

**ICANN  
Transcription  
GAC GNSO Consultation Group meeting  
Tuesday 13 May 2014 at 13:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GAC GNSO Consultation Working Group call on the Tuesday 13 May 2014 at 13:00 UTC.

Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-gac-20140513-en.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#may>

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

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

Attendees:

Government Advisory Committee

Manal Ismail – co-chair – Egypt

Suzanne Radell - USA

Ana Neves - Portugal

Mark Carvell - UK

GNSO Council

Jonathan Robinson – co-chair - Registries Stakeholder Group

Avri Doria - Councillor

Apology:

Amr Elsadr – Non Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG)

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings

Olof Nordling

Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Welcome and thank you for standing by. At this time all participants are on an open and interactive line. Please utilize your mute button. If you do not have a mute button please press star 6 to mute and unmute your line.

Today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Sierra). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the GAC GNSO Consultation Group meeting on the 13th of May, 2014.

On the call today we have Jonathan Robinson, Suzanne Radell, Ana Neves, Manal Ismail and Avri Doria. We have an apology from Amr Elsadr.

From staff we have Marika Konings, Olof Nordling and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Nathalie. And welcome, everyone to the call. On behalf of your co chairs, Manal and myself, Jonathan Robinson. So you heard who's here. Avri, forgive me if I - I wasn't sure you were on earlier, maybe I just didn't see your name in the queue but it's great to have you here; it's first your first full meeting of this group I think.

So I thought it would be useful, notwithstanding the agenda that Manal has conscientiously put together again, to have a quick look back at the actions arising from two weeks ago and make sure that we're on track with those. So whilst they aren't in the Adobe chat room I'll just run through those just make sure we are clear on that.

So we said we were going to fill Mike O'Connor's slot which we've duly done with Avri volunteering to do so which is great. We have Amr confirmed as co lead for the PDP work stream but he's got some challenges in the very short term up until round about the end of this week.

We have a GAC slot vacated by Carlos Gutierrez and Manal, you were going to see if you could make any progress on that. I'm not sure if there's anything to report on that vacancy. I'll just pause for a moment to see if there's any comment on that.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Jonathan. No, actually, the delay is mine. I started a side conversation but then we did not conclude. And I think I'd rather do this at the London meeting maybe. I think bringing someone on board - I'm not sure this is - will be accomplished in due time so it's my fault; it's delayed on my part. But - and I'm also flagging out that it may be not until London so I hope you don't mind. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: No problem. And I see we are already diligently noting in the action items that we will seek to add an additional GAC member by or at London - I think it's really at the London meeting, we'll seek to recruit an additional member there then.

We made, what I think we're going to try and operate with as a standing rule, that the members of the Consultation Group have until the Friday of the week of the meeting to come back on any action item or update for comment and input. And if there is no contradiction to what has been agreed we will consider that agreed and work on that basis.

We are now running alternate team lead meetings on each alternate week at the same time of this meeting. And the objective really there is just to remind those you who perhaps weren't on the meeting last time it's an opportunity to spend 30 minutes on two successive - adjacent and sequential meetings and

the idea being to run through any concerns or issues or items with the topic and just try and keep the momentum going on that.

And the principle was that notionally there are two 30 minute team lead meetings for the team leads to get together and talk through things. But in practice it's likely that all 14 leads will be on the call and sort of in principle two of the team leads are more sort of listeners while the other two discuss their topic and vice versa. But as it turned out in practice on the last one we all contributed a little.

So we've just - that seems like a sensible way of working. I guess we've just got to be careful that it joins up properly with the main work and doesn't feel like a sub group going off on their own but rather is just meant to be a productive management tool I guess.

I'm just reading through the action list on a separate screen so if somebody does need to talk and I haven't noticed your hand go up just make a little interruption for the moment. And then on the day to day track we said we'd confirm our objectives and expectations on the mailing list which I think we've done a little bit on and request input where there are other options.

The focus was really to I think - well we thought we would be circulating the first two options, that's A and B of the day to day track, in a separate document for potentially circulating to the wider group - to our wider respective groups. I'm not sure we're quite there yet and we can come back to that as part of the main discussion.

And then as far as the PDP document we were going to try and review that document and break it up into phases. We spent a bit of time in the intermediate meeting talking about these phases and trying to understand what we meant by them because they weren't completely consistent so maybe someone else can help jog my memory when we come onto that in the main topic.

And then we proposed similar format. And I think this is essentially agreed; a similar format to the extent that the main agenda accommodates that as we had in Singapore which is really a joint session to provide an update and take feedback from the GAC and the GNSO on the work of the Consultation Group and ideally to find a similar slot for informal engagement. And I know there's some work going on in the background to try and facilitate that.

So those are the - that's a quick whistle stop. Any comments or questions on the existing actions before we go into the agenda proper?

All right, what we've done I think quite effectively is a few of us have managed to comment then on this day to day work track. It feels to me like we are settling around some common positions. And it's really just reminding me and all of us that this breaks down into A, B, C, D, E, F options.

And whilst we were thinking about really concentrating on perhaps a couple of them, and in this case it may be A and B which is the liaison, which I should remind you has now - we now have funding for from the annual meeting in LA, which is in November this year.

So I think where we got to we were considering settling on just working on A and B and really developing those and finalizing those. The others are the prospect of this - well there's C, D, E and F and they have various possibilities.

Manal, go ahead.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Jonathan. Just a quick comment on the approach and the selected options. Initially when Marika circulated the document she followed our suggestion that we go by discussing two options. She suggested Options 1 and 2 in the email and those did not really match A and B in the documents.

So the suggested 1 and 2 over the email matched I think A and F which I thought it made a lot of sense they were like complementary. So I started commenting on A and F and then found that C was a little bit confusing for me versus F. So those - the three I started commenting on it's A, C and F.

I'm just flagging this out not to confuse everyone just to clarify why the start. And then, I mean, people started commenting on the comments and this is why you may find that some later options have so many comments rather than Option B, more than Option B.

So I'm just clarifying why we did not start A and B as per the document.

Jonathan Robinson: Manal, rather than confusing things you assisted clarity and that's very helpful. And you highlight slightly my confusion and that's helpful rather than adding to any sense of difficulty here. I understand that - and remember that now. So to remind everyone A is the liaison or so called at times, reverse liaison. This is the funded position of someone arising out of the GNSO, like the GNSO Council, and possibly even a very recently or relatively recently retired councilor, to be confirmed who will act as a liaison point.

F is the so-called GNSO PDP liaisons. And where I recall we got to with that was thinking about them - those GNSO PDP liaisons as a resource to the reverse liaison and so much so that they could either help brief and keep the GNSO liaison briefed and informed and potentially even be taken to a briefing on a particular PDP topic as necessary with the GAC. So it makes a lot of sense to link A and F and I can see that. And that squares up quite neatly.

As far as the buddies on the topics, which is the other one you highlight that point C, Manal, I mean, when I look at that I see something which is about, to the extent that there's an opportunity there to build a bridge on a particular topic and appoint one or more individuals to work from the GAC and the GNSO.

And I could see how that - to work together on ensuring that there - both - everyone is kept well informed. And I think those kind of topics were envisaged to be topics that were of - had had been highlighted via the liaison work or other channels to be of particular importance.

And generally we've taken that particular importance to be topics of public interest I think is the phrase we've used, you know, particular and substantial public interests, in other words, of particular interest to the GAC rather than, for want of a better expression, more run of the mill GNSO PDP work.

And that may be a big enough chunk to work with, that A and F with clarity on C. I was aware of this other point which is in and around E and this is where there's been a little bit of comment as well. This is the awareness and notification.

And we could certainly move that ahead in principle by what I proposed which was the survey so I'm bringing in not only working on A and F, possibly C, but also suggesting that we might be able to work on E as well in terms of dealing with that which is the awareness and notification and just perhaps highlighting in a simpler form as possible to the GAC the extent to which the GNSO does make the GAC aware of and notify the GAC of issues and then survey as to the usefulness and effectiveness of that.

So I'm suggesting that we could possibly make that small step on E. And then finally as far as F is concerned, which is the GNSO PDP liaison, I don't think that's inconsistent with A which is the liaison - the single liaison and should be used as a resource.

So I'm proposing that - I guess that seems to me a - I hope I haven't - Manal, please come back to me and push back if you think I've taken what you felt we were getting - doing some work on simplifying the task because I am conscious that by the time we get to London we want to be a position where we can present both information and focused questions for support.

And if you think I'm over-complicating it by potentially bringing a portion of E and F in we can pull back from that. But it struck me that it may be possible to knit all of that together focusing in on A and F - sorry, focusing in on A and F and also potentially adding E I suppose.

So any comments or thoughts on that? Manal?

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Jonathan. Yes, I'm fine with your proposal. Again, the reason I commented on C was to just - I personally was confused and the pros and cons for one option you have to know the difference between the different options. So that's why I introduced discussion on C just to clarify the difference between Option C and Option F.

But I'm totally okay with getting E into the discussion even before C. I don't mind.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay and I see there seems to be - thanks, Manal - I see there seems to be support from Suzanne and Ana in the chat on this as well. It seems to me then if we were to go down that route what we could do is we could present this range - A to F. I'm envisaging the conversation we as a group would have with the GAC and the GNSO in London and with the wider community.

And say we've looked at A and F but we've picked out in the short term not to the exclusion of any options but with the intention of making productive progress on a limited subset without excluding them on A, F and E.

And, Manal, I take your point, I need to look personally - and I suspect others may as well, think more about C and whether that integrates or doesn't integrate with what's going on. But so far that would seem to be a reasonable target because F doesn't take a lot of - a lot more work.

E is the development of a survey. And by - that's really for the most part what I'm proposing is summary and survey in relation to E. So we wouldn't be completing E but we would be providing that discrete chunk of work on E.

And then as far as 1 and 2 are concerned our 1 and 2 priorities is really dealing with A and F which is this GNSO liaison to the GAC and working with potentially the GNSO PDP liaisons.

Now in doing that I think we could be - that could be a discrete enough piece of work to present well and handle and also put to our respective groups for support. But it strikes me that the critical piece of work in all of that is this - what I've called in loose terms, the job specification, the role of - the detail and the role.

Suzanne, just let me check your comment here. So you say Option C, which of course is the buddies on topics, could be somewhat further down the road. Yeah, I agree with you; once members of the GNSO and the GAC have had some experience with these new mechanisms, as done Suzanne. Yeah - as does Manal, apologies, Suzanne.

Mark, nice to see you're on line as well. I haven't noticed that already. Welcome back. So for the record we'll just note that Mark Carvell has joined us and is part of our group again which is good to see after enforced absence due to illness from a couple of sessions.

Mark Carvell: Yes, glad to be back. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Great, Mark. So, Mark, actually that's - I hope we've done a good job in sketching this out and having our - there's a little dialogue we've been having so far and bringing you up to speed with where we are at least on this track. So that feels about right.

And then I think, as I say, it seems to me the substantive work then is this - which I note our diligent support staff have noted in the action items is getting this role specification. And it feels to me that that's a key piece of work.

So one of the points that Manal had made, which I happen to agree with, is as we make these sort of agreements and make progress here we just need to cross check that with the - sort of program management or project management which is our work track. So I guess the action is cross check in the agreement or outputs from the meeting with the work track and make sure they square up against each other.

Any other - so just checking if Marika, I'm not sure if it's Marika or Olof - you've got it there, thank you.

So any other - and, yeah, confirmed progress with work plan and adapt work plan as necessary. That's the kind of project I like, you can manipulate the project plan to reality. I think we have to be pragmatic here and recognize that some of this is evolving as we go along.

All right, any other comments or questions on this part of the work, this day to day? Olof.

Olof Nordling: Yeah, thank you Jonathan. Olof here for the record. Concerning the survey, well, that's - I fully agree and I think we all agree from GAC members present. So concerning the survey in order to get some kind of assessment on the usefulness of the early awareness documents they do receive now since quite some time.

So a survey rather to be - let's just be very clear that should be performed and reported in London. That's how I interpreted what you said.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Olof. I hadn't got quite firmed up in my own mind and would be expecting, I guess, input on this. But certainly it struck me that we could do the two things, as I said, summarize the current engagement so that anyone reading the document was naturally informed by virtue of the sort of header to the document and then that followed with an included survey or an appended or attached survey.

And I guess my assumption was that - and this is - I haven't even got quite this far but thinking about it out loud, as it were, what seems to me is that in order to do that it would make sense to do it perhaps in London and then deliver the results immediately afterwards.

And perhaps even by, you know, sort of wandering around the room a little or at least publicizing it at our joint meeting and really trying to encourage participation in the survey. But certainly at the last I would expect to advertise and distribute it in London whether or not we could report on the results is an open question. That would be my kind of thought on timing. Welcome any comments.

Olof Nordling: Thanks for clarifying. I would certainly agree to that.

Jonathan Robinson: And I think, Olof, we'll probably be looking to yourself and Marika to help us. Thanks, Manal, I see your checkbox has gone up in the group. And I think we'll be looking for yourself, Olof, and Marika to help us build that document. It needed be too heavy weight but - and it may well be an online survey with a briefing document that goes with it. I'm imagining one or two page briefing document with a sort of 10-minute survey.

And it kind of kills two birds with one stone. It does get the survey results but also publicizes the way in which we work and this piece of work at the same time.

And that - off my screen is a checkbox from Olof and Suzanne, which is great. So I think we feel like we've got a natural way forward with all of that. I'm pretty immersed in this component of the work so I might stumble a little bit more on the PDP side of things.

And in fact I'd be more than happy to have - if anyone would like to volunteer to sort of lead the discussion component under Item 2. I haven't asked anyone ahead of the meeting to do so but if anyone is so willing I would welcome a volunteer to lead. Suzanne, I see you have put your hand up so let me hear from you and perhaps that is a volunteering hand as well.

Suzanne Radell: Well thank you Jonathan. Suzanne Radell for the record. I'm happy to sort of open up and then clearly I would very much welcome getting other people's views.

Marika has done of course as usual a fabulous job of, you know, representing the material. And it struck me that at least from the GAC side as a GAC member I wasn't very clear whether some of our headings were matching up to the diagram of the GNSO PDP itself, the individual steps.

And so I tried to take a crack at that issue so that we could be, all of us on the same page. And it may just be me out of step that the PDP steps are so clear to the GNSO side. I just thought, well, is there any way to make it slightly more clear to the GAC side because we would be looking to that chart, that diagram.

So I wanted the language - I'm asking the question as to how can we square the language? Where do we do issue identification, issue scoping? How do we label that on the chart?

And if I'm dead wrong, you know, people should hopefully help me understand that this is not helpful. When I stopped there and see if Marika wants to chime in, I see she's typing.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. And her hand is now up, Suzanne. So let's do that. And I think my impression, and Marika may bear this out, is that - her comments may bear this out is that Mikey took a bit of poetic license in order to illustrate by dividing the phases into the sort of quadrants that we do need to make sure we are on the same page linguistically. So let's hear from Marika and see if we can do that.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. So that's absolutely correct so basically the phases as they are now broken down actually match the breakdown that Mikey had suggested in a think his PowerPoint presentation where he had a little cycle. And I think he broke it down into four big phases.

But if it's clearer and easier to link this to the actual PDP graphics for the next iteration I can just do it in that way and indeed match the headings in each of the phases with the relevant steps in each of the graphics that we have for the PDP online.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Marika. I mean, certainly I'll support that we need consistent terminology. Our job is to try and enhance communication and break down any issues of confusion we need to have.

And I understand why Mikey did what he did; he wanted to sort of break it down to those simple quadrants and say, look, involvement of the GAC, it was a presentational technique would be best in the first quadrant, good in the second and so on or however he did it.

That realistically - and I suppose this is something where we may want to home in on this area is really, I mean, that's the whole point of this, I mean, we don't callout, we collect GAC engagement in the GNSO policy PDP or GAC GNSO Consultant Group, that really the buzzword, if you like it's early engagement.

So I think we were heading towards focusing in on how we - on a bite-size chunk and maybe discussing involvement in the first of two or three early phases in the first instance. But maybe someone can help me there as well. Suzanne.

Suzanne Radell: Thank you, Jonathan. Suzanne here for the record. If you'll recall last week's team leader meeting Amr made a very interesting suggestion that we start with the good and work backwards to the best.

And I see the attraction there. But I would like to get others' views as to whether that might - it might be somewhat confusing because we'd be apparently working backwards. So as a very literal minded policy - well it strikes me I would like the early engagement approach to actually start with the very first phase.

So again I would like to get other people's views as to whether we are, you know, it's good, better, best. I'd like us to start with best since that's the long-term goal and then work back but am open. I just thought I would put it up there.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Suzanne, for accurately getting that reporting that. And let's see, Manal, your hand's come up since Suzanne's vote so let's hear your input on that.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Jonathan and thank you, Suzanne, for bringing this up. Because as you mentioned when Amr suggested this last call it was a creative suggestion that I was not ready to respond to yet but thinking well, I think we should be going in sequence. I mean, we should be targeting to do all the engagement as early as possible then whatever remains or as a second iteration comes later.

So I can't really picture how we can do it in reverse order because I think we should do all whatever we can to encourage the engagement at the early

stage and then take it from there and see what's remaining or whether there are opportunities for (some) iterations and then go to the later stages. So I'm in favor of taking them in sequence as they happen. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Manal. And if I interpreted Suzanne's point, Avri's point and in fact my own person view as well I think we are - seem to be aligned in a view that early as possible is good.

And, you know, personally one of the - I can rationalize that I noting that one of the challenges we faced in the past is, if it's not self-evident is that the GAC getting involved at a later stage causes both logistical and, for want of a better description, emotional problems.

Whereas so it feels to me like focusing in on the chronologically the early stages and dealing with the mechanics of how we might manage that and you know in theory at least if we got that right we may not need involvement at the later stages but of course we can work through it in sequence and see what involvement is appropriate.

So my sense is that there is a - notwithstanding Amr, and it's a shame he's not here to represent that although I think it's accurate to say he did say he was providing some creative and, you know, thoughtful suggestion but not necessarily advocating for it very strongly. So unfortunately he isn't able to be here and we can hear from him again when he here's this recording or otherwise.

But it seems to me the balance here is of a view that we should concentrate on some early stages. So then if that is to be the case the question is which ones of, you know, how many - as we've just worked through on the day-to-day involvement we selected, 2, 3.5, something like that, the question is which stages.

Have we agreed that already or is that something we now need to consider?  
Suzanne.

Suzanne Radell: Thank you, Jonathan. Suzanne here. I actually think once we see a revised document with Marika's help, you know, that matches up the terminology, I think that will be much more clear in everybody's minds as well as our broader memberships, yeah, as to why are we focusing here and how does this process currently work in the GNSO.

I think that's certainly an informational element that I personally don't really have. And that would help us then get to the actual mechanism. So this is how issue identification and issue scoping - and maybe they come together in your world, I'm not entirely sure I know that.

And maybe - I don't know whether this group could agree, could we break down those initial steps so if it issue identification, issue scoping, issues report? Do those three come together?

We might want to consider how to package it so as we explain this to people in London it's more clear to them as to how we are tackling the different stages, why did we combined these steps and then linking back to the day-to-day mechanisms because that's the whole point or at least that's how I see it.

So I like where you're going with this. I don't have firm views, I would actually defer to GNSO colleagues as to what makes the most sense in terms of packaging the stages. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Suzanne. That's helpful. I'll go straight to Marika since her hand has, in the meantime.

Marika Konings: Thanks Jonathan. So just to note indeed that I think there - before we're probably able to identify, you know, which stages may be the focus I think

some of the questions or issues that are currently in the documents are indeed clarifying questions.

And I think Suzanne already alluded to those so there may be a need to actually first walk through some of these steps so it's really clear to everyone what it currently entails to indeed be able to identify which may be the ones that we should focus on, you know, to consider improvements or changes or enhancements to existing processes and procedures.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Marika. So just to clarify that, are you, I mean, two questions - to clarifying questions. As the document currently stands do the phases not reflect what is commonly understood within the GNSO to be the phases of a PDP, i.e. as they reflect on the Website?

And, two, are you suggesting that we walk through the document now and begin to deal with some of these clarifying questions in order to better assist us next time round when we look at the phases?

Marika Konings: Yeah, so this is Marika. So to clarify the steps in here are what is the current process in that PDP. Just to note that these are the existing steps that have engagement components. I don't think we included here, you know, some of the steps that are just, you know, Council only or for example some of the requirements of the working group. These are really the ones that focus on whether there are existing opportunities for either engagement or participation or some kind of outreach to others outside of the GNSO.

And I think to your second point, yes, one suggestion could be just to walk through the different and truly make sure because what we captured here is indeed, you know, the opportunity for input as it's identified that may be indeed it's not clear enough or not enough information is provided how that actually works in practice.

And I think, Suzanne, you know, some of the questions and read I think go more to a clarification of how that currently happens which I guess will then help identify whether indeed there certain additional options or approaches that would need to be considered.

While I think looking at some of the comments that Mikey introduced they actually go more to potential solutions or proposals so maybe those are the ones to set aside for now so at least I think we all have a common understanding of how these different steps currently work, what are the method by which the GNSO currently seeks input or engagement so that we're then able to consider you know, why doesn't that work or, you know, how should that be changed.

And I think as I mentioned as well on the last of course as part of those conversations what may come out as well is that steps are missing. So as I said these are steps that are existing in the current PDP but it shouldn't preclude conversations on, you know, should there be additional steps or are there parts that are missing as we go through this which may also be identified as potential proposals or suggestions, I guess.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Thanks Marika. It's a question really of how best to use our time in these meetings and during the intermediate when we are able to comment on the document and provide shared comments on the document.

I think we have time to potentially talk to some of these issues working through the document. I think that may be a good suggestion. Any comments or indications as to whether that's a productive use of time? I mean, normally we've got another 20 plus minutes where we could try and talk through some of these, we could work our way through this.

In fact what I might do, Marika, is ask you to lead us on this and say well this is - because at the moment the question is how do we, you know, but

mechanics do we actually use at present and start to talk through those?  
Suzanne.

Suzanne Radell: Thank you, Jonathan. Suzanne here for the record. I guess what would be helpful to me, and again apologies, I'm going to have to drop off very, very shortly. Am I asking intelligent questions? I mean, I fully accept that these may not be the right questions.

So I guess what wasn't clear from the chart - and thank you I feel better, this is not a criticism of Mikey at all - as I went through it, you know, in more detail than I had before perhaps it struck me that well wait a minute, is there not a step we have not outlined? And it could just be ignorance on my part. I don't know how issues are identified and scoped and then the issues report.

Mikey seems to go straight to the working group kind of function because - and in fairness I think that was what the GAC had proposed right, when we had kind of (unintelligible) little red boxes in your chart.

But the more I thought about it I thought, well wait a minute, isn't there an earlier phase? Is that an appropriate step that currently isn't being used as a platform for GAC GNSO engagement? Does it make sense to actually use that as a platform?

So if people could help guide me before I have to drop off the call as to whether these questions actually make sense to you. I hope they do. They are certainly questions that I have, just one person. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, thank you Suzanne. And a queue is beginning to develop here. But I'll just see if anyone would like to respond directly to your question which is really about involvement at the very earliest stages as I understood it.

And so I note that Avri notes in the chat that the GAC can file an issues report and big GAC is able to do so and that may be a good place to start and

respond to a draft issues report which is the very earliest stage, if you like. It's the - anyone may identify an issue but then once that issue is identified, provided it passes a very low threshold within the GNSO Council, work commences on that issue informally framing that issue via the process known as an issue report or issues report.

I don't see any direct responses unless of course Manal and Mark, who are in the queue are responding directly. Let me go to you, Manal, and then afterwards onto Mark.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Jonathan. And actually I don't have answers to Suzanne's question. In fact I was going to concur with her on the importance of engaging the GAC as early as the issues report.

I've had one good experience with the ccNSO on this at the time of the fast-track. And we developed the issues report jointly. And I think this helped a lot during the discussions later. Instead of repeating and asking questions and, I mean, getting people early engaged in this helped advancing and progressing things at later stages.

I have another proposal regarding our discussions that I leave this until the end if Mark is going to talk into substance.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay well thanks, Manal. Why don't you put your hand down and put it up again immediately so you come back in the queue after Mark and let's hear from Mark then. Thanks for deferring to him so go ahead, Mark.

Mark Carvell: And thank you Jonathan and thank you colleagues for commenting. I mean, it did strike me that as set out in the annex there does seem - well it was my expectation that there should be a formal engagement step at the time of issue report. It may be a fairly straightforward one simply ensuring that the GAC is aware that an issue report has been prepared and exists and has the opportunity to react.

But I think you need some kind of formal understood step here at that point and then that will prepare the ground for working group activity but after some interval perhaps of the GAC consideration and the GAC interaction but with GNSO colleagues.

So I would just sort of concur really with what Manal and Suzanne have been saying that we seem to, you know, we do need some kind of formal step earlier in the process. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Mark. So it feels to me like we're heading towards focusing in on this issue of identification report area. But let me not preempt that and hear a response from Marika and then we'll go to Manal.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I think partly to Mark's point and Suzanne's point to just clearly note as well that currently there is this engagement moment or opportunity. And I think what we're trying to do through this document is trying to identify how that, you know, formal engagement should take place.

But once the preliminary issue report is posted for public comment announcements go out to all the SOs and ACs encouraging to provide input. And the idea there that indeed input is provided on the content of the issue report which really tries to scope the issue what is really the issue we're trying to address, you know, is there anything missing?

And that is of course an obvious place where, you know, the GAC could flag any, you know, public policy considerations or any part of the issue that they believe should be considered as part of the PDP as well as providing input to the GNSO Council on whether or not to initiate a PDP on the topic, that's another specific question we usually put out that the GNSO Council can take that as part of their consideration on the PDP as they need to take a decision for those issue reports that have been requested by either the Council or by

advisory committees as for Board requested PDPs actually move straight through to the next level.

And so as we pointed out, you know, in the current method for seeking input what now happens is the announcement is posted on the ICANN Website, it's on the GNSO Website, public comment forum is open. The announcement for that is, you know, distributed to the Secretariat and, you know, presumably that's also gets shared then with the GAC.

I think one of the questions is indeed is that what you're looking for? Is there another way in which that outreach should happen? You know, is that a direct communication that should go out from Jonathan to Heather and, you know, should a conversation be had at that time to really make the GAC aware of what the issue report is about or is there anything else, you know, fundamentally missing from what we currently do in that step?

And again I think that's really what we're trying to work through in these different items, trying to, you know, explained what currently happens and understand, you know, why that may not work for the GAC and, you know, what could potentially be done, you know, to make sure it accommodates, you know, GAC early participation and engagement in the discussions.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Marika. And one question I would like on the table I think as well is, you know, all of this assumes - and I think this is - I don't want to be too provocative here but I do think it's something we need to think about. We tend to have the assumption that the GNSO could or should do something different. And that may well be the case.

But I think we should also, at every stage, be asking the question, could the GAC or should the GAC do something different to adapt its processes and mechanisms to that flow of information?

So it's got to be a two-way thing; either the - either the GNSO and/or the GAC could or should be adapting methods of working in order to better facilitate this engagement. And so that's something we must be careful we don't, I mean, I guess our old - the error of our old ways was pushing - throwing a whole lot of information over the fence and saying, well, we told you so.

And on the flip side we've got to be careful of absolutely adapting that information and yet not achieving the desired outcome because it still falls on fallow ground. So those are just some thoughts in there. And we need to be mindful of that.

Manal.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Jonathan. Let me try to respond briefly on what has been discussed before getting into what I initially intended to say. I believe from the GAC side, but again I'm sure that GAC chair would be in a better position to give us feedback on this.

I believe we need things to be streamlined into the GAC agenda. I mean, we have so many things in parallel, some of which should be more important than others. So I'm trying to suggest what the GAC should be doing, as you have suggested, I mean, we always say that GNSO should be doing.

And I think when it comes to the GAC we have to do two things, prioritize things which might not necessarily match the deadline of certain PDPs let's also acknowledge where did the GAC intends to provide some feedback to the specific PDP or not. I mean, because again we cannot spend a PDP waiting forever.

So - but again with the current load and the current sequencing and the pressing deadlines this doesn't seem to be working easily within the GAC. But again as I mentioned maybe we should outreach also to the GAC chair and hear her views on this.

I'm not sure whether I can go straight ahead on some of the work modalities or wait until we conclude on the substance.

Jonathan Robinson: I think it's up to you, Manal. I'm feeling - I mean, we're coming towards 10 before the hour or coming up towards the top of the hour, I think we're actually five before the hour. So I'm thinking we need to try and pull this together now into - I have a feeling for this might go on the PDP side as well so that we have a way out of here.

I wonder if we could just...

Manal Ismail: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...trying to do that hear from Olof if he's got some brief input; I see his hand is up. And then perhaps you and I can, together, try and pull this together.

Olof Nordling: Yeah thank you, Jonathan. Olof here. Very, very briefly just to remind everybody that in the early awareness documents now the first steps that are indicated in a graphic are issue identification, issue scoping and issue report.

So the very early stages are clearly marked there and perhaps we've, at least, would need to be consistent across either change that or changing the document we have we have consistency.

But those are the steps that are identified and marked than in the early awareness document that come of course they come in a bunch once a month. And that could be discussed when and how such notifications should be given. So just a little comment.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Olof. Manal, let me come back to you and then we can try and pull this together in terms of where we take this. It feels like we are coalescing around focusing in on the issue identification reporting and focusing in on making sure we're all clear on current mechanisms of communication and then on how we might ensure that those are either properly heard, properly acted upon and properly reflected on should they be responded to back within that GNSO.

So what are your thoughts on - I think you used the term modalities or mechanisms of taking this forward, Manal?

Manal Ismail: Sorry. Thank you, thank you, Jonathan. I was just going to encourage colleagues that we do the commenting early on during the two weeks between the calls, I mean, so that may be - it's hard to go through the comments on the calls.

So if we start commenting early on and then we try like 48 hours before the call with the help of Marika and Olof that we conclude the comments that have been submitted and then share this version for discussion where we really have some converse views to discuss rather than an interactive comment that's hard to go through over the call. So I think this way we can conclude easily on substance during the call. Thank you, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Apologies, Manal, I got slightly distracted by an incoming email. If I could ask you just repeat that final point again. I apologize.

Manal Ismail: It's okay. Yes, I was just saying that colleagues should be encouraged to provide comments early on during the two weeks between the calls rather than shortly before the call so that it could be easier to conclude others views maybe like 48 hours before the call and have a version that could be discussed and hopefully we can conclude on some of the issues over the call.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. I agree with you. And I agree with you slightly reluctantly only in the sense that I'm one of the guilty parties of providing comments late in the period; it seems to rush by these week or two between the meetings.

So let's try and see if we can wrap up where we've got to hear. I mean, we seem to provide a satisfactory conclusion in and around where we might go on the day to day work program. We seem to be focusing in on concentrating on, for the short-term, the issue identification reporting stage as far as the PDP is concerned.

My sense is, although I won't try and articulate it now, that these two are quite coherent, the two of them together. That actually these will dovetail and they don't exist as independent streams of thought or work and they will marry up quite well.

And then As far as our agenda today was concerned I think we were thinking about whether we could, in addition to what we've talked about in these two work streams, what we might be able to share with our different groups based on this call.

I think we're probably still - we need to firm up what we've agreed to then and we're in a position to do so. So as a kind of intercessional update I can see how we could pull together and intercessional update that says, we're working on to streams, we're going down this route and this route on the two streams and will be coming to you with a survey in London.

So I can see the prospect of an update going to the two groups. And we can perhaps agree what that date might be. I'd be willing to volunteer to try and capture that so - and work with you on that, Manal, as a cochair and the two of us could capture what that's update might be.

And then we've already talked about matching our progress to our work plan. So that feels like the way forward. Let me just pause for one moment if

there's any other comment or input. I see you're happy to work with me on that, Manal, and I think you're supportive of that as well.

So feels like we - whilst we're all a bit overwhelmed we are making some incremental progress here subject to doing some detail work between meetings. And it's great to have Mark back. I know we will get Amr back on stream fully soon and we've obviously got Avri involved so I think we've got a few more hands on deck as it were. And we should be in a position to make some continuing progress so that feels okay to me.

All right, seeing no other hands, I think that's probably the time to conclude the meeting or more or less on the hour. Mark, I see your question about how we might report to the GAC in London. Yes, I think we envisage something very similar to what we did in Singapore where we will actually present an update.

As the way I would see that working myself, if I could go out on a limb here is we would represent the focus and objectives of the work and then present the achievements to date, which as far as the day to day work will be what progress we've made on A, F and E options as we talked about earlier in the call and in addition what progress we've made in and around this issue identification state of the PDP.

So I would expect to report - and ideally will be coming out of London with a sort of sign-off from both groups again on the agreed programs today. Which I should remind you the most substantial of arguably will be that commitments to the liaison as specified.

And we will work between now and London on that specification so that between London and LA we can recruit that liaison for appointment - can someone help me there? Will that liaison be - are refunded to appoint from LA or from the meeting after LA? From LA, yes.

So actually we will want that liaison to be in place at LA so we want to sign off on that in quotes, job description, in London such that we can get on to recruit from then.

So hopefully that's an appropriate summary and helpful to you, Mark. That should cover it.

Mark Carvell: Yeah, Jonathan, thanks. Yes, Mark speaking. That's great in London. I was just wondering if we can help to fire up colleagues before London, you know, with some kind of digestive of the progress before - maybe you have this in mind, you know, some kind of paper that would go into the briefing for GAC colleagues way in advance of the London meeting so that colleagues will have some chance to digest it and develop their own thoughts and thinking and contribute to fuller exposition at the actual face-to-face discussion. So that's what I was thinking. Thank you for Manal for sort of picking up the before element.

My thanks to you both for fantastic leadership on this by the way and for all the support from Marika and Olof and others. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Mark. And I think that's what I was hope - what I was suggesting was I hadn't quite got to that point but in capturing an update, which I can work on with Manal over the next couple of weeks, we can get a status report. And it need be that either that is good enough or we use that as the seed on which to build and grow a more comprehensive intercessional or pre-London update.

So I think we can get there and it's just a matter of understanding the format. But, yeah, so hopefully that - and that can be the start of the work on both the - I understand exactly your point that you want to get something out prior to the presentation that actually given in London. And I'm sure they'll be variations on a theme but I understand your point that we want something out in advance.

And thanks for acknowledging the work that's gone on so far, appreciate that as well. All right let's call it a day there then. I think we are in reasonable shape. Just give one more moment to see what Avri is typing if there's - just to make sure we capture that. And then I think we'll - thank you, Avri, for your help volunteering there. We certainly we'll rope you in as much as possible.

Okay thanks, everyone. We'll conclude the call at that. We can stop the recording and look forward to talking with you again in two week's time. That reminds you please be as active as you possibly can manage to be on list in the meantime. All right thanks again.

Mark Carvell: Okay thanks. Bye.

Marika Konings: Thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thanks very much, (Sierra), you may now stop the recordings.

END