**ICANN
Transcription
GAC GNSO Consultation Group meeting
Tuesday 15 July 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 15 July 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-20140715-en.mp3

On page:http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#jul

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
Mark Carvell, UK

GNSO Council
Jonathan Robinson – co-chair - Registries Stakeholder Group
Avri Doria – Councillor - NCSG
David Cake, Vice Chair – NCSG
Amr Elsadr, Councillor

Apology:
Suzanne Radell - USA
Ana Neves - Portugal

ICANN Staff:
Marika Konings
Julia Charvolen
Glen de Saint Gery
Olof Nordling
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: At this time this call is being recorded and you may begin.

Terri Agnew: Thank you, (Shirley). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This
                    is the GAC GNSO Consultation Group call on the 15th of July, 2014.

                    On the call today we have Jonathan Robinson, Amr Elsadr, Avri Doria and
                    Mark Carvell. We have no apologies for today's call.

                    From staff we have Glen de Saint Géry, Julie Charvolen, Marika Konings,
                    Olof Nordling and myself, Terri Agnew.

                    I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before
                    speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to
                    you, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Terri. Hello everyone. Welcome back after ICANN 50 in London.
                    And good to have you back on - in the group. I see we're a little short of
                    numbers today. I'm not sure who we would normally have, probably at least
                    David Cake from the GNSO and Manal did give apologies that she would be
                    a little late.

                    So I'm - is a small concern about numbers. Maybe we can make a first action
                    item to write directly rather than just to the group directly to everyone
                    reminding them of this call schedule and of the need to participate as
                    effectively as possible.

                    Welcome back, Mark. I think it's a while since we've had you on a call but I
                    may be doing you a disservice here but in any case great to have you here.

Mark Carvell: Yes, thank you Jonathan. Good to be taking part. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Good. so our agenda item, as you'll see, our agenda, as you'll see, that
                    was discussed between Manal and myself was to really try and pick up on -
                    just remind ourselves and see if there's any loose ends coming from London

or just making sure we're all on the same page and then to deal with some other items. To pick up the two different work tracks again.

So as far as the GNSO liaison to the GAC is concerned just to remind you where we are with that, we created and agreed a spec, we've put out an announcement calling for input so - sorry, for applicants for that specification.

And I believe the deadline for that is the 31st of July so it is a couple weeks really during the course of which we expect to receive applications. I don't know if we have received any yet. I'm not aware of any. I know a couple of people spoke to me informally declaring an interest in - well, expressing an interest is probably the correct way of putting it.

And so it seems to me that the likelihood is we will receive all our applications by the - by the end of the month - by the 31st of July, process them during the course of August and then put a final candidate to the GNSO Council in September such that that's - I wonder if that's - how practical that's doing to be for travel to LA actually; that's an interesting point.

I wonder if it's something we're going to have to - does anyone got any thoughts on that? It's really a GNSO issue rather than this group's issue. But it just strikes me that might get very late for travel to the LA meeting which is only then three weeks later.

That's something we'll have to think about then. Maybe we can make a note of that as an action item. I see your hand is up, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just to note as well that we probably have some other people that, you know, have relatively late notice. We do have Council elections as well so this presumably wouldn't be the only person that would need to be added to the list of travelers although of course, you know, the sooner the better will be the motto here. But as it probably will require formal

approval I don't really see how it could be done before the 4th of September as there are no meetings scheduled in August at the moment.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, I suppose the candidate will know in advance of the Council meeting. Because, I mean, there's two different issues aren't there. There's the practicality of the travel and there's the notifying the affected individual so that they can plan accordingly. And, you know, both. I think what is key - what I'd like to capture as an action item is then to flesh out and agree a time table for this appointment.

And the sooner we can get to a decision, even if it is subject to approval by the Council the better it strikes me. So it may be something we want to accelerate just to give you notice. Check my notes and see if there's anything else I wanted to cover on that.

Just for the sake of clarity, I mean, the intention is that this will be worked on by - and it's all in the specification but the working through the applicants will be done by myself and the two GNSO vice chairs and then the final candidate proposed to the Council.

So that's Item 1a really about the GNSO liaison to the GAC. Any questions or issues relating to that? I apologize, there's some background noise on my microphone if anyone's picking that up there's work going on in the background so I can't do anything about it.

Right, so Item 1b, we've just wanted to touch on the liaison support through the PDP liaisons. I'm not sure there's a lot to be said about that; it's just - this was agreed on in London so it's really a matter of dealing with the mechanisms of that and making sure that that naturally follows the appointment of the liaison.

The next item that - the third action item that came out of London, if you remember we had three action items; one was agree on the appointment of a

liaison to the GAC; two was the liaison support through the PDP liaisons and the third was the GAC membership survey.

Now we've started to get some data in from that. Has that gone to the list? Can someone confirm to me whether or not that's gone to our list and if so when? Okay just a couple of notes then noting that - Marika go ahead just because I think you were going to answer my question on the survey...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I think this was circulated yesterday to the list and to note that it's also up on Adobe Connect now.

Jonathan Robinson: So confirming its very recently been - Manal, I know your hand is up. I just want to note that we have been joined by David Cake so welcome, David.

David Cake: Hello.

Jonathan Robinson: And that record that Suzanne Radell has sent her apologies. Manal, go ahead.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Jonathan. Just very quickly on the previous agenda item on the liaison support through the GNSO Council PDP liaisons, I was just wondering if this also has some internal approval process within the GNSO or is this something that's going to take place immediately as soon as we get the liaison in place?

Jonathan Robinson: Marika, is your hand up to try and answer that or is it an old hand?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Partly because I think indeed that's something where probably a discussion between the liaison and the liaison group would need to work on how they want to work together. But I think one practical thing we would immediately do after the appointment of the liaison is actually create a

mailing list that would include all the existing liaisons to PDP working groups as well as the GNSO liaison to the GAC.

So that they have at least a platform by which they can exchange information and start conversations. And presumably between, you know, those groups then they could work out what would be the best method of cooperating or again, if there are specific questions that come from the GAC on PDP-related items that mailing list could then be used to, you know, provide initial answers or determine how feedback could be provided. And I would assume that that's a first step that could be taken after a liaison has been appointed.

Jonathan Robinson: David.

David Cake: Well, yeah, I just wanted to say that it's my understanding that the - we have sort of in principle support but that we don't need formal support until we actually appoint someone to the position so at that point we will - internal to the GNSO we will be having to have a formal vote but everything else other than that is - doesn't require any sort of formal approval.

Is that your understanding, Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, I think if you're talking about the appointment of a liaison we've been very clear with the Council that we wouldn't make the appointment and that's what the - will likely take place at the September meeting in terms of, you know, confirming or formally appointing the liaison by the Council.

But as far as the PDP liaison is concerned I don't believe that needs any further...

((Crosstalk))

David Cake: No I don't believe it needs - I mean, all the people in place have already had their appointment confirmed separately; we're just sort of asking them to

please do this, you know, to please do this other thing basically, to please be on another mailing list so...

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, that's right. So I've got a question - I suppose this is - there's a couple of things. My opinion is that this is going to be need to be well managed and it's going to take work on the part of Council leadership and the GAC leadership to make sure that expectations are met and managed as to what the liaison can do. And we'll have to work with the liaison to do that. That's key.

And let me see, there's some other comments or questions coming up in the chat. So I - make sure we - yeah, exactly, I see you've captured that, Marika, I was going to say that's important. I wanted to question the mailing list, actually, so just we'll hear from Amr and Mark in a moment but I did want to question - and I had also, like Marika, envisaged that a mailing list would be set up.

But it occurs to me that this is then yet another mailing list that's got to be managed and monitored and handled. And it may be that the Council - the, you know, we'll have to think about what the best mechanism for the GNSO liaison to the GAC to communicate with the PDP liaisons - whether a separate mailing list is the most effective way of doing that.

Go ahead, Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Jonathan. This is Amr. I was just also going to raise a point that I - if I'm not mistaken I think Avri raised on the list which is that the GNSO's term for this liaison is not a PDP liaison, it's a working group liaison because we do have non PDP working groups and we do have GNSO Council liaisons so these working groups as well.

I was wondering if there is any interest from the GAC on having input from working group liaisons to non-PDP working groups similarly as they would

from PDP working groups. I'm thinking about working groups such as, for example, the Policy and Implementation Working Group. There may be some interest from the GAC to also be updated on what happens on those. But I - I guess I can't answer that question personally but I just thought I'd raise the point. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Good question. And I'm going to make a brief moment attempt to answer that because I just - conscious that this is all about - this is the point on managing expectations and we've got to be very careful that we - I mean, our expectation is not - my understanding of our expectation is not that the PDP or working group liaison will interact independently with the GAC but will be available as a resource to the GNSO liaison to the GAC but that they can provide specialist advice when and if the work of the working group or the PDP working group is of particular interest to the GAC, which we anticipate to be when and if that work has public policy implications.

I hope that's a little bit additional clarity. Thanks, Amr, I note your point in the chat that that does sort of concur it seems with your understanding.

Mark Carvell, go ahead Mark.

Mark Carvell: Yeah, thank you Jonathan. I think on that last point I think there will be interest but it's always a matter of how much time individual GAC representatives can make available to themselves to be able to engage on issues like policy implementation.

So my general feeling is that some mechanism whereby progress on policy implementation is reported to the GAC I think would be a valuable one. In fact in one of my responses to the survey I touched on this as an area where the GAC is generally completely in the dark, you know, as to how implementation is progressing.

And it's valuable for us to be aware of where things are going well but also where there are problems being engaged just so that we're aware. So just on that.

My main point of raising my hand was from the GAC side we've got a conference call on the 31st of July and on - done in sort of two hemispherical conference calls the 31st of July the 1st of August. So I think these are first opportunities, these conference calls for updating the GAC on where, you know, how things are going with appointing the GNSO liaison.

Now I notice that there was the deadline of 31 July so it kind of coincides with that - the first GAC call in preparation for Los Angeles. But nonetheless Manal may wish to add a comment. Nonetheless I think it's important for the GAC to have this on the agenda at that time; it seems a very timely opportunity to flag up, look, this is coming along now, the GNSO liaison to the GAC. And this is where we are.

And certainly when we get to September and the conference call then the GAC - well the GNSO liaison appointee will, I presume, wish to be part of those calls to be taking part in those calls. That I think is my expectation. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Mark. So that 31st of July deadline for - is for the applications to be in so I take your point; we'll be able to update and say, this is the now going ahead. But we won't be able to give any indication of selection at that point.

So that's where that will be. When - it would be useful to know when - actually it would be helpful to know in that respect just as a general communication point when the next calls are going to be scheduled for in the run up to LA.

Mark Carvell: Well, Jonathan, yeah, it's Mark coming in. I don't know actually. I don't think they've been scheduled yet. Is that right, Manal? All I've got marked in my diary is the first preparatory call on the 31st of July.

Jonathan Robinson: Well I'd like to put an action - I see there are a couple of hands. I was going to suggest - and one of them is from Olof because I was going to ask the GAC Secretariat to comment on that but let's - perhaps we'll go to - well let's go to Manal, you were first in the queue, Manal, and then to Olof.

Manal Ismail: Thanks, Jonathan. Yes, I will surely defer to Olof because he will be more capable to answer this. But we normally have like two GAC calls (intersessionally). We just received the date of the first call so I don't think the second, at least, was shared on the GAC list but maybe Olof can add to this.

                     But as Mark mentioned, it's going to be useful that we keep the momentum and we keep the GAC updated on how the process of appointing the GNSO liaison to the GAC is progressing among other issues also that we from the GAC side should be looking at like the chair's committee and the quick look mechanism and - mechanisms that would help the GAC quickly prioritize what needs to be reflected upon and commented on to the GNSO early enough so those are a couple of things that we need to keep track of (intersessionally) so thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Manal. Olof.

Olof Nordling: Oh, just to add to what Manal said, Olof here, well the first call has been set the 31st of July and 1st of August, as Mark already noted. And there will certainly be another call something around four weeks before we have the LA meeting but no date has been set as yet. By the way, could you hear me?

Jonathan Robinson: You're very quiet, Olof. Your sound is...

((Crosstalk))

Olof Nordling: ...also very strange headset it seems, bad microphone. But anyway no date for the second call due to take place something around four weeks before the LA meeting. No date has been set as yet.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks, Olof. So...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...the - I'm thinking where next on this point and on the liaison. So I think that's pretty clear and we can probably go then on to the - so we know our timeframe.

We know that these intercessional meetings - I suppose one of the reflective points that was going through my mind is just making sure that - and Manal's got this and it's great to hear that, Manal, that anyone from the GAC side that can ensure that equivalent work, if you like, is done within the GAC to - my biggest concern about all of this is that we've put a lot of emphasis on the GNSO operating differently and more effectively.

And I've said before, it feels to me like we've both got a job to do to make sure that the different organizations move with the times, as it were, and find ways of modifying their process. So, Manal, you're mentioning the triage, for example, I think it's critically important that things progress within the GAC as well so that's good to hear. Thanks. I note that (unintelligible).

All right, so moving then on to that next - that next point which is on the survey. I don't know if anyone had a chance to have a look at the survey. There were really just three questions. And I note that Mark said earlier that (unintelligible) is great.

Our deadline for responses was the 15th of July and we're always slightly concerned about how much we get. Frankly, I wonder whether extending it

would give us much more. So let me open the discussion up with two questions really.

One is, shall we extend the deadline for - shall we keep it open? And has anyone got any preliminary comments or input as to the outcome of the survey at this point, the initial points? I mean, via the scores that you see, it's not that easy to read on - in the Adobe but I don't know if it can be magnified at all.

Any comments or questions at this stage in and around the survey data? Marika, we'll go to you first and then Amr and Olof.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I briefly glanced through the data and it looks like, you know, from the respondents we got and we have to note that of course it's just a limited sample as I think we only had eight people providing feedback it seems that, you know, most people are, you know, somewhat familiar to not familiar at all with the existing mechanisms that we have.

And also in looking at some of the feedback provided on, you know, what can be improved or (things) differently I think some of the comments there actually, you know, align with what we already do, you know, for example, regular feedback and outcome of PDP processes including a summary of previous processes I think that's what we provide for example in the one-pagers.

So I think, you know, one question and it's probably more directed to some of the GAC participants is how can we actually, you know, raise the awareness of some of the existing mechanisms or, you know, have a more of a discussion around, you know, why these existing mechanisms are either not known or, you know, do not appear to work or, you know, achieve the, you know, the objective that we have for those.

Because I don't know if maybe a conversation will actually lead to more ideas or suggestions then through the survey which, you know, has given us I think some useful data but I'm not really sure if it necessarily tells us what we should be doing better or different or more or less of. But, as said, it's just my initial assessment of just glancing through the survey.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Marika. I guess we'll just follow the queue and if people either want to respond to those questions or points or come in with new items. Go ahead, Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Jonathan. This is Amr. Yeah, I would be in favor of extending the deadline. I am concerned that getting eight responses might not be representative of the entire GAC and I would not be surprised if we got very different answers or very different outputs from the survey if we had more feedback.

And if we do want to have meaningful feedback to the survey I think we do need to get more responses. Extending the deadline might not - might not be the only solution required to get these responses. But we should consider it in conjunction with other means of getting more responses. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Amr. So I notice that Avri is also supportive of that. Personally I would think we shouldn't want to do an indefinite deadline. We might want to put, for example, the end of the month as a new deadline. But I also note your point and it would be interesting to see if others are supportive and/or have ideas for what else we might do to encourage input like award a prize or something.

Olof, Mark and then Manal are in the queue. So let's go to you, Olof, next.

Olof Nordling: Thank you. And I'd certainly support that we should extend the deadline, send another reminder to the GAC list hoping to get a little better, a little more representative because I feared that Amr is absolutely right that those who

have responded are those who are the most active and are the most familiar
with the various mechanisms that we do have.

Because I must say that although it doesn't look like it has high degree of
familiarity it exceeds my fears because I thought it was even worse than it
appears on the survey.

So while in order to be on stable ground we should try to get more answers
in. And even though eight out of, well, our normal response rate for any sort
of survey is usually something like around 3%. So we shouldn't be - expect
too much responses - too high a response rate but we should try to get it a
little better. And I would support to extend it to the end of the month indeed.
Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Olof. So we've got support to extend to the end of the month.
And we've got an idea that somehow we should incentivize or find ways -
incentivize is the wrong word - find ways to encourage greater and
participation and any suggestions welcome.

Mark, go ahead.

Mark Carvell: Yes, thank you Jonathan. I think it's certainly well worth extending - we'll have
to send a strong message out from the GAC bureau to respond once we get
into August, you know, in the Northern Hemisphere people are going on
holiday, vacation. So end of the month I think is - it would be good. Eight
responses in the GAC membership now is 140 plus, you know, so it's - we
should try and get it to double figures at least I think.

That said, you know, there is a very obvious trend emerging if you look the
figures in response to Question 1, you've got very high levels of unfamiliarity
with regard to background briefings, announcements, request for input and so
on so there's a trend there.

And actually the design of the questionnaire was I thought a little bit odd when it moved to Question 2 because I guess for those response - many of the respondents they had very little to go on with regard to Question 2 which is about those mechanisms that you are familiar with.

But I think the overall deduction we can make is that, you know, GAC members are not tracking GNSO activity very much. The reasons for that, well, they - it's worth trying to determine that. But I think it's get down to loading, you know, we just don't have the time to do it effectively.

So if we can come up with a magic formula from the GNSO side to the liaison for capturing essential elements that are going to be of interest to the GAC elements in terms of what the working is being done, what is being announced and so on so that we get some immediate raising of awareness that way which doesn't require too much timely tracking by GAC members.

You have to remember that GAC members, like me, we're doing a lot of other things in government policy; we're not just doing the - not just doing ICANN and the GAC. It's a challenge for many of us no matter how much we want to to actually go to the places in the ICANN communications area to pick out the information its challenging time to do that. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Mark. And Manal.

Manal Ismail: Yes, thank you Jonathan. And, not much to add at this point. But, I also support extending through the end of the month. We had some (unintelligible) having some holidays after the London meeting, others on summer vacation. So, maybe if we extend to end of the month we can get a few more responses. I have to note also that haven't we some back weeks of more aware of even BP aware of GNSO or (unintelligible) depending on the topic, I mean. So, you can find some people are very aware with everything -- that has to do with who is for example -- but they are not equally aware with other topics. So, it doesn't have to do every time with the mechanism itself but

rather with the total. But, again let's see how further the sponsors would be. And, I think again, it all boils down to the load as Mark mentioned, which I hope would be resolved by having those mechanism in place as you mentioned also Jonathan from both sides. From the GAC and the GNSO just to try to get to the point, prioritize things so that we can encourage early input. Having said that I'm not sure is it the good or a bad idea to share the results we've got so far to share them with the GAC, on the GAC mailing list. I'm just posing the question, I don't have strong position here. I'm just wondering whether it's a good or a bad idea. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Manal. I mean certainly just a couple of thoughts. I mean, one (Emma) had suggested going, using the core that the GAC has on the 31st to publicize us through there. I think it's a very good idea. And, whether or not we then just extend the deadline by another day or so and just say to them, look you've got a day, you know, you've got 24 hours after this call to fill in the survey and use a little bit of both the pressing deadline and a little bit of perhaps embarrassment that you have filled it in.

Personally I'd be tempted to circulate the survey outward to the GAC. There's a slight problem with that in terms of, you know, the science of it, in that try to influence what people do. So my temptation, my first response to you would say, why don't we just set it up with our reminder. An immediate reflection it occurred to me showing people the output so far is probably not such a good idea because it can influence their thinking. So, my preference is to hold off, hold the deadline-- sorry extend the deadline -- at least to a day or so beyond the 31st. Try and get everyone to respond as much as possible and take it from there. Olof.

Olaf Kolkman: Oh, thank you. And you said exactly what I wanted to say, that it can influence -- so it's not good practice really to release a half-baked survey to -- those who are supposed to respond to it. So, I'm inclined to say no, let's keep it as it is. And, if just extend the deadline. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, so we're pretty much agreed on that based on some additional comments in the chat room so that's okay. Marika did you have point?

Marika Konings: Yes, this Marika. I agree with the comments made although I think it may be helpful for me just to know that only eight people filled them out. And, maybe also know that there have been relatively few complete suggestions for improvement. So, to really try to encourage people to, you know, come forward with ideas or suggestions on what they believe maybe worthful and ideas to pursue to make sure and get (unintelligible), but, may or doesn't work for the GAC. I think that's why we're currently starting a lease to--kind of from the policy staff perspective part. We do have a number of their tools and mechanisms available that, you know, from our perspective, you know, I'm hoping should bring issues to the floor or provide a regular update or timing notification. But, it seems like, you know, those are not having the effect that we would like to have so it would be really good to hear from GAC members on how we can, you know, improve or think about other things that would have the desire to effect.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, so thanks Marika. And since we're agreed we can't-- we can emphasize the level of participation but not the results. We can encourage that it takes virtually little time to fill in and we would love to have as many concrete suggestions as possible. And, I think those are there all good suggestion we can work with. And, then finally I propose that the secretary at work with the whoever -- if not with the GAC secretary, to whoever it is -- convene that meeting and make sure the agenda item is on that-- on for that meeting as a reminder point. So, that would be great.

Mindful a bit of the time passing. And, I think we've pretty much covered then our points on the survey. Could discuss further some of the outputs, I mean, it may be that we have a preliminary view I'd encourage everyone to look at it at this stage. And, as we've agreed not circulate it but my gut feeling there was that it wasn't surprising. I suppose there are little details to resolve also so low in terms of familiarity. But, let's see if we can't get them more data

before we judge it. Let it maker in either direction with more or better. So, now we have an opportunity to pick up our other two work tracks and really the question under I can too -- which I'll probably lead into -- and I have to leave the call a little early.

So, I'll hand to Manal for dealing with this second part of the call I think. But, really it's about trying to make-- understand whether we should to continue with the same frequency. Whether it makes sense to continue over the summer. How do we handle this? And, personally I have a question as whether it remains useful to the team, lead call or we simply have the main group call and so on.

So, Manal if I--if you would be so kind as to pick things up from now and I'll stick around for another five minutes or so. But, I'll probably have to leave at approximately ten to the hour.

Manal Ismail: Oh, sure Jonathan. Thank you. So, proceeding to the first agenda item the work plan, as Jonathan mentioned. You were trying to look into the administrative issues whether we should maintain the same frequency of the calls, which is why we keep and having said that whether team lead call also. And whether we should close to like, for two weeks if this satisfies the majority of the competition group members in the terms of summer vacations.

So, let's take those one by one. So, does the frequency of the current calls which is by-weekly make sense to everyone? And, is the slot again quite good for everyone or we have any suggestions? So, hearing and seeing none omities. Okay, I know you're concurred in with the current second which is good. So, having said that do we need to keep the team leads call, which I think the question goes to the team leads. I personally have an opinion on this but, I first call. Go ahead please.

(Oliver): Thanks Manal. This Oliver, I can say with great confidence that since I picked up the task of being a lead with (Suzanne) on the PP track that I've done a

pretty terrible job of coordinating things with her. And as a result I think we haven't come as far as I think we'd like to in the past few months. I think what I do-- we do need together is to do online work together and I don't see the calls really coming into that. So, I'm open to the idea of not having team lead calls. And, maybe focusing more on some work that (Sue) team needs for each track do online together and perhaps report to the consultation group on bi-weekly calls. Thanks.

Manal Ismail: Thanks and in fact I'm going to say that of this old soul I wonder if Jonathan are you okay with this or? I think we can always have the option of having the team meet call if we need them. But, we still have the mailing list for the team leads were we can also prepare before the consultation group calls so. I know old school Jonathan in the chat is also in favor of skipping the team meet calls, for now.

So, one last point here is whether we should close for a couple of weeks during the summer. It would be hard to coordinate two weeks that everyone would be unavailable. I mean, if we going to have a lack of (unintelligible) at any point and time maybe we can proceed with our calls regularly. Marika.

Marika Konings: That doesn't work out-- would it maybe be helpful if we just do a quorum little call noting that we're continue on the same schedule from now -- every two weeks -- and just see if there are any weeks -- indeed from July and August -- where we may be lacking quorum and we may need to accommodate that we may not have a call on those dates. Would that be helpful so at least we see ahead of time whether there are some dates where we already know for sure that no one will be able to make it. Manal are you still there? Or is it just me. Can anyone hear me?

Man: (unintelligible) speaking I can hear you. I'm not sure Manal-- if Manal might be on mute.

Manal Ismail: Yes, sorry. I was on mute. I'm very sorry. I was saying that it would be very helpful Marika if we have this call I told (unintelligible) at the beginning but I was-- I couldn't phrase the question how going to call for the summer vacations. But, maybe if we poll for unavailability during certain weeks and then we can check. But, I'm sure you're able to do. Mark go ahead, please.

Mark Carvell: Yes, thanks. Well, I was just going to say the obvious one which is the mid-August one. Let me know I'll be--I'll be in Russia actually at that time. So, there may be other, you know, peak vacation time in the (northern hemisphere) who's not going to be able to take part. So, we'll of had the GAC call and the GNSO call at the end of this month. Then I think realistically we're probably not looking until the end of August before reengaging. My case certainly and maybe others too. Thanks.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Mark. So, I think this we can finalize online through the call the (unintelligible) call and thanks Marika for the suggestion. My first time I think we can proceed directly to the next agenda item which have to do with the work track. Dealing with the day to day mechanics. We have already discussed three of the options we have which is the GNSO is on to the GAC. The awareness to the survey. And, the GNSO counts and PDP liaisons. So, I was wondering whether the topic leads and the buddy system is also still valid for discussion after we've adopted the GNSO liaisons and the GNSO (unintelligible) PDP liaisons is this like advanced stage of having even more GAC members involved from the other side. Or, does the adopted options exclude this option for the discussion? Omar go ahead.

Omar Kaminski: Okay, this is Oliver. Yes, I think it would be okay at this point to continue with the liaisons both to the feature working groups and the GNSO council and just see how well we do with that and whether we need more (snopes). It might just give us a clearer picture to what extent we might need to improve on the process of (unintelligible) day to day track. So, I'm okay with holding off on the topic leads and the buddy system. Thanks.

Manal Ismail: So, anyone else have a reaction to this? Because we have three remaining options and I'm trying to see how the discussion would go between here and LA. We have the joint meetings between the GAC and the GNSO and I think maybe the (unintelligible) or something like that. So, two administrative options that I think we will need to get into anyways. I'm sorry the joint meetings and the interaction between the leads at both sides. Whether the Chair and the Executive make this all work together. So, those two options will be discussed anyway. And, I'm just wondering whether we should also continue discussion with the topic needs option. I notice Olof and then Marika please. Olof go ahead.

Olof Nordling: Thank you Manal. And I believe that since we're opening this as a trial period with the liaisons we should-- well if it's an organic growth into touching on the other solutions and involving those in what we already trying. I think that's fine. If we start on many parallel tracks at the same time well given that the liaisons would be a trial period we will have a difficulty evaluating that if we change a lot of other things at the same time. So, just a thought that we'll hold back on doing very many things at the same time. And rather let it develop perhaps into combinations or some aspect of the (unintelligible) that we're suggested. But, not start anything particularly in parallel. That's I guess my little message. Thanks.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Olaf. And this also concurs with my thinking. So, Marika please.

Marika Konings: Yes, this--

((Crosstalk))

Manal Ismail: Go ahead Marika, I'm sorry.

Marika Konings: I'm sorry Manal. Maybe one item we do want to look at or I mean discuss is the joint meetings the, ICANN meetings. And that may also be in combination with the implementation of the GNSO liaison to the GAC. But, that maybe one

item where I think we have priorities we've had (unintelligible) of success of that meeting. And, maybe we want to think about some ideas of how we can maybe even make that more interactive or more interesting for all parties involved. And, I just want to note -- for example -- we did a rethink as well for the joint meetings we had with the (unintelligible) team which had also become the quite stall and not a lot of interaction going on. And, that has worked quite effectively. I'm wondering as part of our conversation we may want to give some thought to that specific item and see if there's some idea to want to maybe try out (unintelligible) and to see how we can make those meeting more and more effective and efficient. I think is more interesting calls I have one that is appending those.

Manal Ismail: Okay, thank you Marika. So, I think we are more or less on the same page so we'll be focusing on the leadership regular interaction and the joint meetings. Along with assessing the options that already adopted.

So, the next agenda item is the PDP work track. And here of course I was going-- sorry I was going to seek guidance from Omar and Susan but I know that you haven't discussed this yet. So, I think at least from the GAC side we need to look into the mechanism that were suggested in London -- like the Chairs Community and the Quick Look Mechanism and other things -- that would help us prioritize our work and manage to provide early input to topics of interest to the GAC. But, I think this could be an action item that we can-- I can take it and try to get some response from the GAC back to the confirmation group here. So, I don't think there is much under this agenda item so unless anyone has any comments. Marika please.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Just to note to-- Omar that I don't know if you've seen but I did a kind of like flow chart for one of the first steps to really map out, you know, what happens currently in that part of the PDP. If that is helpful as part of the conversations or communicating what currently exist but also maybe look at what may be potential improvements. I'm happy to do that as well for some of the other steps. So, just wanted to flag them, and if you want to have

a further conversation about it just let me know off list and we can talk through it, it's very helpful.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Marika. Yes, and I think a good starting point for our work between now and Los Angeles would be the presentation -- the slides -- that were presented in the London. So, if you would like to have a look and then we can discuss.

So, and finally under any other business we were discussing --Jonathan and myself were discussing whether this is -- this consultation group is the right place to look into hot topics between the GAC and the GNSO in terms of certain topics that have to do with substance. And because things might be important -- but I personally am not sure we don't have Jonathan I think on the call now -- but I think those issue should alert us in our work and we should keep them in mind why we are coming up with better mechanisms between the GAC and the GNSO. But, I don't think if there's within the scope of this working group to get VP into a substance. I'm not sure how I can see if they conquering this so thank you. So, do we have any other reactions to this? Omar please go ahead.

Omar Kaminski: Yes, thanks this is Omar. I agree we probably shouldn't get too much into the substance of policy discussions on this consultation group. However, when issue are identified by members of this group that might sort of guide us on our work. We should probably make an effort to take a look at them -- just those perhaps in use cases or scenarios -- where we feel that there is substantial work that is within the scope of this groups mandates to undertake and maybe just use when it's practical examples. If there is just obviously a breakdown in communication between the two processes in the GAC and the GNSO. And, I think that would be helpful. So, I wouldn't discourage folks on the (street) from identifying these sorts of issues and just those guides for us in the future. Thanks.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Omar. Mark please go ahead.

Mark Carvell: Yes, thank you Manal. Any bilateral contract like this is precious, no doubt about it. For too long I have not been with the GAC since 2008 to long the GAC has worked pretty much in isolation. And, I'm a bit hesitate to go into any kind of proposal that we discuss as example communications, IGO's, Red Cross, whatever. And, if in this forum at this time that what we might bear in mind for the future is how we can use this group and the liaisons to prepare the ground for exchanges that are going to be much more valued in terms of (inconsivity) and detail everybody breached up and so on. Face to face at Hican meetings between the GAC and the GNSO. So, what these-- what this avenue of dialog and the liaison can do is to clarify issues, help prepare the ground, ensure that we're all briefed up by GNSO either on the GAC side for a meaningful productive, constructive forward-looking discussion at the -- in the context of the ICANN meeting the public meeting face to face. Because, I think that's where most progress is going to be made. Where there going to be many more GAC representatives then GNSO colleagues engaged. But, I could say we could always be much better prepared and maybe this is the opportunity to divide the mechanism to this kind of bilaterally exchange and liaison to insure that we're all ready for that when it takes place in the ICANN meetings. So that's my sort of initial feeling about in response to that question. Thank you.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Mark and P.S. I fully agree with you and sort of constructive way forward. So, I believe we all more or less agree that we should be guided by whatever is going on but we shouldn't really get into the details of the discussion on substance. Having said that and since you already passed the hour so if no one else has any comments maybe we can conclude at this point. So, Mark I believe you have your hand up from the previous time right.

Mark Carvell: Yes, I should have lowered it. Thank you.

Manal Ismail: It's okay. It's okay. So, we don't have any further requests to speak. So, thank you all and look forward to interactive discussions online -- specially

that we won't have a weekly call -- so it's going to be bi-weekly and I hope this should give more time to achieve over email. Thank you. Can we stop the recording please.

Coordinator: We certainly can.

Man: Thank you.

Coordinator: Kathy you can please stop the recording.

                          END