please go ahead. I see your hand is up in response to this point.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. This request specifically relates to the FY15 budget, so I don't think we can adjust it here. But as I said as well in my email, I think if there is a you know agreement among the group that there would be a need or a request for having someone to attend the London meeting. Olof and I can work and try to see if we can secure such funding.

And of course, there is no guarantee, but I think if there is a request from both the chairs of this group and common agreement that that's the way forward, and then you know I'm quite hopeful that we should be able to find some funds to cover that. So I think that's something we can take up as we get closer or in nearer to an agreement on whether this is the way the group wants to pursue the engagement function.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Marika. Suzanne, your hand is up next.

Suzanne Radel: Yes, thank you and this may be an inopportune moment to raise this question, so apologies, bear with me. I think it's a great idea. I think it's important and thank you to Marika and Olof for you know being mindful of these deadlines so that we could meet them.

I just had a thought as we were sort of agreeing that this is a good idea for the GNSO liaison to the GAC. It strikes me that on the GAC side, I believe we will be spending quite a bit of time ourselves in Singapore on GAC working methods you know covering a variety of issues.

One of them or at least it's something I have been pondering to put out on the GAC list is a suggestion that we the GAC revisit a practice that we stopped a long time ago of issue driven working groups so that there are smaller groups of GAC members paying more attention and engaging on issues a little more routinely and then reporting back.

And so I'm wondering you know in the interest of balance or in case somebody on the GAC side picks up on this, is there a need. And I can certainly check this with (Heather Dryden), with the GAC Chair. Is there a need to signal to ICANN that we may also in the event that we

actually do sort of get this off the ground, that there is a counterpart sort of understanding? That if we have a country, particularly a developing country that is willing to actually take on leading a specific engagement with the GNSO, do we need to ask for funding for that GAC member or do we just assume that we will get it through our normal channels. I'm sorry if this sounds garbled. This is literally just a thought as I am talking out loud.

Jonathan Robinson: Suzanne, I think I'm going to take advantage of my position as chair of this group and just chip in here that at least as far as I understand things. From the GNSO point of view, there is an opening for a GAC liaison to the GNSO Council. But to the extent that you are referring to that as a possible additional mechanism for regulating engagement, that vacancy if you like exists.

I'm not speaking to how that would be funded, but simply from a GNSO perspective I can give you that answer. Now I know Manal is in the queue, but I think Olof also specifically put up his hand in response. So Olof, if you are responding directly to Suzanne, then please go ahead. If not, we will defer to Manal.

Olof Nordling: Thank you Jonathan. Yes, indeed. I mean we do have the particular support program for a maximum over 30 such as events from primarily - well not primarily. It is for (unintelligible) countries and small (unintelligible) states and the like. Those of who are in need of travel support within the GAC to get them to ICANN meetings.

So the way you phrase the questions I think is covered by the provisions we have already. Well at least to some degree. I mean (it's maximized at 30) for the time being, but for other purposes and for

other members, well then we would have to review that and perhaps also file another community budget request.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Olof. Manal.

Manal Ismail: Yes, thank you Jonathan. Actually, I'm mindful of what Suzanne is saying and I believe this is going to take some internal discussion even within the GAC. I believe and I truly understand that it's going to be (unintelligible) Singapore, but I was trying to investigate what mechanisms are at hand and whether London is going to be feasible or not.

Because I believe if we are trying to pilot, I think the last meeting of the year might be a bit late. Because again, this should feed into the work we are doing, so we want to get to progress.

I have to say that Olof has already wrote this request form to the attention of (Heather) and I was planning that we also bring it to the attention of the full GAC membership along with the charter as soon as we as a group here agree to both documents. And I believe as Suzanne said that this is going to be discussed even further than the GAC.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, so thanks Manal. What I understand and I will just test my understanding with you on the call now is that we are going to do a couple of things. We have this draft of the community request form. It is with the group and I think we should probably put a deadline on agreeing it providing there doesn't seem to be any objection to making this application for funding.

So for the moment, assuming there is no objection to doing so, it's really about making sure that it protects adequately and accurately represents the intention. So I think I would suggest that we put a deadline at the end of this week onto it and thereafter nail that down.

And I don't know then whether we then - I guess with the support of - Manal I guess we want to check with you. My thought is that we would then simply submit that to ICANN and communicate to the GAC and the GNSO. But are you suggesting that we hold off from submission to - of the budget request given that we do have the time I suppose for a couple of weeks in case there is any other feedback or comments. Or do you suggest that we simply communicate that this is what we have done?

Manal Ismail: Actually, I don't think it includes any obligation, so I'm not going to suggest that we hold it until the GAC discusses it, but I believe at least (Heather) needs to know and agree beforehand. Because at the end, she is the one who is going to co-submit this if I may. And again, if we get some feedback from the GAC, I believe we can still see how this is going to be reflected.

I mean I understand this is not a (unintelligible), so I do (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Manal. That's a very good point. Yeah, sorry, I didn't mean to cut you off. Go ahead if I have stopped you from saying something.

Manal Ismail: No, it's okay. I was just going to say unless others (unintelligible) GAC see otherwise.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, there are a couple of hands up, but certainly, I concur wholeheartedly with you that we must hear from (Heather) first before we submit it. But subject to that, I think we are on the same page. Mikey and then Olof.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Jonathan, it's Mikey. I'm going to revert back to the days when I was the controller of a multibillion dollar university and in charge of the budget process, and my thought would be that since this is a request for budget that's coming from the GAC and the GNSO, we as a working group or a drafting team or whatever we are don't have a lot of authority.

We should get this document to the budget committees of those two organizations as quickly as we can so that if there is a budget committee for the GNSO and if there is a budget committee for the GAC, they can make whatever priority choices this might represent and include it through that process.

I'm a little uncomfortable with us as a sort of informal drafting team directly submitting budget requests. It seems like there needs to be a step in the middle unless I'm confused here. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, that's a good point Mikey. Let's just hear from Olof and then I will put myself in the queue to respond to Mikey's comment.

Olof Nordling: Thanks Jonathan. This is Olof here. And just to follow up on what Manal said, of course we need (Heather)'s assent to this. And I've transmitted to her and I know she is traveling and getting back today, so I'm confident we will get feedback in time from her. If there would be

any changes, of course forward them to the list immediately, but so it's on her table and I will follow up on that.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Olof. And you will note Mikey and the others in the chat then that Marika has directed us to the fact that this is a community request form for a budget item and she has provided a link to that community request. So providing - you know I take your point Mikey on a procedure, but I must say for an item of this size and given the process, at present I don't uncomfortable providing it. It has been seen by and supported by (Heather) and all and properly communicated in the GNSO.

Marika your comment.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika and maybe just to add on to what I posted in the chat just clarify what this is. This is not - you know there is currently no process whereby indeed communities come up with a long wish list and that's allocated to a certain budget. This specifically relates to community special requests as they have been referred to.

And I think the last round and the budget before there was a certain amount that was made available for allocation into specific community requests made by chairs of the different SOs and ACs. So I think in that context, this request needs to be seen as basically there is a specific procedure in place. You know I think the documents on the link I sent you that basically goes over how these requests are being evaluated, what the process is for that.

And obviously, you know different groups may make different requests because of a specific procedure in place. It's not a question I think of prioritization within you know the GNSO or GAC on you know

allocating the funding, but it's a more complicated process that's done I think with staff evaluation involved there as it should to clarify that and provide you with a link to the relevant information.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, thanks for that link Marika and thanks for your question Mikey and others on this topic. I propose we deal with this by discussion on the substance of the application. If there are any questions and indeed I there are further comments having this session on process on the list and the deadline suggest of the end of this week to hand it back to staff or whatever the appropriate mechanism for a submission. Who would normally submit this then Marika? I guess if it's a community request, it should come from relevant community. So in this instance, it will be a request from myself and Heather as the respective community request is which is why it needs to have been, again have been reviewed in that why.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika, I actually checked the procedure and it doesn't specify that you actually have to submit it, so I think there is, you know, will be appropriate for all of it.

And I just submitted with you and Heather in copy of course provided that both of you agree with the submission. Or indeed you submit it directly to the address that's the provider at the top, so that's something we can I think arrange provided there are no further comments on this.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay fine, so let's move on with that then and then the next item under Item 2 is it is a point that from recollection was something which Mark Carvell raised but it may have been someone else, I may be missed or inaccurately recording this.

And this question is related to a track of work or a - probably something underneath this day-to-day work track which just says other - whilst we work on this - whilst this group's work is work in progress is there anything in the interim that we should be doing? Now I think we've implicitly highlighted one item and that is an ad hoc budget request potentially for if we get to that point for funding of a liaison to attend the London meeting, but there may be some other areas that we should do.

Now I don't know if anyone's got any suggestions as to how we handle this. It's quite possible that this is just handled as just a discussion item - an ongoing discussion item on our list - Mikey I see your hand is up.

Mikey O'Connor: Sorry Jonathan I didn't mean to cut you off, this is Mikey so if you were continuing on by all means finish - I just stuck my hand up because I've got an idea.

Jonathan Robinson: I'm happy that, you know, I was just saying that I was just trying to introduce it and make sure we were aware that that was one possibility, but no you didn't cut me off so please go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay, I started a thread on the list just before the call that might fall in this category and that is that we've got some working groups in various stages and I see that Marika chimed in on that same topic that we could start trying some things out on right away.

I was mostly responding to (Ana)'s point which is - and I agree it would be nice to get some things started and it may be some tentative early trial steps in terms of some of these working groups that are asking for

comments and so on would be something we could put into this category - I wasn't sure about that.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Mikey, I see (Ana) is supportive of that by virtue of her supporting in the chat. I mean I suppose the one thing that we should - we shouldn't underestimate and under-acknowledge if you like the fact is we are doing the work within this group.

Now I understand that's not specifically on specific policy items but I think in answering what are we doing in the interim we should say - we should bear in mind all of us that we're doing this consultation group. We certainly have in our minds that we may want to apply for ad hoc funding for a liaison to London - and now Mikey you together with (Ana) (if you are) at setting up the thought that we might get interaction with existing working groups.

And in so doing allow, you know, excuse me for a moment that it might be a GAC member participating in one or more working groups cut our teeth on some of these elements of interaction. So I mean my thought here and I'll look for your input - I see Marika's hand is up, is that this is something of an ongoing nature. I don't feel the need to conclude under this item right where we do A, B and C.

But I think we potentially collectively return an open mind to trials and trying out different ways of working and frankly reminding each other probably of some of the existing mechanisms by which we can work together as well - Marika your hand is up.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika and just to comment on what you already noted I mean that we I think already - and it's something that I wanted or

convey as well in the message I sent to the list is that we already see different ways in which at least GNSO working group's trying to reach out and get input.

I mean talking about, you know, GAC participating and working group we actually have (Jen) here on the call, she's a very active participant on the privacy and proxy accreditation working group which I think is really valuable. And even though, you know, she's not representing the GAC or providing the GAC a position, at least it means a government's perspective is provided to the working group which helps the group in its deliberations and understand, you know, specific perspectives that governments may have.

Of course it doesn't take away that it would be still really helpful to get, you know, additional input or, you know, a GAC position even on some of the charter questions. And similarly for the translation and transliteration working group, you know, they recognize as well that, you know, there may be certain countries that have specific expertise in this area.

So they decided as well that in addition to reaching out to, you know, the GAC as a whole that they, you know, approach some of the individual members of which they knew that probably would have certain expertise or views on the topic and try to get individual input. Again, you know, very clearly stating that anything you provide us with we understand that that's not a GAC position but it's individual, you know, government input or feedback which we will take as that.

And I think at least from, you know, coming from the GNSO working group perspective I think that's immensely valuable because at least it

means that, you know, some perspective - or certain government perspective is considered and available for the group to consider. Even though, you know, that may not mean that the view was shared with all governments. And as such I think, you know, having any kind of - even if it's, you know, an official GAC position or if there's a way of basically sharing with working groups like these are some of the different perspectives GAC members have shared in response to your request.

I think already that would be incredibly helpful, but again I think it's something really for the GAC to consider, you know, what you feel comfortable with and, you know, and which ways you can provide input or how you want to label it or share that. But I think at least from a GNSO perspective anything they can get their hands on I think will be helpful and especially early on in the process in understanding some of the sensitivities or some of the elements they may need to take into account as they work through the process.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks Marika and we have - and since your hand went up we've now got Suzanne and followed by Manal in the queue, so go ahead Suzanne.

Suzanne Radel: Well thank you for that and thank you for Marika for reminding us of some of these ongoing or as Mikey's put it, some of the newer ones and as well as reminding us of the overture to the GAC on privacy and proxy.

I'm very glad to hear that at least one GAC member is actively sort of commenting on it. But this is - this to me is one of the issues that in fact this joint group is trying to tackle. The fact of the simple act of an

overture is not getting enough attention on our side, so that is our issue
- I mean I think I'm happy to sort of have the GAC fully own that.

The issue then becomes - the next stage of the issue is even if you can attract the interest of some individual GAC members which I know is beneficial that still doesn't get us to where we ultimately want to go yes, which is getting GAC as GAC input into GNSO policy development procedures. Now maybe I'm wrong and maybe I'm beating this, you know, the wrong way - I think that it's given me at least I think more to think about that we need to take to the broader GAC.

Because I can guarantee you when countries do appreciate that privacy proxy - this issue is working its way through the GNSO there will be many, many more people around that table waking up. This is a very sensitive issue; it's a high, high priority in many, many, many countries. Now the fact that people aren't sort of responding to an overture about a charter does not surprise me. I know it's disappointing on your side, I'm going to go ahead and sort of attribute that to you and not in a negative way, I mean in a positive way.

So it's - this to me is a prime example of what we are trying to overcome. So I do think it's useful for us to be reminded that this is already built into the process. To me it highlights the fact that the problem is yes it is built in but it is not triggering the desired results. Now please disagree with me if you all think I'm crazy. I just think this is - to me this is a warning bell and if that is what I thought we were tackling, this is not enough.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes Suzanne if I may and a comment from the chat - two - one quick comment and then I remind, I mean certainly from my perspective that's an appropriate and timely reminder of the subject of this working group and I hear and understand exactly the point you've made.

Second just to remind us that in this particular point right now all we are focusing in on is whether there are any interim measures. And I understand exactly why you respond in the way you do because we could (protect) by saying, well in the interim we do what we've always done. And you're saying well that's a problem and I get it; but just to remind you that we aren't in any way as a working - as a consultation group in doing the work that we're doing here saying that the current solution is satisfactory.

Just simply under this bullet point exploring what interim measures could be in place and might be discussed. So that, I think that's important and your point is well taken by me at least on the work that this group needs to do to deal with the way things may not be working at this stage. Manal and then Mikey.

Manal Ismail: If Mikey was going to respond directly to Suzanne I can (discern) my intervention.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey, I was going to refine something just a bit, but no it wasn't direct to Suzanne - go ahead Manal.

Manal Ismail: Okay thank you, I was - frankly at the beginning I was not in favor of having a first work track that looked into yes an interim solution. I mean

if we concentrate our efforts to the ultimate solution I will give it to (be efficient).

In the meantime I think we should be benefitting from our discussion in progressing the current interaction between the GAC and the GNSO. And I thought maybe we can see what from our discussions would be implemented as early as now might be considered as an interim solution that these are ultimate need to define the setup that we would like to see.

So I'm not very sure what exactly this in fact this would but (unintelligible) I like the idea Mikey proposed but how are we going to implement it in practice. It might be a bit challenging but again worth the try like - thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Manal - Mikey your hand is up next.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Jonathan and let me sort of build on Manal's point and the conversation that (Gema) and I had in the chat.

It seems to me that there are two kinds of participation and one is much easier than the other. The one kind of participation in a working group comes in the form of a comment which is a fairly short duration task that a drafting team can knock out very quickly and then stop. Those comments are incredibly valuable to the working group, especially early in the process and they're relatively easy to prepare.

A much harder kind of interaction which is also extremely valuable but is much harder work is the kind of thing that (Gema) is doing and others where there's actual participation in the working group every

week for a year, etc., etc. You know, it's a much higher level of participation and commitment. And I think that in terms of the interim things we in the US sometimes call that low hanging fruit. I think comments is in - is more suitable to the things that we could do quickly and informally in the interim.

Whereas working our way through the whole issue of how do people participate, that's probably a taller order and I tend to agree with Manal it may distract us from our work. But if we could trigger a few comments from the GNSO in the interim while we're working I think that would be great for working groups and also great for us in learning some things for the work that we're doing - so there's my thought.

Jonathan Robinson: Mikey it's Jonathan, you said comments on the GNSO - I think I understood you to say comments from the GAC.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm sorry, yes sir you're absolutely right.

Jonathan Robinson: I was just making sure for the record if that was your intention. Yes personally I put my hand up and I see Marika's - just to highlight Marika's suggestion that it is potentially flagging one or more key work of working groups in the GAC/GNSO meeting maybe one of the internal practical measures we could take.

In other words I think the - there's a sort of implicit assumption that when the GAC meets with the GNSO in Singapore at our next meeting our agenda is likely to be dominated by a report back from this working group. However it is also likely I guess that this working group will influence the agenda of that joint meeting. And maybe one thing we

could do is try and highlight one or more with work of working groups that we think the GAC might like to pay particular attention to.

And that's not exclusive to Mikey's point that they could then potentially comment on. And so it seems like that there is something to be done on, you know, constructive suggestions for interim engagement that might come out of the work of this working group without it needing to be a full sort third work stream if you like. I think my sense is if we could keep it at a level of an email thread, perhaps even a standing topic on our regular meetings and just keep the kettle boiling that way.

So that's my kind of suggestion I guess and let me see - and Suzanne is I think a supporter of that and yes okay so that's a possibility, Suzanne recognizes that as a possibility. Okay great so I think there's potentially a way we can chalk through this which is keeping this as an active agenda item without necessarily spawning a whole new third work stream when we clearly have been frank. Or, you know, two work streams is probably enough for all of us at the moment.

So that's my sense and I see a nice little array of green picks in the chat room, so thanks very much that's helpful. All right let's try and close off this item then because we've got a couple more items and only ten minutes more on the call that we want to try and (cover up). Our next item then is just touch on the second major work track which is a PDP work track for which we have a working document now which combines from memory a Word and PowerPoint, you know, graphical and text-based analysis.

I guess this really just - I'm not sure we can do specific work on this but it's flagged as a - it's one of - clearly one of our key work tracks and

maybe here is an opportunity for either any comment if there's been any progress since our last meeting or any comments on the content or structure of this work stream. So I think this is one led by from memory Suzanne and Mikey and if either of you guys would like to make any comment please go ahead.

Mikey I see your hand is up and you seem to have morphed into a presenter so that maybe we're about to hear even more than just a comment from you - please go ahead Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey, I think it's Marika reading my mind again and knowing that I'd like to turn the slides for you.

One of the things that Suzanne and I agreed on is that the original attempt that I made to combine the Word document and the PowerPoint document resulted in something that was overwhelming - it was over 30 pages long. And so we've just very recently come up with an extremely shortened version that's only three pages long. And I just want to give you a really quick overview of it and then hand it back to you Jonathan.

So we have three pictures, the first picture is a new version of the process, in which what we've done is basically divided that same process into four phases. And what we're really thinking is that rather than focusing at the 12 steps or whatever it is that are all the way around the outside, that's too hard, that's too detailed and we may never dig our way out of that work. And so we're going to focus more on four phases and so that's just an introduction to that idea. And I see my co-chair's hand up so I'll stop and let Suzanne talk.

Suzanne Radel: Oh no, no, no I wasn't trying to do that, I was going to follow in after you completed and to say all sorts of fabulous things about you.

Mikey O'Connor: Cool I love that part, okay well so the next page is - gets to - it's the same picture clearly and this one is focusing primarily on the comment thread.

Remember I talked about participation and comment and it's sort of saying, look our current situation is fine which the GAC comments on the GNSO. But it does it fairly late in the process and what we would like to do is strive to move that comment type participation earlier and so that's all that's trying to highlight. Our thought is that, you know, these two slides could be used in a presentation in Singapore and not overwhelm people and so this is a fairly simple idea.

And then the last slide is just beginning to brainstorm some things that we could do that we could recommend mostly around the topic of comments. Again the thought being that we may come back with yet another one about participation. But as I said a minute ago that's a little bit more complicated and so that's sort of the state of our thinking. So with that I'll hand it over to my co-chair and then open it up to all.

Suzanne Radel: Thank you, Jonathan may - now may I go ahead and chime in?

Jonathan Robinson: Please go ahead Suzanne, I was expecting you to - go ahead.

Suzanne Radel: Oh thank you so much. Well thank you Mikey and just to explain to the group and I think Mikey has done an amazing job.

But, you know, it's funny we had a good conversation yesterday he and I going through the much longer deck. And I actually think that the longer deck is good for us as a project team - what are we calling ourselves by the way? Are we a project or a task force or what? Well anyway somebody can tell me later, but for us as a group - as a working group it's not bad to have the longer slide deck and to have all of the questions, the very detailed questions presented that way.

We were trying to look ahead to Singapore and wanted to address the fear that we had that the longer slide deck was going to be indigestible, I mean we wouldn't be able to make any headway. People would also probably run screaming from the room because it just looks, you know, so complicated, etc. So I want to really give Mikey enormous credit for figuring this out how to reduce this down to the three pages in a very, very short time to make it I think a more manageable approach for Singapore.

And in the interim I think he and are still going to, you know, tackle some of these - the questions that are raised in the longer slide deck. So I just wanted to chime in and applaud Mikey's effort because I could not have done it.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Suzanne and personally I'm more than happy to second that as well, I mean I think it's - I mean that's a very digestible format, those couple of slides. So I agree, very useful to indicate what's going on. Manal I see your hand is up.

Manal Ismail: Yes thank you Jonathan and thanks Suzanne and Mikey of course - I mean I was so excited to know that we are down to three slides and with Singapore in mind this is very promising.

But I would like also to know how are we going to provide feedback or answers to the questions that were included in the older version? I mean are we going to (prove) them and discuss them each group of questions that relate for example to a certain phase at the time? Or - and how are we going to reflect this in the current document?

Jonathan Robinson: Mikey I sense that you might - I know Marika's hand is up, but I sense that you might want to respond directly to Manal's question. So if that is the case please go ahead, if not please refer to Marika.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Jonathan, yes I was actually thinking that what we might do - this is a fairly fast moving document between Suzanne and me and we want to get it to the place where others can participate.

But we found that the first one was so big that we couldn't even figure it out, never mind asking you to. I'm quite taken with the format that Olaf and Marika have come up with as the second page of their document where the choices are arrayed across the top and then there's a series of questions that we need to ask about each choice. And my idea is to work on this list a bit more and then build a similar document to the one that Marika built.

And put these across the top and then have us as a group work through the answers. So that way our work stream would be very parallel and at the end of the day we would have basically two documents that looked a lot alike that would document our conversation about that - so that's my thought at the moment.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks Mikey, let's defer to Marika who is next in line.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika, I had a similar question as Manal and actually Mikey's response triggered me to comment on because that is actually I think what the outset was of the original document where indeed you had the table and where we try to identify the questions.

I think the thinking behind that was that we would first focus on what (does) currently exist and why doesn't that work? And from there be able to say, okay if we've indeed established that those options don't work or even the current form of them don't work or we haven't been able to identify how we can actually modify the existing options to make them work. Let's then start thinking about what other mechanisms do we need to think about.

I mean along the slide deck I can think it needs for presentation purposes I think it's, you know, bringing that to the whole GAC and the GNSO I think will make it easier to understand, you know, what we're thinking about and, you know, some of the things we're touching upon. But I think we still need as a group to go, you know, this smaller group to go through the access size of looking at all those existing engagement opportunities at the moment how those are being enacted.

And establish why they don't work so we can actually work through, you know, what will work or how we can make it work in the future. And I'm hoping as well that some - I know, you know, Mikey and Suzanne have been having conversation, but I'm hoping that some of those conversations will also take place in the, you know, broader group. Because I think several of us have been, you know, active participants in, you know, (promising) the GNSO side and (that from) the GAC side.

So we can really think through as a group on how to make that work and come up with, you know, ideas and, you know, hopefully make recommendations that and also can go back to the larger group for also consideration.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Marika, I'm mindful of the fact that we've hit the top of the hour. I mean I think that that sort of segues us very neatly into this expectation from both work tracks for the following call.

And my sense is that we've kind of come to that by virtue of the fact that what we're saying is we've got - we'd like to end up with some similar tables of record of a series of questions that seems to me that our objective should be to now start to populate those tables within initial answers. And so it seems like we've sort of naturally come to that answer. And I think we should set ourselves the target.

I don't want to say of the specific percentage complete or anything like that but I think we should make a decent goal of populating those two tables, recording the questions and providing some of the draft answers on our two work streams. So that's my suggestion, it seems that that's where we've come to naturally anyway. I don't know if anyone would like to make any comment and as I said mindful of the time that is a note to the next call. I see a couple of checkmarks coming up in the chat room which is great.

And I think I should also be mindful of the time, recognize that there may be additional comments under any other business. So let me open it up to either comments on that last point which is our expectations for the work in the interim and/or AOB. Right I see many

of you if not all of you have check marked in support of what I suggested, so that looks like we have a plan of sorts. Let me just pause for one moment in case anyone would like to make any last comments or remind me that we've forgotten something.

Okay I think that that's great and it seems like, you know, we've got some very nice material which frankly helps me feel confident as we head towards Singapore that we will be able to explain ourselves. We've clearly got some work to do in the meantime but there's good prospect of making progress there. That seems to me to have been a very constructive meeting and so I guess it's up to me to thank all of you for participation and particular to note the contributions of various sorts that have gone into this.

So it seems like we're already making a pre-balance deficit, we all seem to be participating so that's great news. Thanks everyone I think we'll call it a wrap at this stage. And so we'll be on the call in two weeks' time it's just a final reminder that we need to work together in the meantime on lists and between one another if necessary.

Man: Thanks Jonathan, see you soon.

Woman: Bye.

Man: Thank you, bye

Woman: Bye, thank you.

Woman: Bye-bye.

Woman: Bye-bye.

Coordinator: Thank you for calling the Digital Replay Service.

END