

GNSO Council Adobe chat transcript 19 March 2015

Marika Konings:Welcome to the GNSO Council meeting of 19 March 2015
Carlos Raul Gutierrez:Danke
David Olive:Welcome Everyone
David Olive:Hi Carlos
Osvaldo Novoa>Hello all
Carlos Raul Gutierrez>Hello David. Hola Osvaldo
Carlos Raul Gutierrez:Hola a Todos
Carlos Raul Gutierrez:looking forward to buenos aires you better brush up your spanish
Osvaldo Novoa:Hola Carlos
Jonathan Robinson:Hello All
Jonathan Robinson:We have one or more open microphones
Mason Cole:greetings all
Heather Forrest (IPC):Good morning everyone
James Bladel - RrSG - United States:SOI Update: I may or may not be streaming NCAA in another window...
Amr Elsadri:Hi. Apologies for being late.
Dan Reed:James, has the "madness" taken you already?
Amr Elsadri:Ed Morris sends apologies, but will be a few minutes late. Wrapping up another call.
James Bladel - RrSG - United States:Only if Iowa State is upset today...
Carlos Raul Gutierrez:Welcome Olivier!
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:Always exciting to visit a new party. ;-)
James Bladel - RrSG - United States:Glen is very faint
Amr Elsadri:Welcome to the G-Council Olivier. :)
Amr Elsadri:@Glen: Can barely hear you.
Amr Elsadri:Thanks Glen.
Amr Elsadri:Yes Heather. Sounds really cool. Congrats. :)
Heather Forrest (IPC):Thanks, Amr. Tasmania is marvellous - I recommend it to everyone
Amr Elsadri:There's an IRD-EWG initial report with an open public comment period now. Don't recall that ever being on our projects list. Shouldn't it be?
Mary Wong:@Amr, that isn't actually a GNSO-initiated project
Osvaldo Novoa:I lost my connection for a couple of minutes, sorry if I missed something
Amr Elsadri:Neither was the other EWG, right? :)
Mary Wong:Correct - that's why the Projects List refers to the Board-initiated PDP, not the actual EWG process/work
Amr Elsadri:Ah. Got it.
Amr Elsadri:Thnx.
Marika Konings:FYI, the template as circulated by Volker is up in Adobe Connect.
Carlos Raul Gutierrez:here we have it
Mason Cole:Concur with that, Jonathan. I unfortunately have not had any reply to my requests for time with GAC leadership to discuss this.
James Bladel - RrSG - United States:Jonathan: Would you consult with GAC chair/Vice Chairs each time, or just for the first?
Stephanie Perrin:My apologies for being late, I miscalculated the time
Edward Morris:Hi guys. Sorry I'm late. Just finished a call with the Accountability legal subteam.
Carlos Raul Gutierrez:Mason, are you going to be in Istanbul? Thomas Schneider should be there
Mason Cole:Carlos, no, unfortunately not
Bret Fausett, RySG:Apologeties for my late arrival. I was caught up in something and got here as soon as I could,
James Bladel - RrSG - United States:Perfect! Thanks.
Volker G.:We still need to do the actual analysis though
Amr Elsadri:The policy and implementation WG had its first call to review the public comments yesterday.
Marika Konings:Comments have been received from RySG, NCSG, ISPCP, ISP, ALAC, BC, BRG
Marika Konings:ISP=IPC
Amr Elsadri:@Marika: as well as a couple of individual comments. ;-)
Marika Konings:correct
Heather Forrest (IPC):I agree - this was left as an open item at our last meeting
Mary Wong:Thanks, Jonathan.

Mason Cole:lowering my hand, Carlos answered

Marika Konings:Maybe also to add, the GAC is not expected to provide detailed input at that stage, but just an indication of whether public policy is involved (which basically flags whether the GAC is likely to provide substantive input at a later stage)

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:very good point Marika, thank you

Donna Austin, RySG:To Susan's question: I think one important thing to note is that the GAC now has a professional secretariat and this should enhance the GAC's ability to respond in the timeframe.

Mason Cole:yes, i a

Mason Cole:am

Philip Corwin:To clarify, I'd hope the Res. would be clarified so that there is not a requirement for consecutive PDP use.

Amr Elsadr:@Philip: It would be helpful if the language of the motion clarifies this.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:ok

Marika Konings:@Philip - what is the concern with regard to consecutive PDPs?

Philip Corwin:There was a concern that the quick look might not be appropriate for a particular PDP. On other hand, I understand concerns that the test could run on at length if there is no timeframe for trial period.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:agree with Marika

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:lower m hand

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:should be rephrased

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:phrased

Marika Konings:@Philip - the idea would be that if it would be successful, it would apply to every PDP.

Philip Corwin:Understood

Marika Konings:but of course it doesn't mean that each PDP is of interest for the GAC to engage in - the response could be 'no, we don't believe there are any public policy implications'

Stephanie Perrin:Just a question....does it matter if the three PDPs are on similar subject areas?

Amr Elsadr:@Marika: Yes. Good point.

Stephanie Perrin:Some issues are less controversial than others for the GAC..

Marika Konings:@Stephanie - I don't think so (apart from the answer likely being the same ;-)

Susan Kawaguchi:@ Marika, if the GAC's response is "no we don't believe there are any public policy implications" that would qualify as one of the PDP's?

Stephanie Perrin:Yes that was my point....a mechanism cannot really be tested on items that are non-controversial.

Amr Elsadr:Yes. Of course. This only involves the issue scoping phase and the QLM

Philip Corwin:Good point Susan.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:so the next 3 consecutive PDPs

Amr Elsadr:@Jonathan: +1

Susan Kawaguchi:I was under the impression the GAC would have to indicate there was a public policy issue

Susan Kawaguchi:in the pdp to qualify

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:immediately following this motion

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:no objection

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:I don't have the document in my hand

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:maybe staff can make the changes

Heather Forrest (IPC):To clarify - it is the 3 consecutive PDPs following adoption of this motion?

Marika Konings:the changes are in brackets on the screen

Marika Konings:@Heather - correct

Heather Forrest (IPC):Thanks, Marika

Amr Elsadr:The objective of this is only for the GAC to identify whether or not there are public policy issues in the issue scoping phase.

Heather Forrest (IPC):@Phil - isn't that evaluation part of the process we're testing?

Amr Elsadr:@Jonathan: +1

Heather Forrest (IPC):Apologies - I meant "evaluation"

Avri Doria:wow, don't even have to say aye any longer.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:aye?

Avri Doria:yeah

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:ok

Avri Doria:the ayes and the nays.

Amr Elsadr:@Thomas: Absolutely agree.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:@Amr: I can also confirm that the ALAC is also feeling the load/spread thin on all of the work taking place.

Amr Elsadri:@Thomas: Not at all!! Great work being done on the CCWG.

Amr Elsadri:@Olivier: Would be concerned if ALAC wasn't feeling the same way. :)

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:Frankly I do not know how the co-chairs of both CWG & CCWG have any life outside IANA & Accountability. :-)

Amr Elsadri:Thank you very much Thomas.

Thomas Rickert:You are most welcome

Mason Cole:I defer to Phil and Mary on this issue

Philip Corwin:

Philip Corwin:I'll speak after Mary

Amr Elsadri:Thanks Phil. That's very helpful.

Steve Chan:@James, i can send the sign-up details to the Council list

Heather Forrest (IPC):I would be grateful to go back to the timeline slide, please

Marika Konings:I've released the slide deck so you can scroll the slide deck

Heather Forrest (IPC):Thanks, Marika, very helpful

Amr Elsadri:Thanks Jen. Good to know.

Marika Konings:The link is on slide 6

Mary Wong:The new public comment policy is just one period of 40 days, no reply period.

Mary Wong:The 40 days can of course be extended.

Larisa Gurnick:In addition to 40 interviews, 178 individual responded to the 360 Assessment

Larisa Gurnick:Stephanie, your concern about timing of the Draft Report has been reflected in the extended timeframe

Larisa Gurnick:and addressed.

Osvaldo Novoa 2:I am having a lot of echo

Heather Forrest (IPC):Thank you Jennifer

Mary Wong:The list of interviewees is on page 111 (Appendix 3) of the Working Text. - it includes Board members and participants from other SO/ACs

Marika Konings>Note that this report was shared with you on the mailing list.

Amr Elsadri:There was an attempt to have a pilot of this done with the "thick" whois PDP. Didn't work out so well. A 50% response rate is much more impressive. Good to hear that is the case.

James Bladel - RrSG - United States:Thanks to Lars & others for helping "drum up" responses to this self-assessment.

Marika Konings:It is something that is usually specified in the charter, whether or not a self-assessment is expected.

Mary Wong:We can/will forward to the GNSO Review Working Party and Westlake unless we hear otherwise within the next day or so.

Avri Doria:i am searching to my mute button

Avri Doria:please go ahead

Thomas Rickert:The experience would likely be provided by individual ccTLD operators.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:The workload is a real concern at the moment. How many CWGs/CCWGs can take place in parallel?

Bret Fausett, RySG:very good meeting. Thank you.

Volker G.:thank you jonathan

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:thank you

Mason Cole:Great work, everyone

Amr Elsadri:Thanks Jonathan and all. Very productive meeting. Bye.

David Cake:Thank you

David Olive:Thanks All

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:Thank you Jonathan. Thanks all.

Thomas Rickert:Wanted to go on the record thanking CLO for her contributions!

Heather Forrest (IPC):Bye all