

**ICANN  
Transcription  
GAC GNSO Consultation Group meeting  
Tuesday 18 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 18 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/gns0/gns0-gac-20141118-en.mp3>

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

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

Attendees:

Government Advisory Committee

Manal Ismail – co-chair – Egypt  
Ana Neves, Portugal

GNSO Council

Brian Winterfeldt, Councilor  
David Cake, Vice Chair

GNSO Liaison to the GAC:

Mason Cole

Apology:

Amr Elsadr, Councilor  
Suzanne Radell, US  
Avri Doria, Councillor  
Jonathan Robinson, Chair

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings  
Olof Nordling  
Glen de Saint Gery

Karine Perset  
Nathalie Peregrine

Nathalie Peregrine: Good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the GAC GNSO consultation group call on 18 November 2014. On the call today we have today we have Manal Ismail, Ana Neves, and Mason Cole. We have received apologies from Amr Elsadr, Suzanne Radell, Avri Doria and Jonathan Robinson. And from staff we have Marika Konings, Olof Nordling, Glen de Saint Gery, 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 over to you, Manal.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Nathalie, and thank you Mason and (Anna) for joining, and of course ICANN staff. Apologies for the late circulation of the agenda. I tried to circulate an agenda this morning, my time, and then I tried to elaborate it further when Marika has already helped me sent the diagram she circulated a couple of hours ago.

So first allow me to ask whether anyone has any objection to the agenda or suggested additions or more pressing topics that we need to discuss. Okay then I think we can start with our first agenda item, which is the quick look of the triage mechanism that has - we have been discussing this for quite some time now.

So allow me first to start with wrapping some points because I have the feeling that we keep discussing some points again and again, whereas I think some of the points are already agreed upon and we should mark those as such and progress forward. So because I think if we agree to those, this might focus our discussion more on certain areas.

First of all my understanding is we are focusing our discussion on early engagement, and when we say early engagement this means the very

preliminary phase of the issues report. Again, later participation is always an option and remains an option, but our current discussion involving the quick look mechanism or the triage group is concerned about the early phase, right?

So hearing no objections, I will continue on that basis because I've been looking into the material we have, for example, the one-pager piece. And it has so many information that has to do with description of where the process is now highlighting of which phase we are in and things like that which I don't think it currently applies to the early phase we think about.

So the other thing is that we're focusing on GAC input, because again individual governments' responses is always an option and will remain an option. But I think our target here is the GAC response. So any objections to this? Because again, I keep hearing that we can leave this to individual governments' response. It's always we're there. We're trying to coordinate an overall GAC input that goes early into the process.

And there is a need for early indication from the GAC whether the topic is of interest, and they will provide input or if it is of interest and they remain - they wish to remain informed or if it is not currently of interest. And again, we have agreed that changing this at a later stage again is an option. Of course we will lose the advantage of getting input early into the process, but again, it remains an option so it's not a (unintelligible).

Another point is that again there is need to prioritize and streamline input that is to be provided by the GAC to the GNSO. And I understand that this very early flagging thing should be quite quick, I believe. Because I've not been on the previous call, I was going through the detailed minutes or action items that Marika very helpfully provided and maybe I missed something but I read in the minutes that this may be reflected in the communiqué and cannot be done intersessionally, and I'm not sure whether this has to do with the early

flagging, whether the GAC is interested in a certain topic or later phases that has to do with the substantial input expected. So, Marika, please?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Just to reflect I think on what we discussed during last week's meeting that I think it was particularly the view of Mark Carvell that he thought that even the quick look mechanism may not be able to be done between meetings and that it was something that the GAC should consider during face-to-face meetings.

And I think that was I think some others, you know, raised questions whether that really couldn't be done as a, you know, on a mailing list or through calls between meetings as I think as we tried to clarify and saw that the quick look mechanism isn't just a kind of flag-raising issue, it's not intended to prepare detailed input or comments at that stage. Although of course, it could still be done if there's a desire to do, but there seemed to be - and I think, Mark, that maybe some that would need to be considered during GAC face-to-face meetings.

But again, I think it would be interesting to hear if other GAC members had the same perspective, whether just, you know, specifically the quick look mechanism is something that could be managed between meetings and noting again there's of course, you know, the timeline that aligns with, you know, when a preliminary issue of course is published for public comment, a timeframe that is with that, we may not necessarily align with the face-to-face.

And depending on what is or what isn't possible, that may need to factor in as well as, you know, what time the notification to the GAC should happen to allow for that mechanism. And again, I think maybe at some stage looking at the flow chart.

You know, once we come to a kind of common understanding on how that may look, maybe that would be the moment to start talking as well about timing and, you know, trying to get a sense of how long would the different

steps in that process take which may give a better sense then if indeed if that's something that is manageable to do, you know, between meetings, looking at the work that involved and - or is it really something that, you know, can only be done on the final decision that only can be done during GAC face-to-face meetings. And again, I think probably something for the GAC to reflect on.

And again, that maybe -- and I think per (Suzanne)'s e-mail -- maybe that is one of the specific questions we may at the end of the day have even after we fleshed out a kind of straw man or proposal, one of the concrete questions to put back to the GAC, you know, would people feel comfortable in taking the decision on the quick look in between meetings or if it's something that should really be reserved to face-to-face meetings which could potentially then have an impact of course on the overall timeline.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Marika. And yes I definitely agree that this could be one of the questions that we take back to the GAC and come with a response, but I think at least we have to clarify this with the GAC members of this consultation group because at least we have to go back to the GAC with something that we as members agree upon and proposing as one group. So maybe we can also have this discussion online since we don't have either (Suzanne) nor Mark on this call. And, (Anna), please feel free to share yours if you wish so.

Again, my understanding is that also from the GNSO side, the GNSO may be flexible in terms of the timeline of a certain PDP if they receive a timely indication that the GAC intends to provide some input. So again, is my understanding right, so if the GAC indicates that it's interested in a certain topic and it intends to provide input but maybe it needs more time, can this be accommodated through the PPD process or will the PDP progress regardless? (Anna), would you like to have the floor?

(Anna): Yes. Thank you, Manal. Well as I was listening and thinking about what we have been doing since the beginning of this process and I do think that we are running in circles, but because I think that we have to identify a specific topic as you just mentioned I think to work with. Because without a specific example, without a specific topic, I think it's very difficult to engage the GAC colleagues and to understand what we are trying to do here and how things will run.

So I think, well at least what I feel from what we need from the GAC side, is to have a specific topic and to see how we manage it with the GNSO and with (Mason) and et cetera to see how things work. And without a specific example I don't think that we can do it. So it's my feeling. Thank you.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, (Anna). I'm sorry I can see Marika's hand, but I would like to response very quickly first to (Anna) before giving the floor to Marika. I fully agree that we should also be having some pilot on the substance side, choose some topic and get to practice whatever mechanism we're going to propose. My only concern is that this will not address two things.

First of all, the prioritization, because if we already choose a specific topic to engage upon then we're already on a specific topic. So - and at this early stage we wanted to really know how are we going to prioritize and whether this mechanism works mostly and we can fine-tune as we go. I had something else to say, which I already forgot, maybe I can give Marika the floor first, hoping that I remember. Marika, go ahead, please.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Manal. This is Marika. More in relation to the kind of question on flexibility on the GNSO side, so in the GNSO PDP there, a couple of them are minimum timeframes. So from that perspective, there is flexibility, you know, should more additional time be needed. I think the question partly, you know, when would that time be needed.

Because for example, on - if the publication of the preliminary issue report is the trigger for the GAC quick look mechanism and, you know, the question is, you know, does it make sense or is there a need to hold off publication of the final report until the GAC, you know, provides its input, because I think at that stage it's just a kind of flagging of whether there is GAC interest or not in the topic, which, you know, doesn't necessarily impact the issue of the report per se as that is, you know, a separate message or communication that could go to the GNSO council as it, you know, takes its decision or considers the final issue report and decides on next steps.

So I think that's maybe something to think about or consider. And again, it comes back to the question of how much time would the GAC need to, you know, conduct or perform a quick look mechanism and how does that align with the current timeframe of going from a preliminary issue report to a final issue report.

Because we currently do have a minimum I think 42 days in between that, which is the public comment period and then there's usually some time that staff meets to review and absorb those comments before it produces a final issue report. So typically that is already I would say, you know, a month and a half to two months time period there that would allow at least the triggering of the quick look mechanism.

On, you know, the other question which I think, you know, is linked and that's something that's charted in the graphic is well, should the GAC indicate that there are public policy considerations, that may trigger a separate track on the GAC side where you may want to bring together people, you know, whether that's the whole GAC I think that's perhaps something for you start to develop concrete input for the GNSO PDP working group.

And I think as I've explained before as well, the first step of a GNSO working group is at an early stage of its deliberations to actually reach out to GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies, as well as supporting organizations

and advisory committees to ask them to provide input on the topic that they will then consider as part of their deliberations. And the timeframe that is typically set for that is a minimum of 35 days.

And again, that is a minimum, and that we've seen as well in recent cases that some groups at that stage may come back and say well we need a little bit more. And in certain cases the working group may say okay we'll wait, considering all the input until we get yours as well, or in certain cases they may say okay that's fine, but in the meantime we'll start looking at some of the other input received and, you know, we'll just deal with your input when we get it.

So again, I think there is flexibility. I think, you know, the main point I think will all these issues and approaches is communication. I think as long as the GAC would be able to provide a kind of, you know, by this date we'll be able to provide you this with this input, it allows for both the council as the manager of the process but also the PDP working group to plan for that and, you know, hopefully be able to accommodate as such, you know, if that requires more time based on, you know, what they have as their work time.

So again, I think there's a lot of flexibility, at least from my personal perspective. A lot of it comes down to communication and setting expectations by when information may be received so that everyone can plan accordingly.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Marika. And before giving the floor to Olof, I just remembered the other thing I was going to respond to (Anna). So the first thing is that this might not be able to test the prioritization thing and the second thing is that, and I'm not sure, but we might not be able to find that PDP that is starting that early on the issues report phase.

I mean if we just pick one of the ongoing discussions, then again this should be a in a more advanced phase than the phase we're talking about, which is



the issues report. Again, I'm not saying it's not useful, I'm not saying we shouldn't do it, but I'm flagging that those two things might not be tested through this pilot. Olof, please go ahead.

Olof Nordling: Thank you, Manal. And this is Olof. Well just a little thought from my side that I believe that the whether it can be done, a quick look mechanism, intersessionally or as a slower look or whatever we'd like to call it, only at the face-to-face meetings or perhaps a combination of the two, that seems to be while a little bit divisive issue, but probably because we haven't clarified the ambition level. We have a little framework saying that okay this doesn't preclude us coming back and such, but there's some degree of commitment to it.

And perhaps it could be an idea to sort of develop the straw man proposal and then keep this whether it can be done partly or wholly intersessionally or only at a face-to-face meeting as a discussion point for decision by the whole GAC since we realize that we have slightly different views coming from different GAC members here. Just a thought, and well that's really it. So just a thought for your consideration.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Olof. And yes it's definitely something we can take forward to the GAC and decide upon. But as I mentioned if we keep the quick look mechanism only to work three times a year, I think this would slow the whole process down, so - because we are still going to be preparing the substantial input itself. So just flagging out that this is important or this is of less importance, I personally believe should be done on a more quicker pace, but again, as you mentioned, it's a collective view of the GAC and it has to be - we have to seek GAC input on this. Marika, is this an old hand or a new one?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. It's a new hand.

Manal Ismail: Okay. Go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes so this is Marika. So triggered by Olof's comments, as well as your comments, of course I think there is maybe an alternative path that could be considered while the quick look mechanism is supposed to be, you know, quick and as I said the idea that there are three flags that, you know, can be called and maybe in most cases that can be done through a kind of e-mail, phone or non-objection kind of process, but maybe you just want to build in that if there is a need for further consideration that, you know, that issue can be pulled out of the quick look mechanism and maybe go into a slow look mechanism or at least put on the agenda for a face-to-face meeting.

So maybe that is a kind of safeguard mechanism that you could build into maybe reassure some of, you know, those that believe this can be only be done in face-to-face meetings to at least allow for that option should people believe there is a need for that, that that request can be made.

And, you know, it's probably for the GAC to think about, you know, what that would require, is that one person saying they want to have this as a face-to-face discussion and it automatically moves into the agenda for that meeting, noting that it will probably involve some delay in moving things forward but that, you know, normally the default will be that it is indeed quick look unless in exceptional circumstances there is, you know, a need to consider it at a face-to-face meeting.

So I think again we may be able to come up with something that provides some safeguards for those that may have concerns if it could only be done, you know, with speed in mind and, you know, at the risk of, you know, due consideration by everyone.

Manal Ismail: So fair enough, and I think this is a practical way of satisfying all requests. And again as we said, if someone really needs to discuss something in a face-to-face meeting, definitely this should be accommodated, hopefully on an exceptional basis but again definitely it should be accommodated. So I'll pause here. If we don't have - if no one has any further comments on those

points, we can proceed forward with the ideas we already have at hand right now. Olof?

Olof Nordling: Oh yes thank you. Again, Manal, sorry for not wrapping it up my initial comment. Olof here. Well the idea would be that we have a straw man and we put the question on which part can be done on quick look and face-to-face intersessionally and at face-to-face to something that we bring up for this discussion in Singapore. Because I believe that it depends a lot on what ambition levels and what commitments people see, and that probably need discussing within the GAC and that's probably a good discussion point for Singapore, I believe, rather than trying to bring it up intersessionally, if you know what I mean. So while that's just to conclude my remark. I forgot that little part. Thanks.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Olof. And yes definitely we can take the discussion in Singapore. And now I think we had already a couple of proposals and suggestions. Mason has already very helpfully suggested that we might also flag any common issues as early it comes and even before the issues report goes out for public comment. So this is one helpful proposal we have. We can see how we can get views of this in the overall mechanism.

Also (Suzanne) suggested in an exchange that was forwarded to the list I think earlier this morning that there also should be some triggers on the GNSO side to trigger the need for GAC input on a certain issue. Some examples that she mentioned were anything related to international treaties that governments sign or anything related to national laws. Those should trigger from the GNSO side that GAC input is needed here.

And I think also earlier it was mentioned that maybe anything related to previous GAC advice, so if the discussion on an issue where the GAC already have a standing advice on this, then this indicates the need for GAC input. So I'm not sure how this sounds to GNSO colleagues and whether they share the same or...

Mason Cole: Manal, may I get in the queue? It's Mason.

Manal Ismail: I have to admit - yes, Mason, you go ahead.

Mason Cole: I think those are fine. It would be -- I'm sorry this is Mason speaking. I think those ideas are fine. There may not be the ability for the GNSO to determine at an early phase whether or not an issue is an international treaty or an international law, although I think we can probably make a pretty good guess.

That said, the council's preference may be -- and I haven't talked to the council about this -- the council's preference may be to inform the GAC about each issue it's working on so that the GAC can make a determination itself whether or not an issue is appropriate for GAC involvement. That way there's no confusion about whether or not the GNSO's interpretation of an issue meets the criteria for the GAC to involve itself. I'm sure the council is happy to try to make helpful suggestions, but I think we want to be careful about deciding for the GAC whether or not an issue is deserving of its attention.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Mason. And I have to admit also that given that we agreed that every issue is going to be forwarded to the GAC to flag out its interest, I'm not sure how this trigger is going to work within this mechanism. Unless it's (unintelligible) at later stages, meaning that maybe we should not proceed further without receiving the GAC input, for example. But again, I wished we had (Suzanne) with us on the call to further discuss this. But unfortunately she's not, so we can try to fine tune this online and maybe ultimately come up with a question that may be taken back to the GNSO similar to the questions that were taken back to the GAC.

So Olof?

Olof Nordling: Thank you Manal. Yes, Olof here. And just a thought and - well, one idea could be that - alright, we now have made some preparing in this while

collecting what's happening in the GAC and providing us with that. And we have the one pagers and such. But very early in the cases, then -- before it even reaches the one pager stage which (Mason) talked about -- I think it may be worthwhile at that point.

So while the GAC support staff can actually help out a little bit on seeing whether we see an immediate association with international treaties and such to the extent that we know. I don't say that that would be fully covering and 100% reliable, but at least that could be an attempt to enhance -- with the assistance of GAC support staff -- what is conveyed to the GAC in that regard.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Olof and yes, I think this is a good suggestion and will be helpful. I have already also looked into the document that Marika shared earlier. It's the GNSO Issue Reports Request form. Which I think is quite concise and to the point and provides questions that might be helpful for a quick look mechanism -- because as I mentioned earlier -- the one pager is more of a brief description of where we stand and the stage we're in. But if we're talking about something at the very early stage, I think something along the lines of the GNSO Issue Report Request form; to me it provides very good information.

I'm not sure if everyone on the call has already had the chance to look into this, but again I think it's a good starting point that maybe we can share and discuss the details and fine tune to accommodate whatever the triage group may need to prioritize the topics. I think it can also -- should this be agreed -- it can also - we can also attempt on a - whether this topic relates to international treaties that governments sign or whether this issue relates to national laws or whether there is a standing GAC advice on this issue.

So I think what (Suzanne) was suggesting -- should we agree this -- may also be part of such a form that may be received by the triage group or within the quick look mechanism. I'm not sure how this sounds and I'm not sure whether

everyone had the chance to look into the form. So do we have any reactions at this point in time? Thank you. Thank you. So Marika, go ahead, please.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. So basically the GNSO Issue Report Request form -- which you see now up on the screen as well -- the intent of this document is really for anyone that wants (unintelligible) an issue report -- whether the GNSO council (unintelligible) committee or the board -- use this (unintelligible) as much information as possible at the outset. And I think it falls to the GNSO council to understand the request that's being made and be able to evaluate that request, you know, if it's suitable for (unintelligible) has been already addressed in other forms. There's work already ongoing looking into this.

So help provide as a staff as we embark on writing the issue report, what information is possible (unintelligible) with that process? (Unintelligible) relevance as well to the GAC as it would consider this issue. You know -- for example -- the - describe the issue. You know, what is the rationale for policy development? And, you know, what are the problems that have been identified that, you know, (unintelligible) and develop policy and developments on this issue? The question on what's (unintelligible) and to get there, you know, sort of (unintelligible), maybe sort of mention there as well.

Maybe (unintelligible), you know, mechanism (unintelligible) forward to the GAC if indeed...

Manal Ismail: Marika, your voice is breaking.

Marika Konings: Oh. Can you hear me better now?

Manal Ismail: Marika (unintelligible)...

Man: Right now it's good, but...

Manal Ismail: We can hear you good; I think it's breaking out, yeah.

Marika Konings: Okay. I'm sorry. May be the Skype connection. Let me just wrap it up. But I think that, you know, that may be a specific question as well, you know, to the GAC. You know, which information would the GAC need in order, you know, to make a decision on a quick look mechanism? And a possible template like this. And I think we may want to discuss, indeed, who should be completing a template. I think in the flow chart I developed, I had to assign it as kind of a task for the GAC secretariat, but I think all have suggested it may also be something the GAC support staff could do.

Again, I think from the GNSO policy staff side, you know, we're happy as well to, you know, provide as much information as we have available to assist in that effort. So maybe that is something we, you know, we just need to talk through and better understand as well which information would the GAC need in order, you know, to take a decision, basically. And as that, you know, maybe this template may serve as a starting point, but presumably there's different or other information the GAC may need.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Marika. And the -- as you said -- this is again a second question that we can go back to the GAC with. But also maybe another question that should maybe pose to the GNSO is whether or how flexible is it that we add to this form. Something like is there a standing GAC advice on this issue? Because again -- although it's - it may be a GAC request -- but it should be of interest to the GNSO.

So it's not enough that the GAC revise this part of the information but also to share it with the GNSO. I think this is the essence of it, that maybe it should be alerting to the GNSO that there is already a GAC advice on a certain issue that is currently going to be under discussion. So maybe this could be also posed to the GNSO. Olof?

Olof Nordling: Thank you, Manal. Olof again. While it seems like -- if I understand it right -- this is to be filled out by the particular proposer within the GNSO or ALAC or even the GAC as other ACs may provide an Issue Report Request. But to be filled out by the requester.

And of course, it's very convenient if the requester -- him or herself -- knows whether there is existing GAC advice. They probably wouldn't have a clue on that unless it's the GAC itself that request. Perhaps they have an idea on whether there is some international treaty and perhaps they have a notion of their own national law that may have some kind of incidence on the issue.

But I think this is something that probably Marika you and I should have a close look up and come up with also some idea whether it's useful to expand this Issue Report Request form or whether this is something that can be tossed between us at the initial stage. From - in order to fulfill what (Suzanne) was asking for.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Olof. I have Marika, but before giving Marika the floor; yes, I understand that the requester is the one to fill the form. But again, he or she may dig such information easily, whether there is a standing GAC advice on this, either through ICANN staff or even through the online register of the GAC. So I think this information could be provided easily. So I have Marika and then (Karin). Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Thanks Manal. And this is Marika. Yes, I think at least on the template and - you know, the template itself was developed I think it's part of the - a revised PDP and, you know, it's something that staff has developed based on some of the information we know needs to be covered in the issue report.

You know, from my perspective I don't think it would be a big issue to, you know, add something to that nature here. I do have to note that we haven't been very successful yet to get people to actually fill this out before they make a request. Often requests are made and, you know, form of motion. So



maybe, you know, as part of - if we make changes here we maybe need to do a little bit more promotion and really get people to complete this as they request issue reports.

And just triggered as well by Olof's comment, I mean, I think at least from our side -- from the policy staff side -- we normally try to include as much information as we can in the Issue Report. And if we are aware of GAC advice or specific issues that, you know, relate to the GAC, we will definitely include those in the issue report. But at that, you know, we may not be aware of everything so maybe on the staff side we could make more of an effort as well as we, you know, send our drafts for review. But of course we do have internal reviews because, you know, different departments they may have perspectives or provide input to a certain topic that we also include on our GAC colleagues.

So we also have an opportunity to flag if they are aware of any specific, you know, GAC documents or communiqué's or, you know, principles that should be referenced or considered. So that may be, you know, a kind of internal thing we should maybe be more consistent in ensuring that we cover that aspect as well as part of the issue report.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Marika. (Karin)?

(Karin): Yes, thank you Manal. This is (Karin). I just wanted to note that there's an existing question in the form that could maybe be used to provide information - GAC related information. It's the question number seven on the economic impact of the issue. And it's effect on competition, consumer trust, privacy, or other rights. So this question -- this type of question -- could perhaps be augmented to - stretched out to either possible public policy considerations.

It doesn't have to be -- at this stage -- probably very specific. So it could be straightforward to identify possible public policy considerations at an earlier stage, including of course if it's - if the topic has been subject of previous

GAC advice or otherwise - other topics that are widely understood as having public policy implications - for example on privacy or other types of rights.

So it looks like this current - I mean, my question I guess is could this - is this...

Manal Ismail: (Karin), yes, it...

(Karin): Existing question be used?

Manal Ismail: It occurs to me, but then I thought maybe we should leave the current questions as is because they are probably intended to provide certain information. They are drafted to. And I don't think it's clear enough that any standing GAC advice should be listed here. So I'm not sure, but maybe putting this explicitly would better serve the purpose. But again, we can take this discussion online and back with our constituents as mindful of the time we have only 10 minutes left so maybe we should be moving forward.

So (Karin), do you want to come back on this?

(Karin): No, that sounds great.

Manal Ismail: Okay. There was also the prioritization - the GNSO prioritization process was also shared - it was brought to our attention -- again -- by Marika. And I was wondering the difference between the prioritization process versus the triage working group call. Meaning that what is it exactly that the staff do in terms of prioritizing the issues before sending the template to the triage group? And again, if we can have this up on the screen, it would be helpful for those who did not have the chance to see the document.

Again, we don't necessarily have to answer this now, but Marika, if you want to address this, please go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. As I understand it, basically all the requests that the CCSO receives come into the CCSO secretariat. So they basically then, you know, flag that there - a request has been received and they complete a template. Which I can check with my CCSO colleagues if they can share that template, because I think that probably just indeed -- as I've suggested as well in the graphic I did -- the kind of basic information that the triage committee would need. Like, you know, who has made the request, what is the specific request about, is it, you know, a request for input, a request for participation? And presumably you could have, you know, standard categories; because I think most of the requests fall under certain categories, you know, at least within the ICANN world.

So the basic information is included in the template which is then sent to the triage committee. And basically it's a small group. I think its three members. It's as well -- again -- a very short time frame. So within two days they're expected to agree on the proposed approach.

So if they say yes, it's something we should be doing, they inform the council and a draft (unintelligible) is prepared to either provide input or response or whatever is being asked for. And if they recommend, no, we shouldn't do anything they also inform the council. And the council then, you know, passively approves. So I guess it's the non-objection kind of approach. The decision online within two working days.

So, you know, they're overall time frame looks like they usually do that within a week. And as I said, you know, I can ask them if they can share the template, so that may also, you know, provide some insight into, you know, what categories of information they include in that and then could potentially be as well another model for us to look at.

Manal Ismail: But if they receive multiple requests for input, do they do any prioritization? Or when - where is the prioritization done? Is this done by the triage group itself or by the council or by staff?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. As I understand it, it's the triage committee that recommends, you know, this is an issue we should be working on and this is an issue at this stage that we shouldn't be working on. It's my understanding. And if that, you know - (unintelligible) colleague of mine is actually at the meeting where I'm at, so I can have a chat with him about that. But that's my understanding of how they work.

And then they have public -- and I think I shared the link as well before that -- they have a public record of all the requests received and their response to that - to those requests.

Manal Ismail: I also noted that the one pager for the GAC includes not only GNSO briefs but also CCNSO. So probably there is some prioritization that needs to be done within the GAC itself, even if we have a joint mechanism with the GNSO. Again, some coordination needs to be done -- I think -- within the GAC to accommodate for GNSO and CCNSO PDPs. Olof, go ahead.

Olof Nordling: Thanks Manal. Olof again. Yeah. I mean, this prioritization is a sense that the triage committee -- like Marika says -- well, they look at the current workload and they look at the incoming requests and they look at the proposal that's coming from the secretariat staff. And take a decision, either following the secretariat's proposal or rejecting it. So it's a prioritization one by one, sort of piecemeal approach not looking at all of the proposals at one point in time but rather looking at the individual request and proposals that come up.

]

And they can address many different things. So while - for the handling by the CCNSO. And, well, so it's a wider matter than just for what we're looking for here. To it, however, prioritization among the GNSO matters. So different - slightly different concept as far as I have understood it, but probably useful model to have a look at. Thank you.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Olof. Yes, and thank you Marika for sharing the URL -- the link -- in the chat room. I've also had a look on this and it's interesting. So again -- mindful of time -- I think maybe we can take the discussion on the very first draft Marika shared earlier -- or a couple of hours before the call -- and we can discuss this maybe online and try to progress on it on the next call.

But before we conclude this call, I would like to quickly again bring to your attention the preparations for Singapore. Although we sound a bit early, but I don't think it's that early because it's early in February, so we basically have December and January. And in December we already have holidays. So we need to be considerate of the time.

This is one thing; we need to agree on what exactly we would like to share with the GAC and the GNSO. (Suzanne) again was suggesting that we could try a slightly different approach, just to make sure we're consulting with our constituencies and engaging them in whatever decisions we reach. And not just reporting back to them every meeting. We already tried to do this the first two meetings. We had some concrete questions that we were seeking input on. But again, this is something that we can think for and discuss online and on the next call.

And also when exactly we would like to start sharing whatever we intend to discuss in Singapore. I think even if we don't receive comments online, again, it's very useful that we share this early before the meeting and it kind of breaks the ice when people are more familiar with the documents or with the questions that we intend to discuss in Singapore. It makes the discussion in Singapore more fruitful and we can expect some conclusions there. Thank you and I can see your check mark. Thank you.

And finally, the schedule between now and Singapore. Again, I know we're competing with two very hot priority issues - IANA transition and the ICANN accountability. I hope we can - if we - maybe if we share a calendar and fix the times early on we can get better indication of the participation on the

calls. And maybe we can try to fine tune or adjust to - in order to ensure more participation on the calls.

So I've noted that you have already agreed or confirmed our periodic calls every two weeks. I think it would be good to have the exact dates and maybe do like a poll on those dates to get some indication of the attendance. And as I said, maybe accommodate that some may be busy and try to make it a day or a week earlier or later, should we have no attendance in one of the calls.

So can we do this call for - I mean, intersessionally between this call and next call, Marika? Go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just to confirm, you would like us to send with the notes, you know, the dates for the next meetings which, you know, until the end of the year are every two weeks and then, you know, basically have a doodle poll so people can confirm for those dates whether they can make the call or not so then the chairs can review whether, you know, critical mass, go ahead with those meetings or whether we need to consider rescheduling. Is that correct?

Manal Ismail: Perfect, yes.

Marika Konings: Alright, great.

Manal Ismail: Because we also have holidays -- the Christmas holidays and the New Year holidays -- and I'm sure we would leave those without calls. So we just need to know the exact dates of the calls. And as you mentioned, do the (unintelligible) so that we can know there's a critical mass or not. So...

Marika Konings: So Manal, this is Marika. Would you like (unintelligible) it out...

Manal Ismail: Sorry, Marika, I can't hear you. Can you repeat, please?

Marika Konings: No, my question is if you already want me to add the dates as well in January leading up to Singapore then as well -- at the same time -- so we can confirm those, too.

Manal Ismail: I think it would be helpful for us to plan between now and Singapore - to have the whole thing. It's like six calls or something, maximum. Or maybe less. So yes, if you can do this, it will be extremely helpful.

So if no one has anything to say, we can adjourn the call at this and thank you all those who have joined the call and I really hope we can keep the momentum and continue the discussion online and hopefully receive views and opinions from those who were not on the call, too, so that we can keep the progress hopefully and have some fruitful discussions in Singapore.

So thank you all. The meeting is adjourned and we can stop the recording.  
Thank you.

Group: Thank you, Manal.

Marika Konings: Thanks, bye.

Olof Nordling: Bye.

Group: Thanks, bye.

END