

ICANN Transcription  
GAC GNSO Consultation Group meeting  
Tuesday 02 December 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 02 December 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. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-gac-20141216-en.mp3>

On page:

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

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:  
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/>

**Attendees:**

**Government Advisory Committee**

**Manal Ismail – co-chair – Egypt**  
**Suzanne Radell, US**

**GNSO Council**

**Brian Winterfeldt, Councilor**  
**David Cake, Vice Chair**  
**Avri Doria, Councillor**

**GNSO Liaison to the GAC:**

**Mason Cole**

**Apology:**

**Amr Elsadr, Councilor**  
**Jonathan Robinson, Chair**

**ICANN Staff:**

**Marika Konings**  
**Olof Nordling**  
**Glen de Saint Gery**  
**Karine Perset**  
**Julia Charvolen**

Coordinator: The recording has been started. Please go ahead.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. This is the GAC/GNSO Consultation Group call on 16 of December. And on the call we have Avri Doria, Brian Winterfeldt, David Cake, Manal Ismail, (Suzanne Liddell). And from staff we have Marika Konings, (unintelligible), Olof Nordling, Julia Charvolen, and myself, Glen DeSaintgery.

Have I left off anyone?

Mason Cole: Glen, it's Mason. I'm on the call as well.

Glen DeSaintgery:Hi, Mason. Sorry. Mason is on the call. Mason Cole. And we have apologies from (Amar Estuda). Thank you very much, Manal, and over to you.

Manal Ismail: Thank you. Thank you, Glen. Apologies again for the delay in getting started. So welcome everyone to the call. And allow me to start by asking whether anyone has any comments on the agenda before we start. So seeing none and hearing none, let me proceed directly to our first agenda item on the GAC early engagement PDPs. And if we can have the document also displayed this will be very helpful, the document that was circulated. Yes, this one. Thank you.

So I'm sure everyone is already extremely loaded and busy between the calls so I'm not really sure whether you had time to go again through the flowchart that was discussed last time and to have some time to read this document. So I'll try to go step by step in this document and try to seek comments so that we can hopefully accomplish this on this call. I hope this is fine with everyone.

It's also worth noting that after we discuss and agree to an ease of the proposal - no, I'm sorry. Okay, so the first step I'm trying to get - can we have it a little bit bigger? Is...

Marika Konings: Manal, you can zoom in by the plus on the bottom of your screen.

Manal Ismail: From my own? Okay, okay. Thank you, I'll do that. Okay yes. Great. So this is a proposal on how the GAC can get engaged earlier within the GNSO PDPs so this - and the highlighted, the blue highlighted steps are newly introduced steps that were not in the normal process before. So the first step is a request for issue reports submitted to ICANN staff, which should indicate whether there is a standing GAC advice on the mentioned topic if not for the requester.

And this is marks day zero of the process, and the GNSO council, ICANN board or any of the advisory committees are the ones who proceed with this step. So what we have added here is that we should try to indicate whether to indicate to the GNSO whether there is a standing GAC advice on the mentioned issue or not.

So if we don't have any comments on this step, it's a straightforward one, we can proceed to step two, which is communicating to the GAC with a quick-look mechanism or whatever committee is going to be taking care of that. If an issue report has been requested, including information on the topic that a preliminary issue report is expected to be published by a certain date, and this is just to note that this usually take 45 days after transmission of the request to ICANN staff.

This is again a new step. It should - it is suggested to be done between day zero and day five with five days from step one. It's also suggested that this be translated to the GAC quick look mechanism through the GNSO liaison to the GAC. And again here just to note that when we say GAC quick look mechanism that this is used here totally as a description of the function itself, again subject to what also the GAC overall agree.

So I'll pause here again and seek any comments, remarks or feedback on step two. So seeing and hearing none, we can then go to step three, which is

the publication of the preliminary issue report for public comment. Here again we have introduced this final sentence which is including information on any standing GAC advice on the topic.

So here ICANN staff preparing the issue report will be getting some further information on the GAC advice that might be relevant to the issue under discussion. And here again there's a note that ICANN staff has up to 45 days to prepare the preliminary issue report. So I'll pause again here and seek any comments or... So Marika, I'm sorry I missed your hand. Go ahead.

Marika Konings: Thank you, Manal. I just put it up. This is Marika. It's in relation to this point. I just wanted, you know, to note for the record that even though we've highlighted here in blue as a specific item that, you know, information standing GAC advice on the topic if available will be included. I wanted just to note that that will typically already be on. Because basically as part of the preliminary issue report, staff tries to gather, you know, all and any information that available on the topic, which would also include, you know, anything we could find from the GAC on that topic.

But just I think by calling it out here it's really making sure as well that a specific item of attention which may also then involve, for example, consultations with our colleagues on the GAC to really make sure that, you know, we didn't miss anything and have that as a specific item of attention when we do our research.

So I just wanted to note that for the record that it's not that we're now excluding any GAC advice on purpose, it's just that we're calling it out here to really make sure that, you know, we do our due diligence and make sure anything relevant is included.

Manal Ismail: Okay. Thank you, Marika. Yes sure. And this also goes along with what (Suzanne) has been asking for, triggers that would be done on the GNSO side as well. So if we don't have any other comments on step three then step

four says, "Submit notification of publication of preliminary issue report for public comment to the GAC."

And this again happens on day 45, and the GNSO is onto the GAC or the GNSO secretariat will be carrying this step. And again this is subject to how the group decides on how we want to carry this step, is it the GNSO liaison, is it the GNSO secretariat, and we can take it at the other end of the GAC as well.

So again I'll pause here and see if there are any comments on this step and seek answers for whether we can see this step should be carried by the GNSO liaison or the secretariat or maybe once you've seen the other people's I believe it's good to have (unintelligible) while informed on each and every step. I'll pause here and see if we have any comments.

So okay then I'll take this as anyone can send (unintelligible) the other and we'll leave it for now for the GNSO to decide. And we can go to step five. This is where the convening of the Quick Look Mechanism Committee takes place at the GAC side. So - and this is to review the preliminary issue report.

Again this is suggested to be on day 45. It's also suggested to stand two weeks or so. Again we're not trying to conclude this here, we're just trying to agree on a feasible way that makes sense that we can propose back to our constituencies and get the final approval or fine-tuning on the proposal. But for now at least as a group we have to agree that this is - whether this is a good way, a practical way, effective way to go or not.

So any comments on this step? And I'll just record that this was the annotated note that we agreed last time to have attached to the flowchart providing further communication and explaining the flowchart in a more easy way. So it seems to be a straightforward proposal.

So step six again is the Quick Look Mechanism Committee communicates its recommended response to the GAC so the Quick Look Mechanism Committee will look into the preliminary issue report and then suggest a way forward to the GAC. This is expected at day 60.

And again it will be carried out by the Quick Look Mechanism Committee, or whatever else it's going to be called, and would basically suggest one of three options to the GAC, either that this issue has public policy implications and the GAC would then comment on preparations to provide input on the issue to the PDP working group or that the issue may have public policy implications and the GAC should then consider further whether to provide input on the issue or not, and finally that the issue unlikely to have public policy implications but the GAC again reserves the right to provide input on the issue to the PDP working group should it later became obvious that there are public policy implications.

So - and also here we thought the one pager served as a good tool to facilitate following developments for - on the GAC side. So this is basically what the Quick Look Mechanism Committee would look into and probably suggest to the GAC. I'll pause here again to seek comments either from GNSO colleagues or from my GAC colleagues.

And another question again for GAC colleagues would be whether this could be done intersessionally or do we really need a face-to-face meeting to accomplish this step. Olof, I can see your hand so please go ahead.

Olof Nordling: Thank you, Manal. And this is Olof for the record. Just to recapitulate, we talked about these three options for responding earlier, and I think we then called them a red light, yellow light and green light. And of course there may be variants of that as well that you have a twinkling yellow light, meaning that it's really hard to decide. And I think I made that comment that it has - would have to be punted to a decision at a face-to-face meeting.

So that may happen as well. So when we drill into these options there may be well more deeper processes that we need to look at, but while these are really mapping what we have discussed earlier on the red, yellow and green light. Thank you.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Olof. So, Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I think one of the questions for the group is in relation to those items that have been highlighted in yellow and of course related as well to any of the other steps in there, but I think specifically items that are highlighted in yellow, do you believe that those are items that, you know, we as a consultation group can reach agreement on or whether some of those are specific questions that should be put forward to the GAC as well as the GNSO to obtain input on before we can, you know, kind of finalize this proposal?

So I think the idea, and I think it's something we discussed as well in the last meeting, that hopefully for our next meeting in Singapore we will be able to bring a concrete proposal to both groups but possibly with some specific question that we would like input on to make sure that it aligns with the expectations and objectives of both groups.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Marika. And yes I agree to both. We should be proposing something that we agree upon as a group but also we should keep our self flexible and pose it as also question or a proposed solution to our constituencies, and hence it is subject to change. But I can also see (Suzanne)'s hand up. So, (Suzanne), please go ahead. (Suzanne), we can't hear you.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. (Suzanne), if you're trying to use your Adobe Connect, even though you have a microphone, you'll still need to use the Connect My Audio option and select Connect My Computer to make your microphone work.

(Suzanne Liddell): Is that better?

Manal Ismail: Yes.

(Suzanne Liddell): Oh thank you and my apologies. (Suzanne) for the record. I did want to just chime in and agree with Manal's point that it may well, you know, serve us better to use the highlighted areas in part of our presentation to - in the form of questions to our respective groups. This is probably early in the call to flag this concern but I continue to have some hesitation as to whether this is a little bit of information overload to the GAC in particular because they're not as close, they haven't been involved as much as we have down in the weeds here trying to figure out how best to proceed.

So I do think we need to have a presentation in Singapore that very clearly walks people through where we are today as a consultation group and how we have arrived at these proposals, these options. And then we have to put it out to our respective communities to agree that these are reasonable options and that they are worthwhile pursuing.

And I guess I'd like to flag again at some point in the relatively near future I think we're going to need to find a case study so that people can understand exactly what it is we are proposing. My fear is that right now it's going to appear very ephemeral. It's very process oriented but we need probably an actual example that we can use from the outset so that I'm sure on the GAC side my sense is people are not anywhere close to where Manal and I and other GAC members on understanding where we want to go. Thank you.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, (Suzanne). And I can (unintelligible) what we're going to be presenting will be a final proposal. It's going to be food for thought, if I may, just like what we're doing now. We're again brainstorming on the proposal and discussing the changing as necessary. So maybe it's going to be like two pages and maybe we can have it like a working session rather than presenting, doing some sort of a presentation or so. We can go through the

proposal - the steps, and like you mentioned (unintelligible) and maintain the highlight to other colleagues where we need further input.

For the example, again, I very much agree to having some sort of practical case that we can start practicing those steps, but again I'm open to any suggestion. I just don't see them mutually exclusive, and I think if we have some steps and try to follow them and then as we practice those on real cases then we can again feed back into this and fine tune again and practice it again. But again, as I mentioned, I'm open to suggestions.

Brian, I'm very sorry to keep you waiting. Go ahead, please.

Brian Winterfeldt: No thank you so much. This is Brian Winterfeldt for the transcript. First of all I want to support my colleague (Suzanne)'s suggestion that we have a test case. It sounds like a very good idea. And I noticed in the chat box that Marika has mentioned that possibly we could use the first issues report after Singapore as a test case if we can all sort of agree to that after our face-to-face meeting. And I think that's an excellent suggestion.

My question is actually for my GAC colleagues. I noticed in step seven there's basically a 20-day window that's been given to review the Quick Look Mechanism Committee's recommendations and for the GAC to determine whether or not it's able to accept that recommendation. I noticed one of our yellow points in that is whether that requires a face-to-face meeting or can be done via teleconference or e-mail.

And I think that's a very important question to iron out because I think a 20-day window is very short, and clearly if that's not going to overlap with a face-to-face meeting, depending on the timing, you know, that could really delay potentially the process. And so I'm wondering if that's a reasonable timeframe and if there is any at least initial feedback on whether we're able to - where the GAC would be able to make progress intersessionally.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Brian. Again and this is personally I think just flagging whether this is of interest or not should be done intersessionally, but again it's going to be taken back to our GAC colleagues, as you mentioned, to make sure that the GAC as a whole agrees to this. But again we've spoken just a matter of flagging out whether this is of interest to the GAC or not and accordingly whether the GAC intends to prepare input to the GNSO on this topic.

Regarding the input itself, I would say this would definitely a face-to-face meeting. But flagging out the issue I hope and I propose that we do this intersessionally.

Mason Cole: Manal, it's Mason. May I get in the queue, please?

Manal Ismail: Yes. Please go ahead, Mason.

Mason Cole: Thank you. I just wanted to follow up on Brian's question. I am concerned as well that the window is very short for the GAC to provide its input. I wonder if GAC colleagues on the call might also consider other points in the PDP process to provide its input if not during the comment of the initials report, further down the line when there are other opportunities for the GAC to provide input whether or not the GAC would be flexible and provide its input at that time. And I mean that just so that...

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Mason.

Mason Cole: Excuse me, Manal, I'm sorry. Just so that GAC input is not lost in the process of the PDP.

Manal Ismail: Okay. My understanding is, but again I stand to be corrected, that this is just flagging interest and not necessarily GAC input as a matter of substance or views or consensus input. Again, it may be a short window, it may need more than that, but I understand that this step is just the flagging of the interest. I can see Marika's hand up also. So, Marika, could you please help here?

Marika Konings: Yes thank you, Manal. This is Marika. So this is just the flagging stage, but at the same time, the flagging would serve as a kind of internal flagging for the GAC, you know, to consider how further input would need to be or could be provided later down the road.

And I think the suggestion here is that if the flag would be raised that says, you know, there are definitely public policy implications, that would at the same time serve as a trigger for the GAC to form a committee or a working group or whatever they decide is the appropriate mechanism to actually start working on more detailed input. And that is, you know, I think step nine in the document. And again, I think that is something for, you know, the GAC to maybe further elaborate on as that's I think really probably an internal procedure on how you would manage or do that.

But the whole idea is that it would allow for the GAC to organize itself internally so it nicely lines up, but the stage the PDP working group is formed and it starts reaching out to the different SOs and ACs as, you know, which is one of the implications of a PDP working group to obtain early input, that the GAC hopefully by that stage would be able to provide that substantive input after having, you know, an issue already flagged and said look this is an issue that is of interest or concern to us so we're definitely going to be involved.

So the GNSO as well as the working group in that way is already put on notice that there definitely needs to be engagement with the GAC to, you know, ascertain when they're able to provide that input. But hopefully by already starting that process at the stage of the issue report, it means that by the time, you know, the working group starts, which, you know, there usually is a bit of a gap in between because, you know, you need to have a final issue report so the council usually needs to vote, you probably have to have, you know, the development of a charter, you know, you need to form the working group, call for volunteers.

So there is some time that will then allow for that substantive input to be developed and provided, you know, through the means that works for the GAC, which hopefully that aligns nicely with as well the actual of the PDP working group to have that at a relatively early stage in their deliberations.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Marika, and thank you also, (Suzanne). I note your - what you typed in the chat room, so (Suzanne) is in favor of having this is a working session in Singapore rather than doing a presentation to our GAC colleagues and also agrees with Brian that this is a good question to be posed to the GAC in Singapore.

So again, we're just trying to -- let me put it this way -- to agree on the questions we should be posing to our GAC colleagues in Singapore. So will we be proposing a window of 20 days or will we be proposing something longer or shorter? So I think this is what we need to agree upon here, again, as a question to be posed to our GAC colleagues. Also if we have a concrete test case that we can also propose we definitely can do this. But again as I said, I see them working hand in hand and not mutually exclusive and feeding into each other. So, Olof?

Olof Nordling: Yes. Thank you, Manal. This is Olof again. And just to follow up on how to put the question to the GAC, I believe that proposing this kind of window while at the same time saying that well there may be cases when the window is not sufficient, but that's also something that can be signaled back the GNSO. And that's what I meant with the twinkling yellow light.

We need to have a closer look at this altogether in a face-to-face meeting or something that there is sort of a safety valve, at least for a start here, to say that well it's not that we'll be conclusive, it maybe so that we are conclusive or the GAC is conclusive defining its yellow or its sort of red or green, and it may be yellow that is likely to be, or it may be twinkling yellow meaning that we really have still not analyzed this is sufficient detail to be able to say so we

ask for some kind of extension. I think that could be useful to bring up in case people are concerned with the 20-day window. Thanks.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Olof. Yes and definitely this is something that we should highlight when we get to discuss this with GAC colleagues. I mean we should highlight certain questions that need to be answered, we should highlight such explanations that would help GAC colleagues to answer the question, and maybe we can have after each step a set of questions that we need to double check or to seek answers from GAC colleagues.

So - yes exactly, along the lines that (Suzanne) also is suggesting. She has a question regarding whether a 20-day timeframe would be sufficient. So after each step maybe we can work a set of questions that we need to seek GAC input on. So, Olof? Is this an old hand?

Olof Nordling: Oh sorry. That was an old hand, yes. Leftover.

Manal Ismail: Okay. Okay. So I can see (Suzanne) also agreeing to this. So maybe we can even insert a merged or after each step questions that we would pose to seek answers upon during the session in Singapore.

So moving to step eight, I guess. Yes so it's communicating outcome of the quick look mechanism to the GNSO council. Again the question here is whether eight days after the quick look mechanism - I mean after step seven, whether five days are enough, and who exactly should do this step, whether it's the GAC secretariat, GAC chair, maybe one seeing the other. Again, this is something to be agreed by the GAC and could be highlighted as a question also.

The following step is if outcome of quick look mechanism is option A or B, which is either the GAC is interested and going to provide input, intends to provide input, or the GAC sees potential public policy issue here and will be keeping an eye and maybe be providing some input at a later stage. Both

options will need to form a drafting team to develop the input or keep an eye that can provide an input later when deemed necessary.

So again, it's up to the GAC how this is going to be handled but we are flagging that. If it is option A or B then we need to hand this over to someone who will be taking care and keeping an eye, drafting proposals to be discussed by the GAC or suggesting input or whatever. So do we have any comments on that line?

Then step ten is the closing of the public comment forum on the preliminary issue report. And again, the final step is submitting the final issue report, including outcome of the quick look mechanism to the GNSO council. So, Marika, go ahead, please.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. This is just to note that for the closing of the public comment forum, I currently use the 40-day timeframe, which is I understand is going to be the new standard. I think David Olive wrote a blog post about it not too long ago about some of the changes that will happen in relation to the public comment forum. But should that timing, you know, be different we can of course adjust it here. But it's currently based on the assumption that we'll be moving to a kind of a minimum timeframe of 40 days for any public comment forum. So that's how that is reflected here.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Marika. Olof?

Olof Nordling: Oh yes. Thank you, Manal. This is just to note that well what we are talking about here is just the quick look mechanism. And it's perhaps worthwhile to put underneath so people don't misunderstand it on the GAC side that this is not the end, this is not even the beginning of the end, but it's the end of the very beginning.

This is when the actual work will start in the PDP working group and such. So just to make that very, very clear so people don't jump to conclusions and

think that all right this will be the end of it and they'll be done and dusted. Just as a safety measure, if you like. Just at the end of after 11 there to say that while this is the end of this particular phase of the PDP, but it's the beginning of quite a lot of actual work on the topic to follow. Thank you.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Olof. And yes indeed it's an important point that should be highlighted during our meeting in Singapore. So any comments on the document or any comments on specific steps? Any such further suggestions for how to present at the Singapore meeting?

So if we have none, I would also highlight that Marika had circulated the ccNSO prioritization process and followed by the triage working group and the template as well of the ccNSO that I would also encourage members of the consultation group to have a look at. Yes thank you. So just to get the sense of how this is also being done at the ccNSO. And actually it was requested by members on the last call that we circulate further details on the ccNSO process.

So I think for the next call maybe we can try to highlight the exact questions that we would be posing after each step. Maybe this would be the second iteration for this document. And if we have no further comments on this then we can go directly to the second agenda item, which I do not expect to take long. So hopefully we'll be done on time.

So, Olof, is this an old hand or...

Olof Nordling: Sorry. Old hand again. Too slow.

Manal Ismail: It's okay. Okay so the other agenda item is the GAC/GNSO dialogue on ongoing topics. And first if there is any updates or requirements that is needed. But (Suzanne) I can see your hand up. Please go ahead. (Suzanne), are you asking for the floor or you're on mute, I can see.

(Suzanne Liddell): Can you hear me now?

Manal Ismail: Yes.

(Suzanne Liddell): Thank you, my apologies. Thank you. This is (Suzanne) for the record. My apologies for being rather inept here. Thank you, Marika, for helping me out. Just a quick update, and of course Mason may wish to chime in as well. We, the GAC, on the GAC side, the GAC chair Thomas Schneider, has asked me to collaborate with him as well as with a small group of IGOs, called the IGO Coalition, to - this is a bit of a three-legged stool.

So the first step is to collaborate in determining where we are vis-à-vis the NGPC, and then the third leg of the stool is in fact the GNSO PDP working group, which has committed some questions to writing for the GAC. And regrettably they have been very, very patient. We have asked them to please sort of just hold until we can understand, me meaning Thomas and I in particular, precisely where we are, what remains to be resolved between the GAC and the NGPC.

We think there's - the work has really gone quite, quite far, and we're trying to isolate the remaining outstanding issues so that we understand them. And then regrettably it has to be then. I would turn my attention to the incoming GNSO PDP working group questions and develop a proposed draft response that at a minimum needs to be signed off by the GAC sort of management team, potentially by the GAC as a whole, but it may well be that the management team and the IGO Collation, if we can get that sign off we can then get back to the GNSO.

I know this is a bit frustration for the GNSO PDP working group. We're just juggling a lot of things at the same time and they need to have a better understanding of where we are. Thank you.

Manal Ismail: Thanks, (Suzanne), for this update. And any further requests for the floor? So my second question here would be whether we need to ultimately document this process in a way that is similar to the documentation we're trying to come up with for the early engagement. And here I mean that we can use the case of the GAC/GNSO needed cooperation on the topic of IGOs and INGOs to come up with general steps that could be followed when similar need arises in future ongoing PDPs at phases later than the registry report.

And I'm triggered here by the deliverables that we are committed to through our charter. And let me quickly recall what the charter mentions as first of all a documentation process for ongoing smooth and highly information exchange between the GAC and the GNSO. And this is basically what we've been working on the day-to-day work track.

The other - the second deliverable is an agreed documented process for ongoing smooth early engagement for GAC and GNSO PDP. And again, this is the part covered by the PDP early engagement flowchart and the annotated cover we have discussed today. The rest of the second deliverable states that this should be along with an agreed documented process to follow where GAC early input is in conflict with a GNSO proposal.

And I think this really matches what is being discussed through this track of how to converge GAC views and GNSO views when they are not necessarily the same on a certain topic. So it's just a question on whether this work track needs to be documented, and if yes whether we need to work like a similar table or flowchart similar to that of early engagement.

So any - did I make my point clearly? Just trying to see whether we need a similar flowchart and steps that needs to be followed for the second work track which has to do with resolving or trying to converge GAC and GNSO views on a certain topic which comes later into the PDP process.

So hearing and seeing none, no comments, so I will say that we do a similar maybe steps or flowchart that illustrates how this is being identified, how it's triggered, how it's communicated between the GAC and the GNSO and ultimately resolved. For example, whether the GNSO liaison to the GAC has happened to find flags that support the needs and tells us whether this communicated through the secretariat of the GNSO with a specific work feed on the topic from the GAC side or the GAC council part, which is (Suzanne), and how this is taken afterwards, organized conference calls or maybe establish joint working groups on the topic.

So it's just a matter of documentation, how are we going to deliver the work of this. This is again in addition and out of experience of the test cases that will be definitely going in parallel and feeding into whatever process we're trying to lay out here. So I hope this makes sense. And if there are no requests for the floor, I'll actually end the call here.

Marika Konings: Manal, this is Marika.

Manal Ismail: Yes, Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Just a note that I'm happy to maybe start something on this topic in the form of, you know, flowchart or table. And I'm actually looking for some confirmation of what the group's thinking is. And maybe this is something as well that I can work on with Mason, because I think at least from the GNSO side my understanding would that be any such requests would flow through probably the council to the liaison to provide that interface. So maybe that's something I can work on with Mason and have that maybe for the next meeting.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Marika. Perfect. Yes please. Okay. Thank you. So if I recall correctly, the next call is on January 6. And unfortunately I won't be able to join this call, but I believe everyone else was available including Jonathan

and Mason. So I hope we can work intersessionally and hand it smoothly to Jonathan on the next call.

So meanwhile I wish you all good holidays and a merry Christmas and a very happy New Year. Thank you all for joining the call today.

Man: Thank you, Manal.

END