

**ICANN
Transcription
GAC GNSO Consultation Group meeting
Tuesday 04 November 2014 at 14:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GAC GNSO Consultation Working Group call on the Tuesday 04 November 2014 at 14:00 UTC.

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

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-gac-20141104-en.mp3>

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

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

Government Advisory Committee

Mark Carvell, UK

GNSO Council

Amr Elsadr, Councilor

David Cake, Councilor,

Brian Winterfeldt, Councilor

GNSO Liaison to the GAC:

Mason Cole

Apology:

Volker Greimann, Vice Chair

Avri Doria – Councillor - NCSG

Jonathan Robinson, Chair

Manal Ismail – co-chair – Egypt

Ana Neves, Portugal

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings

Olof Nordling

Julia Charvolen

Karine Perset

Nathalie Peregrine

Operator: Good morning, good after. Please go ahead. This call is now being recorded.

(Nathalie Perergrine): Thank you very much (Francesca). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody.

And welcome to the GAC/GNSO Consultation group call on the 4th of November, 2014. On the call today, we have Mason Cole, Brian Winterfeldt and Mark Carvell.

We have apologies from Manal Ismail, Jonathan Robinson, Ana Neves, Avri Doria and Volker Greimann.

From staff we have Marika Konings, Olof Nordling, Julia Charvolen, Karine Perset 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 now with you Mason.

Mason Cole: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon everyone. Mason Cole speaking - the GNSO, liaison to the GAC. I've been asked to chair the meeting for the day in Manal's absence.

So I understand we don't have that many participants on the call today. But we have attentive agenda on the right hand side of your Adobe screen.

And even if we don't follow the agenda precisely, I think it might be useful just to get perspectives from anyone who'd like to share on some of these items today.

For my part, I think if we can agree to a regular call schedule going forward - something that everyone can participate in - that would be a very good outcome of the meeting today.

It's going to be important that we have as much participation as we can. So I anticipate some of the items that we'll discuss today will need to be transferred to the list for discussion.

But perhaps we can just do a quick run through the agenda. I'm particularly interested in perspectives from Mark - if we may - on some of these issues from the GAC.

But anyone else, of course, who has points of views to share, then we should. So I'd suggest we start at the top of the agenda.

And just share our own thoughts about how the L.A. meeting went, what we learned from that, in terms of the working group going forward. And we'll just start with that.

So let me open the floor. Would anyone like to talk a bit about the L.A. meeting? And some of the learnings that we had - discussions we had about the work tracks - anything else that's relevant to the meeting today.

Oh, David Cake has joined. Good morning David.

Mark Carvell: Mason, it's Mark speaking, if I can just...

((Crosstalk))

Mason Cole: Yes...

((Crosstalk))

Mark Carvell: If I could just say...

Mason Cole: Please go ahead Mark.

Mark Carvell: ...from the GAC perspective, in discussion we had with the full committee in L.A. was very timely.

I hope it will have registered with a lot of people, you know, that this is important work. And that we will get more GAC engagement over the coming months as we finalize the modalities.

I (unintelligible) in my comments to the committee later on and, of course we have a new chair, (Thomas Schneider), who I think is (unintelligible) of the importance of this, this important going working with the GNSO.

So I'm confident that the GAC will, you know, will gear up. And we have more members participating.

And today, actually, is a bit awkward because there are several colleagues in Busan at the penitentiary.

I happily managed to avoid that (unintelligible) for U.K. team there including somebody who deals with and works alongside me on Internet governance.

And then there's also actually (unintelligible) working group conference call I think happening at the same time as this call. So I think that's kind of worked against it.

But anyway I - just reflecting on that - I think it was good to have that fresh view for you to be introduced Mason and to the full committee.

And I think, you know, with Manal's help we will, you know, be able to ratchet up the involvement as we reach this critical stage of the work of the joint consultation group, thanks.

Mason Cole: Thank you very much Mark. If I may, I would agree with you. I think the L.A. sessions were useful in terms of opening a dialogue between the GNSO and the GAC.

I understand the conflict that GAC members have with the IANA issue and the meeting in Busan.

So perhaps today is an anomaly. And we'll have better participation on the calls going forward.

But I share your point of view that L.A. was productive. And hope that we can continue that productive progress - any other thoughts on Los Angeles?

Okay, very good. Excuse me. Marika, can I impose on you to give a brief update on the work tracks.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. So I thought it might be helpful to actually pause a second and look back at the charter.

And what you see on this screen is just a section, if that was important to highlight. And maybe, as well, the history of, you know, why are - we've been talking about two tracks.

So the one track focusing on did PDP and already engagement of the GAC and that process.

And the second track, which is a day-to-day ongoing coordination between the GNSO and the GAC - so as defined in the chart of the deliverables that this group is expected to produce is first of all, a documented process in the form of a table, flow chart, et cetera.

And to depict the ongoing (unintelligible) and time information exchange between the GAC and the GNSO organizations.

And there are already some examples included here on what form that could take, you know, the GNSO liaison to the GAC which we already have in place now (PermaLiasion) Consultative Group.

And I think, as you're aware, there are some other ideas that are being discussed under that specific track.

And then, the other hand, an agreed documented process, again, in the form of a table or a flow chart that would depict the ongoing smooth - or any engagement of the GAC in the GNSO polished development process.

Along with an agreed documented procedure to be followed where GAC early input is in conflict with the GNSO proposal. And a mutual agreement could not be reached.

And I think on both of these tracks we, you know, made great progress or already - or at least have outlined I think the direction we're heading in, I think we have some more concrete outcomes on the day-to-day cooperation track.

Where, of course, you know, we already have (unintelligible) in place as the GNSO liaison to the GAC. And I think the work we've done on the GNSO PDP, we haven't really been able to fully dive into that.

So that may be another point for the work going forward. But I thought it might be helpful just to remind everyone of the deliverables I set out in the charter and how those basically resulted in the two tracks that the group has started working on - noting that, of course, in several of these instances there is clear overlap between the two.

Because, you know, in your ongoing communications you may at times also have information sharing or input information to the PDP's.

So I think that we need to make sure that, you know, there are overlaps and links between the two tracks. But at the same time, I think it's important, as well to see that progress has been made in those two areas.

And do have the documents available or the last stack of both of those if it's helpful to go into those. Even though I don't think we have any of the team leads on the call. Well I think Amr has just joined.

And so he may provide some insights on that. So that's what I basically wanted to share.

I don't know if you want me to cover anything else at this stage, Mason, or whether you want to go into the two tracks and see where things are at.

Mason Cole: Well, let's cover items 2A and 2B on the agenda. And I think some of the color for going more in depth on those deliverables will probably come out if we can proceed that way.

So let's move on. Thank you very much, by the way, Marika for that update.

Item 2A, the PDP work track, Amr good morning, thanks for joining the call.

Would you like to provide the group with an update on that work track? Is there anything that you'd like to share this morning?

Amr Elsadr:

Hi Mason. Hello everyone. This is Amr. Actually, well if I am going to provide an update, I'd probably say that there's very little that we've done on this at least that I've done along with (Susanne). We haven't done much coordination.

And to clarify why I feel this has been happening is, like Marika said, "There is a lot of overlap between the PP track and the day-to-day track.

Although I am a processing enthusiast, and I think that's a rarity in the GNSO. I'm one of those folks who is very enthusiastic about process issues.

And I deal with them all the time on counsel and also on the standing committee of improvements. But, as is, I'm still having a little trouble figuring out what we're supposed to be delivering on this track.

And if got more of a sense from this group on what they would like to see, I can and try to work something out with that. Marika's already some work. And thanks for that Marika.

And sort of just laying out what the process looks like - and (Mikey) had already started doing some work earlier when he was leading this group on where the possible nodes of interaction between the GAC and GNSO process maybe.

But it feels to me that most of the nitty-gritty stuff is on the day-to-day track. And if there's something clear - something that this group would like to see delivered on the process track, I'd be happy to work on it.

And I think I have enough relevant expertise on the matter to do that. But some guidance would be appreciated, thanks.

Mason Cole: Thanks Amr. Marika, I see your hand.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Maybe just to remind everyone, as well, that, you know, why we initially started out on this track is I think a table, you know, staff prepared.

That basically outlined the existing engagement opportunities in the GNSO policy development process and then describing how those are currently managed or handled.

And then I think we had, as well, you know, comments or suggestions or feedback.

I think from people in their group on why those, you know, weren't working or whether, you know, whether they maybe should be rethought or in a different way implemented.

And I think from there, then we went to the flowchart. I think, you know, first of all an attempt to show what is currently being done. And I think we said, "Okay, that's maybe first try to focus on."

I think we broke it down into, I think, four or five stages that map, as well, the policy development, graphic in the stages that we've identified, you know, in that process.

And basically said, "Well maybe we want to focus as a first step on the initial stages of the policy development process as input" - at that stage, is probably the most valuable.

And that is the flow chart I put up there - which, you know, in blue it basically depicts, in blue and white, the existing steps of the issue scoping part of the policy development process.

And then in red highlighted, there's one of the ideas that has been floated as a possible, you know, mechanism that would allow GAC input at the stage of the preliminary issue report.

I don't think we've had an opportunity to really go into detail. Whether people believe that, you know, this is something that should be pursued.

You know, if so, what would be the exact format or how would it work in practice.

So I think we're really at that stage of trying to think through at which parts of the PDP process GAC input, you know, would be beneficial, desirable, you know, required, you know, optional.

And if so, you know, how? What form would that take? And I think at least a quick-look mechanism was an idea that tries to address the fact that, you know.

The preliminary issue report is something that is a staff prepared document that outlines the issue. It's not, you know, and GNSO opinion or a view yet. So it may not require any kind of detailed position yet, apart from flagging.

You know, is there any information missing? And is there any specific view on whether a PDP should be initiated.

Hence, maybe the form a kind of a quick-look mechanism that would possible, you know, address the GAC's concern of needing - you know, to needing more time to develop formal positions.

This would be a kind of, you know, raising a red, orange or green flag that would give a kind of indication of whether, you know, GAC views would be forthcoming on this issue, which would then, also, put the GNSO on alert.

To really make sure that, you know, there's ongoing engagement. So I think that is a little bit the thinking about the quick-look mechanism that could form a kind of trigger for further engagement opportunities throughout the PDP.

And I think that's where, you know, we're basically at. And I think as Amr already said, as well, there is of course as well overlap between the earlier and - daily or ongoing communications where input is being requested and sought.

But I think, nevertheless, it will also be important to really focus the steps in the PDP in trying to define how GAC engagements would look or should look.

As that may also make it easier to, you know, visualize on how that may work in practice.

And maybe, again, these are some of the things we may want to experiment with. Is it something to try out?

Again, I think of course, you know, that quick of mechanism would also require, you know, commitment from the GAC or at least a mechanism from the GAC side to be able to do that.

And so I think those are some of the things that we may want to talk about or think through.

Mason Cole: Okay, thank you very much, Marika. Amr, I see your hand.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Mason. This is Amr, again. Yes, I also have a thought on this. And it's just a personal opinion and probably needs to be discussed more amongst - on the GNSO council.

But I am personally agreeable to the principal of maybe making some very light handed modifications to the GNSO process to accommodate the easier inputs by the GAC along the process.

And I think I said that. I said this on our previous call. But like Marika said, to sort of experiment with this, we would need some sort of confirmation or commitment from the GAC.

That they would work with the GNSO to make this happen and to make it productive, to make it something that would add value to GAC or the engagement in the GNSO process.

And I just want to stress that I would recommend very light - and a very light headed approach to making these changes.

And just with the purpose of allowing the GAC process to sync more in line with the GNSO process. And I'd be happy to sort of dig into that a little a deeper.

If folks from the GAC and if the GNSO council is agreeable to the idea.
Thanks.

Mason Cole: Thank you very much Amr. Mark.

Mark Carvell: Yes, thank you Mason. And thank you Marika for running through the deliverables.

I think it's time now to put to the GAC the quick-look mechanism approach - which I would support.

Because it's - as I said, I think all in all the earlier the GAC's has an opportunity to express a view as to a potential involvement in APDP process, the better - the earlier the better.

So my suggestion subject to consulting with (Anna), (Susanne) and Manal Ismail maybe subsequent to this call, is that we've put a proposal to the GAC that a quick-look mechanism is instituted as a matter of course for each GAC meeting.

And the reason I say the meeting, I think any steps, whether it's at the scoping stage or in terms of engaging with policy development, has to be considered when the GAC meets.

I don't see a possibility for any of these modalities to operate virtually or intersessionally. So the timing of the mechanism is pretty crucial.

We have to have some period prior to GAC meeting where we have information to work on with regard to the issue at the scoping stage.

And then at the meeting itself, we have a slot for determining the quick-look for undertaking the mechanism.

And then the process following that will I presume perhaps be through via the liaison - you, Mason, in terms of reverting back to the GNSO in a sort of timing which is consistent with why the public comment process I guess.

And then we record this in the Communiqué, the GAC Communiqué that with undertaking a quick-look mechanism preliminary examination of an issue and undertaking a liaison with the GSNO accordingly.

So, and what I'm saying, is I think we need now to put to the GAC a proposal for agreement that we institute some - this mechanism, a quick-look mechanism, as a matter of course for each GAC meeting.

Now I'm assuming that you are okay with the idea that we incorporate these legalities in the physical GAC meetings - which is three times a year, obviously.

And you understand that it's perhaps difficult to undertake these (unintelligible) lesson meeting intersessionally. But that's my view.

And as a fact, I could discuss this further with the others active in the group subsequent to this call. Thanks.

Mason Cole: Thank you Mark. Marika, I see your hand. But if I may let me just ask Mark a question.

Mark if the GNSO work proceeds more quickly than the - more quickly than the meeting schedule for the GAC.

Meaning, if a PDP advances beyond the initial, you know, the very initial stage - past where a quick-look mechanism might be appropriate.

Would the GAC feel comfortable then providing input at different stage of the PDP process? Because they're - just as a reminder - there are multiple stages along the timeline for input for the GAC.

Mark Carvell: Yes, I thought you'd see the point. And it's important for the GAC to keep instead with the policy develop process and not to slow it down - in order to get it to physical meetings.

I do see that as a problem, potentially. I'm not sure yet how we address that. But I think it's a problem we've always anticipated.

And part of that issue, of course, is that to get to that may well have to consult within their administration. And you have to allow time for that, as well.

So I don't have the foggiest answer to that, in terms of the ability of the GAC to respond and engage in policy development beyond steps at meetings. I really don't know yet how that's going to - how that might work out.

Mason Cole: Okay, thank you very much, Marika.

Mark Carvell: (Unintelligible) very much help. I'm sorry.

Mason Cole: No, not at all. Yes, go ahead, Marika, please.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. And also in recognizing, of course, the timing aspect and where that may fit in - I think there're probably different ways we could look at it.

And I think it partly comes back, as well, to the question, "You know, how much input does the GAC want or need to provide at which stage."

And, you know, for the quick-look mechanism - and that's something you know, I try to map out a little bit in the chart, as well.

The idea is that, you know, the quick-look mechanism wouldn't really be anything more than the GAC saying, "Yes, we believe this issue has public policy implication and will provide you with further input, you know, in due course."

And, you know, (unintelligible) while this may have public policy implications. And, you know, we may provide you with public or input at a later stage.

And green would be well, we don't think there are any public policy implications at this stage. Of course, we still reserve our right to come in at a later stage.

But, you know, for now, you know, don't hold your breath unless I'm providing you with anything. And that would basically trigger - for the GAC internally.

It kind of, you know, creation of a working group or whatever kind of mechanism you would need to actually come up with that more substantive kind of input - which probably would need to be, you know, considered at meeting and, you know, work through and record as part of the communique.

But the question is, "Does the - just the raising of the flag." And it could be a kind of, you know, standard kind of language.

Is that something that could be triggered in between meetings? And, again, we're just looking at more kind of indication.

You know, the GAC is planning to provide input on this issue. So the GNSO can, you know, anticipate that and follow that up, you know, either through the liaison or our other conversations.

Alternatively, if, you know, your view is that, you know, more substantive input can already be expected - at the stage of the preliminary issue report. And again, the issue report is just scoping the issue.

I think where you really want to have your input and views and opinions is when, you know, the working groups start the deliberations. Because that's really the stage when people - well and the group will start looking at, you know.

What information do we have? What are the different views of the different groups? And how are we going to address those.

So that is - at least from my perspective - I think, the crucial moment - where you do need to have that input available and then maybe not as much flexibility to wait for a long time for that.

I think alternatively if you do believe that at the preliminary issue report, the GAC may already want to provide substantive input. Then maybe the trigger should be moved up.

So basically, as soon as the GNSO council, you know, request an issue report, at that point notification goes to the GAC. And say, "You know, GAC will start working on the issue report.

And the timeframe that we typically have is 45 days - a maximum of 45 days. But we can ask for more time, if needed." So that may already give you a window of 45 days to start thinking about it, and you know, may still then come a little bit after, you know, public comment is open or closed looking at, you know, how the schedule of ICANN meetings is. But that would allow at least for more time to get that done and maybe align it more with, you know, doing it at GAC meetings or the ICANN meetings.

So I think the basic question comes down to is how much input do you want to provide at what stage, how much time is needed for that, and based on that, you know, where does it then need to fit in to the overall profit that we currently have.

Mason Cole: That's a useful reminder about the quick-look mechanism and whether or not something is red or intra-green. I think that's a good gating item for keeping the workflow manageable. Because if the GAC doesn't see public policy implications on a particular issue, then that frees up more of the GAC time for input on other issues. So thank you Marika.

Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Mason, this is Amr again.

Yes, I just wanted to really agree with something Marika said which is that I personally believe that GAC input would be far more valuable at the stage where the deliberations on the policy, when the PDP working group is doing its work, will probably want to be far more useful than at the earlier stages when we're scoping the issue when we're drafting the charter.

An earlier recommendation I had made on this group was that instead of trying to approach the process issue from the beginning and working our way up, so starting with the preliminary issue reports and then the charter drafting and the PDP, I had recommended that we actually start backwards. But folks on this group didn't seem to agree much with that idea.

And one of the reasons is because I do believe that input at the PP working group stage would be far more beneficial and we could see quicker return on the work that we're doing if we did that.

But also the timing issue was something I had in mind at the time because when the GAC is interacting with a PDP working group, it doesn't necessarily have to be a stage when public comments are being provided for an initial report by the PDP working group.

But PDP working groups traditionally always reach out to the different ACs and SOs seeking input very early stages in their work. And these working groups go on for quite a long time and cover at least – usually at least two to three public ICANN meetings in which the GAC will be able to meet and deliberate on different policy issues.

And if one policy has been flagged to have public policy implications, then the GAC could provide input using its normal mechanisms of doing so to a GNSO PDP working group even before an initial report is published.

And I think this in itself would be a big win for this group and a big win for early engagements of GAC on GNSO PDPs. And that way you could get the GAC perspective on public policy implications very early on in the PDP proceedings. And I just think that would be helpful. Thanks.

Mason Cole: Thank you Amr. Olof?

Olof Nordling: Oh yes, thank you; just to follow-up what Marika has said almost everything about the quick-look process.

But recalling our discussions over the months, while the quick-look process – well, the thought was rather that this could happen at – well, within the timeframe of this very first set of the PDP on issue scoping.

So – and the thought being really that this would be useful on both sides; that it would be useful for the GNSO to be aware of that whether it was a green, yellow or red light, and a very preliminary fashion, and now promises and no regrets. And it also would be useful for the GAC to realize in an early stage that, “Oh, we have something here that we really need to address.”

So going back to Mark, I think we should consider GAC and a proposal we would provide to the GAC that this could potentially be something that can be developed intercessionally without having thought of a binding function but being helpful to the workings of both the GNSO and the GAC.

So just a thought from what Marika said which I wholeheartedly agree with. Thank you.

Mason Cole: Thank you Olof. David?

David: Yes, I just wanted to comment on Marika's, you know, response to quick-look, the GAC (unintelligible), you know, some sort of groups looking to it. And then maybe take an official position on sort of by the GAC Communiqué.

While I've got no real problem with that, with the GAC taking an issue, each stated in a public (unintelligible) why the GAC Communiqué – that's almost certainly not going to really be sufficient. And if the GAC goes the effort of forming a small group to look at it seriously, an opportunity of more detailed and sort of back-and-forth interaction with a working group would be terrific.

I mean at the moment (unintelligible) IGO, IGO (unintelligible) rights mechanism, sort of looking at the GAC advice, and it's sort of one sentence long. And it's not that anybody is sort of disagreeing with it, but we're having a discussion about what it actually means. And expect that something that, you know, one of the people in the GAC who sort of put forward that position could explain to us in a way that was really helpful.

Whereas sometimes it's – I think I said at the time talking to the – that communicating with – working with policies sort of input but finally sort of (unintelligible) mechanism of the GAC Communiqué even (unintelligible) trying to sort of – have a communication via just sort of not billboard. It's sort of, you know, the minute to the mount and the process is very – back-and-forth is very slow. And that is sort of the commitment to it.

Well hopefully, a much more detailed explanation some way in which the GAC can sort of realize there's an issue and then sort of regularly – we understand the GAC can't or be able to directly participate in the working group. But perhaps while they'll show up, you know, something other than, you know – (unintelligible) for example, you know, a page or something (unintelligible) thinking. It's a rationale of GAC advice would be really helpful and basically a rationale for GAC advice would be terrifically helpful for GNSO working groups.

Mason Cole: Thank you David. Mark?

Mark Carvell: Yes, thanks. I'm very much in agreement with what David – what everybody has said so far.

The GAC has changed a lot in recent years. I mean I joined in 2008 and (unintelligible) activity was pretty minimal then where now really much more active (unintelligible). So I didn't mean to suggest that we would sort of just park things until we actually met again; I didn't mean to suggest that.

I think the quick-look mechanism position (unintelligible) deciding whether their public policy issue, I think that has to do – that decision has been made at a meeting -- at a physical meeting. It would be the first time that the committee will have been made aware of an issue, and if it's very obvious that there are public policy aspects to it which the GAC should engage on, that is the time to signal.

But I don't think we can do that (unintelligible). I think it requires and what it speaks together for those who have been active following GNSO consummations and so on to be able to bring up to speed the other members of the GAC who may not be following issues very closely. And then (unintelligible) that many do not. We need to do that at a physical meeting.

And we can take a decision I think at the time of agreeing that there are substantial public policy issues, then to form a working group. And that could work intercessionally and engage with the GNSO process instead and prior to the next physical GAC meeting. I'm sure that could be achieved.

So I think it's quite feasible for us and the GAC to pick up an issue, and with an active group or subgroup of the GAC, work on that in coordination with the GNSO group, the PDP working group if that's already gearing up. And then the GAC working group will report online to the GAC at the appropriate

moment. And then at the next physical GAC meeting, there will be I guess a kind of review of where things stand.

And we'll have you Mason providing the liaison and (unintelligible) and a meeting with the GNSO agenda which would include an issue which is developing at the PDP where there a lot of public policy issues and the GAC working group has a case on it.

So I can see that scenario being put in place. Thanks.

Mason Cole: All right, thank you Mark.

David, is that an old hand or a new hand? Okay, thank you.

Okay, I see that Marika has captured most of this in notes. Mindful of the time; it's now quarter till the hour. Perhaps we move on to the rest of the agenda.

Marika Konings: Mason...

Mason Cole: One thing that I wanted to bring – yes Marika, sorry.

Marika Konings: I did have one last comment if I may – or question.

Mason Cole: Please.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. So question for Mark is do you think that in order for the GAC to be able to take a decision in the quick-look mechanism, would it be sufficient for you just to know what the issue is that the GNSO counts as considering? So in other words, you know, we just send you – this is what the issue report is expected to look at, or do you think that would have to be the preliminary issue reports so you can actually see, you know, what is being covered and how an issue is scoped.

Because as I explained before, I think there are, you know, two possible trigger mechanisms that we could think of and I think it depends partly on how much information the GAC would need for it to be able to use the quick-look mechanism to be able to determine, you know, whether or not the public policy implications.

Mark Carvell: Well thanks Marika. Yes, Mark speaking.

Well I would encourage a fairly simple document, an initial explanation of the issues as being sufficient. If we have that in good time, I mean three to four weeks before the GAC meets so it allows GAC perhaps to consult with the necessary specialists for the demonstration if that's necessary, and then to arrive at the GAC meeting well prepared to give a view on whether there are substantive public policy issues in the discussion. Based on the preliminary report I would have thought would be the way to do it.

And always, and as we said earlier, we can always reserve our position if subsequently in the more detailed issue document reveals things that we hadn't anticipated or alerts as to aspects that we hadn't considered. We then (unintelligible) then to revise our quick-look response I guess; we always have that safeguard.

So I would support a preliminary issues paper approach with the quick-look mechanism. Thanks.

Mason Cole: All right, thank you Mark. Marika, did that help with your question?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Yes, although I'm still not clear on whether we're talking about a short, you know, one-page kind of document that could be provided at the start of, you know, when the issue report is requested, or the preliminary issue report which is usually at least, you know, 40 page if not more document. But I think that's something where we're going into details

and I think that's something we can probably think about further. That's it; that was definitely helpful.

Mark Carvell: Mason, yes Mark speaking. I'm sorry if I've been (unintelligible).

Mason Cole: Right.

Mark Carvell: I guess I'm thinking of the pre-preliminary, a much shorter, one-to-two pages. That would be my preference or my suggestion. Thanks.

Mason Cole: Okay, thank you both. If I may, let's go ahead and move on to a couple of the other agenda items.

Just in considering the GNSO liaison role, one of the things that I've noticed right away is that I have very little effective way of communicating with the GAC right now. That I do so a bit through Olof, a bit with Manal, a bit with others in the GAC on calls like this. But I have no formal way of notifying the GAC about business issues related to GNSO progress.

And I wonder if it might be useful if we identified someone within the GAC, someone with whom I can communicate on a day-to-day basis, who then could relay information to the GAC so that the communication loop is fully made.

I saw in the Board Resolutions – excuse me – that were published yesterday that the Board has agreed to funding for GNSO secretariat or a GAC secretariat. So perhaps that person can be a day-to-day go between for me. Pardon me. I do think that someone with whom I can confer on a day-to-day basis would help, you know, the day-to-day coordination work that needs to happen between the GNSO and the GAC.

So I'd be particularly interested in Mark's point of view on this, but others are of course welcome on this. Anyone? Olof?

Olof Nordling: Oh yes, apologies; I was on mute.

Just to make it clear, when you wish to convey something to the GAC, if it's perfect to send it to me and I'll inform the GAC to this.

But I think what we were talking about was also that you have a direct connection with – let's put it – one GAC representative to confer with rather than going always through, well, ICANN Staff or the external secretariat which is certainly also a possibility.

So to have a peer relation with someone from the GAC. And I think that's a very good idea. So I leave it at that; thank you.

Mason Cole: Thank you Olof, Mason speaking again.

Yes, that's exactly what I'm referring too. I think someone who is inside the GAC process and can provide beneficial perspective back to the GNSO would be best.

I'm mindful of the GAC's limitations on their time and some of the difficulties in accommodating GNSO work day-to-day. But if that's something that can be arranged, I think that would be very beneficial.

Mark?

Mark Carvell: Yes, I think it's a good idea to arrange that. My suggestion is that one of the five vice-chairs that we now have be accorded this responsibility. We could put that to Thomas anyway; the GAC chair.

Mason Cole: That's a good suggestion. Okay, any other input on this issue?

Okay, I believe we're now on item 2B number one which is creation of a GAC/GNSO working group.

I'm sorry. Marika, can you remind me where we went with this agenda item because it slipped my mind?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Sorry, it took me a minute to get off mute.

I think basically where we left this off, and I can pull up a document that we have for this. We started out listing a number of options that the group wanted to consider in relation to day-to-day coordination and engagement. We then narrowed down that list – you know, one of the things we already implemented as, you know, the GAC or the GNSO liaison to the GAC.

But there was still a number of other elements that we're looking at. And the document you see on the screen outlines those different options that we're considering with some of the comments, you know, the pros and cons, how could this potentially be implemented; as a pilot. You know, what is our overall assessment, and to look at, you know, the early awareness and notifications, notices, which I think we've been discussing in quite some detail; the rethinking of the recurring joint meetings, regular engagement between the GAC and GNSO chairs.

And I think at the last meeting there was also a suggestion that maybe there could be something of a joint working group between the GAC and the GNSO that could, you know, serve a kind of purpose of, you know, sharing information, you know, keeping up-to-date.

But again, I think we didn't really go into great detail on that concept. So I think, you know, the question is, is this one of the options that we want to add to the list, and you know, in considering further detail and then decide, you know, which of those we want to move forward with and slash out further and make concrete recommendations.

You know, the working group, is that the option that we want to move forward with and that would encapsulate some of the other things we have spoken about.

So I think it was just one of those ideas that was thrown out in the face-to-face meeting that I think that Manal knows it, that you know, we may want to think about and consider further. And then I think also, you know, think about how such a group could potentially work, what would be its role, you know, how would be the set up.

So I think again, I think from my perspective, at least I think it was one of the additional ideas to the list that we already currently have. Probably at some point, we need to start moving this into, you know, concrete recommendations and you know, suggestions on what we as a group or what you as a group believe should be recommended to both – to the GNSO and the GAC in relation to day-to-day coordination. In addition of course to what, you know, we currently already have in place in the form of the liaison involved.

Mason Cole: Okay, thank you Marika. The floor is open for discussion on this. All right, I see no hands.

Well perhaps this flows back upward in the agenda back to a discussion about how the GAC and the GNSO work together just on an ongoing basis inside the process.

Would others agree with that? Okay, thank you very much; I see the checkmarks. Okay, all right then. I think we should continue this discussion on the list.

Let us then move to Item 3, a regular call schedule. It looks like we're having some difficulty getting everyone on the call. And I appreciate Mark's input

that there are competing priorities for the GAC members particularly right now.

Would it be helpful if we scheduled a discussion somewhere on the order?

Marika, pardon me but this is only my second call for this working group. Are we meeting roughly once a month, once every two weeks? What is our current schedule?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Our original schedule which I think we managed to do quite well before the London meeting, was meeting every two weeks. But then we had I think some significant challenges during the summer months, and you know, trying, and as well that I think there were several meetings at the same time. So I think that we kind of lost that schedule.

But I think at least before, people felt comfortable and happy with having a call every two weeks. So you could maybe suggest on moving forward on that same basis and sending out a note to the group proposing that and seeing if there's any concern or objections. And maybe as well encouraging people that if they already know now ahead of time if there's certain dates that they cannot make it, that they let us know so we, you know, can anticipate if there's certain meeting dates that, you know, are difficult for everyone. And we may need to consider a change in dates.

Mason Cole: Right. David, correctly points out in the Chat Room that it's not just GAC members but some GNSO folks are in Busan as well. David, that's absolutely correct.

So I'd be in favor of proceeding on a two-week basis. Is there any objection to doing so? If not, then I'm happy to suggest that to the list. Okay, looks like we have some agreement on that.

And I'm mindful as well that we're approaching a holiday season and things tend to get jammed up for the holidays as well. But it won't be very long at all before we're preparing for the next meeting which is now in Singapore as I understand it. So I would end all of us to not only attend each of these discussions, but encourage colleagues to do so as well as much as possible.

Okay, any other business that needs to be discussed today? All right, I'm seeing no hands.

Marika, anything else from the Staff side that needs to be discussed?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. No, I'll get the notes out to the list and then they'll encourage everyone to, you know, comment or provide input, especially those of course that couldn't make the call. And then, you know, we'll confirm as well the next meeting for Tuesday, 18th of November at 1400 UTC.

Mason Cole: All right, very good. We're now at the top of the hour so that's perfect timing.

So I thank everyone for their time, and let's call the meeting to a close. Everyone have a good morning/afternoon/evening and we'll talk to you in two weeks.

Marika Konings: Thanks.

Man: Many thanks Mason. (Unintelligible) everybody.

Man: Thank you very Mason.

Marika Konings: Bye.

Woman: Thank you very much (Unintelligible). Have a great day.

END