

**ICANN
Transcription
GAC GNSO Consultation Group meeting
Tuesday 07 October 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 07 October 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/gns0/gns0-gac-20141007.mp3>

On page:

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

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

Attendees:

Government Advisory Committee

Ana Neves, Portugal

Mark Carvell, UK

Manal Ismail – co-chair – Egypt

GNSO Council

Avri Doria – Councillor - NCSG

Jonathan Robinson, Chair

GNSO Liaison to the GAC:

Mason Cole

Apology:

Volker Greimann, Vice Chair

Suzanne Radell - USA

Amr Elsadr, Councillor

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings

Olof Nordling

Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: The recording has been started, please go ahead.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Noe). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the GAC GNSO Consultation Group call on the 7th October, 2014.

On the call today we have Ana Neves, Mason Cole, Jonathan Robinson and Avri Doria. We have apologies from Amr Elsadr and Suzanne Radell.

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

I would 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: Thanks, Nathalie. And I should actually note that we have a provisional apology from Manal as well; she may join, she may not. It's dependent on her - on the practicalities of travel and what's going on for her.

So hi everyone. Welcome. It's a small group so we should be able to work effectively and fast. It just does remind me actually - it's one thing I think we might want to talk about in LA is refreshing the group in the sense that some have dropped off or been frequently unable to participate so that's something to think about as well how we handle that.

You saw the agenda, there's really two substantial points. I guess one of which I touched on already a moment ago but primarily this is about making sure we're in shape for both - primarily the meeting with the GAC on - GAC GNSO meeting on Sunday but also thinking - the face to face meeting of this group.

So as far as the agenda is concerned any comments or questions about something substantial or not so substantial that might have been missed off? We do have an AOB to wrap up at the end so any comments or questions on

the agenda? All right, seeing and hearing none we'll go straight on to look at the GNSO GAC meeting.

Now I know you've only very recently had a presentation shared with you but let's get that up anyway. And so that's coming up in the Adobe room now. If we could move to the first slide?

Really this is - this kind of highlights that where this is going to - this is set out to work at this point is to make sure - I think there's a couple of objectives here, and it's worth thinking about what those are and hearing if anyone's got any more we'd like to achieve.

I feel, to some extent, this is a matter of repeating what we've said before and that not everyone has been there previously, not everyone has heard everything we've said previously. And so to my mind, there's some value in simply re-orienting people and making sure that it's clearly understood where we're at. There's clearly some progress items to report on as well.

So the way the presentation has been designed it gives a little bit of background, it then goes on to deal with the two work tracks that this group has been working on which is the sort of regular or so-called day to day interaction, and then the detail on the engagement with the GNSO PDP.

And under Work Track 1, because a product, if you'll forgive me referring to you as that, Mason, of that - of that track is the GNSO liaison, there is an opportunity to introduce the GNSO liaison at that point.

And I think it's something I've talked about with Mason together with the Council vice chairs and in other discussions with Manal and so on, it really does seem important that we set expectations very early on and very clearly as to what the expectations of the liaison to the GAC are. So there's an opportunity here to introduce the role and to set expectations, frankly of that GNSO and the GAC.

And then ultimately to look into another part which is this whole early awareness and notifications and talk to, you know, deal with the survey and then to look ahead as to where this might go. So that's the way the presentation is structured.

My final comment before I hear if anyone else has any comments or points at this stage is that my feeling that this is the substantial discussion between that GNSO and the GAC, there is not - it's not like we're going to have a lot of other agenda items. We'll cover the work of the Consultation Group and so that's - and how it might work and what's going on rather than any other content.

Let me pause a moment there and see if there are any questions or comments and then I suggest we, without going into the presentation perhaps in detail, we can walk through and because if anyone has got any concerns or issues as we go so any comments, questions?

All right it looks like I've been presented with the ability to page through it here which is great so thank you Marika or Nathalie, whoever has them not or Olof, if it was you.

So clearly we know the background, I'm not going to reiterate this on this call, but it's important that this is all about early engagement as we identified some time back.

We highlight that there is a track that deals with day to day interaction and the primary initial recommendation of that is a pilot project which is that GNSO liaison to the GAC. And going forward we have three other areas to refocus on, to focus on and think about.

So I'm just going to walk through this at fairly high pace; I don't want to bore you all with the whole presentation. But if you have comments on any

element of it, style, content, any sort of thoughts by all means just put your hand up in the Adobe room and we can discuss it.

And of course given that the liaison is a pilot and we are introducing the liaison here, it seems that it's worth highlighting that and then giving over at this point to say it's a timely point to introduce Mason and let Mason talk through some slides. So at this point, Mason, we have the placeholder.

Now Manal has put in a couple of slides. I think - I forget what you have drafted originally and I haven't gone back to check that this morning. So can you remind me what you have in terms of number of slides and perspective content?

Mason Cole: Mason speaking. You know, I could spend quite a bit of time and a big number of slides going through the current work of the GNSO and a reminder on how the PDP process works so that the GAC is completely feeling informed. I don't think we have the luxury of that kind of time.

So I agree with you that I think it's important to set expectations for the role so I think my slides will concentrate on that and then just a couple of basics about the current work of the GNSO. So I don't anticipate any more than maybe 10 to 12 slides and hopefully not very much time out of the agenda.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, so my feeling, Mason, is yes, that's a really good plan. And I think it's absolutely critical that if we walk away with one thing we must walk away with an expectation and if necessary a discussion as to what can be expected of you in this role.

If that means that we cover off detail about - it never does any harm and maybe you and I can share with anyone else who wants to workshop this weekend share that content and talk about through because I'll be aware, and anyone else who wants to join in as to what content has previously been shared with the GAC.

And I guess as I said at the outset, my feeling is it doesn't do harm to reiterate some things but I don't know whether 10 to 12 is too long. I certainly think we should give this a 10 to 15 minute slot; that feels about right to me. I mean, we've got an hour and a half together so I think giving this 15 minutes is no bad thing.

Just note for the record that Mark has joined the call, Mark Carvell, UK GAC rep and participant in this group so welcome, Mark.

Mark Carvell: Yes hello everybody, yes. Sorry for late joining, yes. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: No problem, Mark. Just to capture this we're on Agenda Item 2 walking through a - doing a walk-through of the presentation that we propose to walk through with the meeting between the GNSO and the GAC, a meeting that will be essentially dominated by or cover the work of this group.

So I guess it's worth asking the question, of this hour and a half let's just assume we have - so let me see, so can anyone help me to know what other items there are to be discussed with the GAC in this hour and a half slot? And although this is strictly not the forum for that it's useful about setting the expectation of how much time this part this component has got.

Olof, I see your hand is up, please go ahead.

Olof Nordling: Yes, in addition to - this is Olof for the record. In addition to the GAC GNSO Consultation Group update and discussions on decisions...

Jonathan Robinson: Sorry, Olof, you're very faint. Olof, you're faint.

Olof Nordling: Oh sorry. Okay. Hearing me better now?

Jonathan Robinson: A little.

Olof Nordling: Oh yes, okay. I'm on a headphone, maybe that's the reason. Anyway I'll try to speak up...

((Crosstalk))

Olof Nordling: In addition to the GAC GNSO Consultation Group update and discussions and decisions there are two other main items on the agenda and that's IANA stewardship and ICANN accountability to share views on those matters and also IGOs and Red Cross Red Crescent. So that's what we have listed; maybe you have other things on your agenda.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, okay so that is pretty important topics, both of those, which condenses this, in my mind. And I see your hand is that Ana, to a maximum - maximum of an hour. Ana, go ahead.

Ana Neves: Thank you and good afternoon. Well, regarding the time it is allocated to GAC, I think that we really need to be very practical and to think about something that everybody will feel very engaged.

So if it will be only to talk about how where we are and how things are for the time being, I think that we need to go a little further and to have a good discussion about a specific subject for people to feel that is for real. You know what I mean? Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, and I do know what you mean. And I'll be interested - you present a real challenge there and it's a good challenge and it's an interesting point because what we've got to somehow manage is making sure that this group does its work, and we are all very engaged in that work. And you're right, we don't want to simply present it but nor do we want the whole GAC trying to do the work of this group.

So there's a line to be walked there I think. And I do take your point, if we just give a flat presentation. But actually maybe hold that point, put a pin in it and come back to us a little each are once we've walked through this presentation because they're our engagement points and hooks in this presentation.

And in addition there is some quite strong feelings about those other topics that Olof just mentioned. So I don't think we are without opportunity for engagement and active discussion.

I think we need a minimum of probably - a minimum of half an hour possibly, tolerate 40 minutes for those other two, which reduces the of the 90 minute this hour - it's down to about 50 minutes. It feels like we've got - we should work with about 45 minutes for this consultation group.

Let me walk through, and if you guys can imagine then that this is a 45 minute slot including nominally 10 minutes for Mason. And my experience is these things always take longer and we do want to have interaction, as you say, Ana. So let's have a look.

The next slide we talk about the liaison and the action to take a take away from this which is where I'm saying there's opportunity to engage here is to release a are you - okay, do we, collectively, have a common understanding and are we bought into the opportunities that this produces?

We then highlight the possibility of the regular interaction between the chairs of the different groups. And there's a point in red here again, how do you feel about this? Is this productive? How frequently should it happen?

Now personally I started to form an opinion that it should be a minimum of one intercessional call contact but it may be more frequent than that. And I'm just going to keep going in the interest of speed and time but please put a hand up. And I'm assuming that's an old hand so if you could withdraw that unless there is another point to be made.

Yes, good point, Olof. And note your point in the chat that we can't go too fast because of simultaneous interpretation or translation. Ana, did you have a point to make in the audio? Would you like to say something? Okay great, I'll keep moving then.

Then there's the rethinking of joint meetings which is another topic for this group. And clearly we are in such a joint meeting now, at the time we're giving this presentation, having this interaction.

I'm not sure here what we are seeking, you know, what - a guest we've put here will be thinking of the joint meeting, this is what we've - we might do. What's the value? So again, Ana, to your point earlier and to others who might be thinking about this, here's an opportunity. How do we feel about these joint meetings? Are they valuable in this form and format? What more could be done?

So all of this points to the fact that each time there is a red item seeking feedback or input there is the prospect of this really going slowly as it were, which is valuable but in terms of a limited time slot, we need to recognize that. Oh, summary, sorry, I was going back, apologies.

Joint meetings. And then we go on to discuss the prospect of early awareness notifications. And the point being here that the GNSO provides regular information to the GAC but the question is how valuable is this information and how well utilized is this information.

In a sense this is part of the justification for having a liaison and some of the concern is to whether there's other ways. We did the survey and out of the survey came in number of points. And I guess this is more sense presentation of the outcome of the survey and a bunch of suggestions that's come out.

Challenges. Suggestions. Additional suggestions. Now these slides are, you know, as I flipped through them now very dense, and I think we're going to have to do some work but that's okay, an edit and a polish we can do as long as we feel that we have the right structure and time to work with.

So having talked about the survey then it's not clear what action we're seeking; we're not sure at this point what, you know, is this just an update on that - sort of the survey or is there some other action required?

Our next - our next hour second work track is the whole mechanism for early engagement of the GAC in the PDP. And here we talk about focusing in on the early phases, the issue scoping and initiation phases because by definition in a sense, that is early engagement.

I don't know how clear this slide is, I must say. I think as a slide there's something we need to think about whether this illustrates the point. Marika, were you the author of this? I think this is a chart you prepared at some point.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I think this probably comes from the earlier presentation where we may have walked through the different phases of a PDP and, you know, just illustrates indeed that we're focusing on the first two but as you say I'm not sure whether it needs a specific slide or whether that's just something you can, you know, communicate verbally that we're focusing on the initial phases and at a later stage we'll maybe look as well at some of the other stages of the PDP.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, I certainly think that's worth looking at whether this adds or detracts from additional clarity in its current form. I'm not saying it's not a useful diagram but perhaps in its slide format it's not that useful. And then I think this is a key point, these are some of the ideas being explored as to how we might deal with this. So there's an opportunity here to talk about a quick look mechanism. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I'm not sure how well this will display on the screen in the meeting room or how easy it will be to view. So once the slides are finalized it may be helpful to circulate them in advance of the meeting to both, you know, the GAC members as well as GNSO participants so people can also pull it up on their screen if they want to follow along.

Jonathan Robinson: Are you referring specifically to the previous slide, this one with the diagram on or generally?

Marika Konings: Yes, yes no the one with the diagram specifically.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. I mean, I may suggest we strip it out altogether and maybe just add that as an appendix as a PDF or something.

Mark Carvell: Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: These are some practical ideas being explored for which we could seek input and comment. Mark, go ahead.

Mark Carvell: Yes, you know, thank you, Jonathan. I think you do need to reduce the density of these slides for this presentation and home in on the points for immediate discussion and decisions.

And perhaps the thing to do is to prepare a room document and let the GAC secretariat have that as soon as possible beforehand. I don't know how quickly it could be translated but I think you - I think leave the detail to that document on which you can refer to of course in the presentation but the slides should be as few and as simple as possible really homing in on where you to hook the full committee in terms of advancing the work and securing their support.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, I think that's a very...

Mark Carvell: That's my suggestion. Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: ...it's sage advice, Mark. Go ahead.

Mark Carvell: Well I just wanted to sort of underline that point. I think - especially given the time constraints you've got.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, I tend to agree. And I think the concept is there in the presentation but it's not quite - the execution isn't quite there, you know. The concept with the points in red, these hooks for discussion but I don't think we've quite got it executed properly.

And so that's an important point, agreed. And then what we seek to do here is to look ahead and given an indication as to where this is all going. Manal, go ahead.

Manal Ismail: Yes, thank you Jonathan. Can you hear me well?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, it seems okay, thanks.

Manal Ismail: Okay. Just to note that during the last call it was suggested that we share details - the results of the survey with GAC members and get them on board of any future suggestions we're going to make. I mean, there was a concern that we preempt the discussion and go immediately to suggesting triage committee or quick (unintelligible) or things of the sort.

So that's why the slide seems to be too dense. I mean, they can still be reduced but the issue is that we - I tried to put as much information as possible from the survey based on the last call that we should share the survey results and lead the discussion to lead us to any way forward or future suggestions.

I have to say that also there were a few questions that Suzanne suggested to prepare and share. She started to share them in advance of this call, but obviously she got stuck in other work and could not neither share the questions nor beyond this call.

So I'm not sure whether those questions might be the slide we are looking for after presenting the survey results. Maybe those questions they could serve as whatever input we are seeking from GAC and GNSO members.

But again, I'm not sure. I'm just trying to share where this came from based on the discussion of the previous call. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Manal. So we've got some kind of, if I understand you correctly, we've got a path to tread here between ensuring we educate and bring along and give opportunity for input and decision making with enough content without presuming to just get to the conclusions.

I don't know - I recall a thread with Suzanne's questions that she was - so these were going to be questions for the GAC essentially that we were seeking input on. Is that correct understanding of those questions?

And I don't know anyone else...

Manal Ismail: What I recall - yes, okay. I'll try to answer this.

What I recall from the last call was that the questions were supposed to be addressed the GNSO. But if Suzanne was just suggesting that she take GAC use on such questions whether they are copied/missing, there are more questions to be added, but I think ultimately she was suggesting that we address those to the GNSO.

Because I recall her mentioning how does the GNSO itself cope with too many PDPs and (unintelligible) processes going at the same time. She was trying to seize from the GNSO point of view how things are being handled.

But I stand to be corrected by anyone who was on the call last time.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, with respect to things like the potential triage approach and so on.

Mark?

Mark Carvell: Yes thanks. I wasn't on the call last time but I think it's a good idea to put questions for the GAC to consider, I mean if they are questions that the GAC should be putting to the GNSO. Nonetheless, I think it's good to flag it to the GAC. These are questions that need addressing and they may well indeed trigger further questions on the day.

So I'm in favor of notifying the GAC of the questions that (Suze) is preparing way before the meeting. Then I think you'll get a bit more traction with GAC colleagues and more productive conduction would ensue - I would have thought. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Mark. Clearly the challenge is we don't have the questions at the moment and we've been getting close. But I think certainly we'll try to the extent that the presentation can tease those out to the extent that we get something from Suzanne, utilize those and try and circulate that.

I'm just wondering what we can do. I have seen the suggestion that we look at the presentation and then think about whether we pare it back a little bit. I certainly feel that somehow it needs some paring back, but I'm happy to take a crack at that.

Olof, go ahead.

Olof Nordling: Thank you, this is Olof. Can you hear me?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

Olof Nordling: Okay. Well, thinking about it, and if we have to prioritize, I believe that the two big (unintelligible) for this time, when the GNSO meets the GAC and we have something to present from the consultation group, well obviously the GNSO liaison and the role.

And secondly, I would say the outcome of the survey, if perhaps we should spend more time on that and less on other aspects of all the work that has been done. Just in order to follow-up on this getting people on board and getting full clarity on those novel aspects and also directions for the future when it comes to.

I think myself that the outcome of the survey and the various suggestions, well, that's something; that's pretty meaty and also very, very important. Well, it is an alternative approach to just focus really on those two aspects.

Jonathan Robinson: Now I happen to have some sympathy with that point, Olof, and thank you; it's a good point. And I think the way, just quickly off the top of my head, a way to handle that.

I mean we've actually introduced the liaison earlier in the discussion and I think we could potentially bring the survey results further up. I mean we've structured this in a way which it's in line with our - the way in which we're doing the work.

Where maybe if he can bring up these two headline points and then say - the key is also which is what this presentation attempts to do. And we maybe need to do some more work to conclude that point, is to not get everyone totally hung up on the fact that the liaison is the only mechanism by which early engagement and/or interaction can take place. It's part of a big picture

that we've been working on, and as long as we can convey that and show the landscape and where the liaison and the survey come in to it.

But I think you do make a good point. And when we considered making the survey, quite a lot of the reason for doing that was to say, "Okay, well before we go too far down the route of solutionizing," as some people like to say of producing solutions, "we first need to establish where we're at." So I think reminding everyone of that and then producing the outcome is a good suggestion. So I like that idea and I think we can probably work with that.

Any other comments or points in respect to that?

All right, I'll commit to a rework of those slides and we can try with some of the feedback that we've taken here. I'm not sure that we'll be able to do as Mark suggested as much as I'm very sympathetic to the motivation for doing so of creating a separate document which is a sort of briefing document ahead of the meeting. But we might be able to do something there.

Would anyone else like to speak or comment at all?

Manal Ismail: Yes, thank you Jonathan. I also have sympathy with what Olof mentioned. Frankly, I was trying to get something off the ground quickly, and that's why I was trying to follow the set of the London meeting.

But maybe it's not the best format for this time. And I was hesitant to adopt this format. And I'm willing that we change the whole thing to something better.

Because last time we had some concrete questions that we needed feedback on and reactions from the GAC, and that's why we highlighted those as we go through the presentation.

I don't think we are that clear this time with regard to what exactly we are asking for. So maybe we can leave it at the slides in light of this time's discussion (unintelligible). So thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, thanks Manal. And I think two points in response to that.

One, if you hadn't have done anything, we might have had nothing. So actually, we should be very grateful that you got this off the ground.

Second, I am mindful also of Ana's earlier point which is creating some hooks for discussion, and you have tried to do that on the same format as we did before. So in reorganizing, we must lose sight of that element, and maybe it was Mark as well who made the point about, you know, ensuring we have areas for discussion and engagement. Those we mustn't lose sight of that I think.

All right, from my mind that probably concludes Item 2 on our agenda for this call for now. I don't propose to go through any kind of detail editing of the slides of content online - sorry, on the call.

We can exchange versions, and as I say, I'm happy to volunteer to make a first crack at it. I'm sure others of you will pitch in with any thoughts and updates. And we can always speak either one-to-one or through the group list; either way.

And I think we've got probably enough guidance for Mason. We need to insert whatever we are going to take from Mason into this. And it certainly feels too long and complicated at this stage, so we'll have to do some work. So yes, I think we've got our marching orders as to where to get to on this.

What about - okay Mark, go ahead.

Mark Carvell: Yes, just very briefly. I suggested as Olof may recall, that Mason circulate a biography so that GAC colleagues would have some sense, you know, who aren't familiar with Mason would know where he's coming from and so on and his expertise and so on.

Was that followed up? Thanks.

Mason Cole: Mason speaking. Yes it was, but I'm happy to resend that to you Mark if you'd like.

Mark Carvell: Okay, yes; thanks. So I missed it maybe somehow.

Mason Cole: Sure.

Mark Carvell: Please do, yes. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, great. Can we confirm that that was actually sent out Olof and should have been received? Just to make sure that there is no doubt about that.

Olof Nordling: This is Olof. And well, there is doubt about that. I think it has been - it has certainly been received by Heather, but not circulated to the GAC as of right now.

The idea was that Heather would make a short introduction at the very opening of the GAC session - at the first opening, the first GAC session on Saturday and then introduce Mason at that point. And Mason have an opportunity to say a very few words, really, prior to so that everybody recognizes him.

So we have not sent out - and I would have to double-check with Heather, whether that is the best way to do, to send it out beforehand. We can - thought about sending it out at that particularly point.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, but that clarifies that it has been thought about and Mark has not missed something and...

Olof Nordling: No.

Jonathan Robinson: ...the current plan is to, yes, send it out and presumably after Mason has made his introduction on Saturday.

Can we ask you Olof just to cross check that with Heather and see if she's perhaps willing to consider sending it out ahead of introducing? And she could say something like, "Here's a bio of Mason who I intend to introduce you to on Saturday," and you know, something along those lines.

Olof Nordling: Truly, we'll double-check with her.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Olof.

Olof Nordling: Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, now we plan to meet face-to-face as a group, which from memory is late on Monday I think. Can someone remind me of that?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I'm sorry; just getting off mute here.

I believe it's at 6:30 to 7:30 on Sunday evening, and it's in Constellation.

Jonathan Robinson: Sunday evening; okay.

Marika Konings: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: And so there is a question of what valuable we could cover at that time or what - does anyone - have we got any proposed items to cover there? Just any suggestions I guess as to what would be most usefully covered.

Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. One suggestion I would have would of course, you know, I think first of all, to concretely look at the input received during the GAC/GNSO meeting. But I think secondly, probably look at the work plan, you know, from here between (Mark Hesh) and try to determine what the group aims to achieve in that timeframe, and you know, what that means from, you know, a workload perspective.

Once we schedule meetings, are we still continuing on the track of having the sub-teams that, you know, may prepare some of the ground on some of the items that we're looking at, and in that way be able to, you know, plan out our time between Los Angeles and the next ICANN meeting which presumably would be the next meeting to get, you know, input or even approval or endorsement of some of the proposals that the group may come up with.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, that's a good idea actually; focusing on the structure logistics and organization, and whether we are still - whether it makes sense given the size of the group and participants in the group and so on, whether it makes sense to continue along the lines we have.

You might also talk about levels of participation of whether we need additional or substitute members to the extent that some have either dropped off or frequently been unable to attend.

Manal, go ahead?

Manal Ismail: Yes, just to support what you and Marika have said.

I think we need to - it would be the best to have this in a face-to-face meeting to work on a work plan, do some cross-checking with (unintelligible) and the scope of work and the deliverables we have committed too so that we can see when can we achieve and have some estimation on when this group would be, for example, concluding its work. Because at some point in time, we need to have this call (unintelligible) on a substance level, and I think our group is working on the procedure and aspect of it.

So I think we need to have a look at the charter and work out a work plan in light of it. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, good point Manal. So between us, hopefully between you, myself and Marika and Olof, we can pull that together.

Mark?

Mark Carvell: Yes, I agree very much with Manal on all those points.

Just a fact that I think we ought to have a Vice-Chair, that one of the new GAC Vice-Chairs were going to elect, you know, involved in the group to help steer it through the GAC processes. Just a suggestion; thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, good point. So when do we raise this? I mean because it really feels like - I mean candidly, I'm going to need to talk with Brian who I'm not sure has been and maybe I need to talk with him about his ongoing involvement. And he's obviously interested in this topic but hasn't been a regular participation.

The GAC has lost a couple of participants, one or more participants along the way, and so we need to refresh that participation.

And you're right. I mean originally the way we set this up Mark, was for the Chair and the Vice-Chairs of the GNSO plus - I don't know if Manal, when

you started, you were in capacity still as Vice-Chair of the GAC. But it is a good suggestion that Mark makes to engage one of the leadership team of the GAC involved.

So when do we deal with this? Do we deal with it as part of our agenda on the face-to-face? And if we do so, it might be worth - it means we miss the opportunity to discuss that with the GAC. But I guess it may not be a discussion point. We really want to re-energize the group on the part of a new work plan.

So I guess if we work on the work plan - I'm just thinking off the top of my head - if we work on the work plan on Sunday evening, we can then communicate a new work plan and put out a call for an agreed set of additional volunteers/participants. So that may well work quite neatly.

Manal.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Jonathan.

I think we will meeting before the elections take place, or it' going to be probably before we know for sure who are going to be the Vice-Chairs and who is going to be the Chair.

Maybe we can flag it that we will wait the elections and we might be requesting that we have one or more of the Vice-Chairs joining the group. But I think by the time of our meeting, the elections - if I recall correctly, the elections will not have taken place yet so we won't know who are the Chair and the Vice-Chairs.

But I agree to the benefits of having at least one of the Vice-Chairs onboard of our (unintelligible) of the (unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: Okay good. Well that's something we can firm up at our face-to-face meeting.

So it seems like we've got an agenda of at least three points which is feedback from our meeting, our joint meeting, generally structured logistics/organization of work plan; that's point two. And then participation in the group and any refreshers or changes to that as point three. So that is a helpful guide for the Monday meeting.

So personally, that moves us then on; satisfied with that. So that subject to anyone else wanting to comment? That probably puts us on to A or B at this stage, if there are any other points that anyone would like to make.

All right, that leaves us then, I think, with our work cut out for us to revise and polish up this content including the addition of Mason's slides, get an agenda shaped up and published for the Monday meeting, and I guess pack our bags, those of us who haven't left which I'm aware of a couple of people who might be very close to traveling.

So that feels like it's last call for any other comments or input before we wrap things up?

Okay, well I hope that wasn't too much of a whistle stop through this subject matter. Thanks very much for participation and comments. Just sparing a moment for anything else to come through on the Chat, it looks like that's it.

Thanks Manal, thank you too for especially the work on getting the presentation to (Neville) and the other sorting out of the agenda and all the good work you do.

Good. We'll see everyone in LA and correspond an email in the meantime. Thanks very much.

Man: Thanks Jonathan.

Man: Thank you.

Mark Carvell: Yes, thank you.

Woman: Thank you very much Nathalie. You may know stop the recordings. Have a good day.

END