

ICANN Transcription GAC GNSO Consultation Group meeting Tuesday 8 September 2015 at 13:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GAC GNSO Consultation Working Group call on the Tuesday 8 September 2015 at 13:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Attendees:

Government Advisory Committee
Olga Cavalli, Argentina
Manal Ismail – co-chair – Egypt
Mark Carvell, UK
Ana Neves, Portugal

GNSO Council

Jonathan Robinson, Chair
Avri Doria, Councillor
Amr Elsadr, Councillor

GNSO Liaison to the GAC:

Mason Cole

Apology:

Suzanne Radell, US

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings
Olof Nordling
Glen de St Gery
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Your recording has started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody, and welcome to the GAC-GNSO Consultation Group meeting on September 8, 2015. As part of the roll call and confirmation of presence, I would like you to please say that you're on the call or (unintelligible), once I mention your name. Thank you every so much. From the GNSO, Jonathan Robinson?

Jonathan Robinson: Present.

Nathalie Peregrine: David Cake? We'll mark David Cake as absent. Amr Elsadr?

Amr Elsadr: I'm present.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Brian Winterfeldt? We note Brian Winterfeldt absent. Avri Doria?

Avri Doria: On the call.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Carlos Gutierrez? We will not Carlos Gutierrez absent. Mason Cole?

Mason Cole: Present.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. And from the GAC, we have Manal Ismail.

Manal Ismail: Yes, present.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. We have received an apology from Suzanne Radell, next on the list. Next is Ana Neves.

((Crosstalk))

Nathalie Peregrine: I see Ana Neves is connected on the audio bridge. Next we have Mark Carvell.

Mark Carvell: Yes, present. Hello everyone.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. And next is Gema Maria Campillos. We will note her as absent on the call. And Olga Cavalli?

Olga Cavalli: Hello, present.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. And from staff I would like to note that we have Olof Nordling, Marika Konings, (unintelligible); and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking, for transcription purposes. Thank you very much, and (unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: (Unintelligible). For the record, Manal Ismail and myself are the co-chairs of this group, and we welcome everyone back to the group. It's been a while since we've met, and so this is really a matter of getting things back on track, and deciding what - you know, sort of resetting our expectations, I guess, and making sure we cover whatever additional open work there still is to do here, and so on.

So you'll see there's a proposed agenda up on the top right of the screen, and that takes us through a number of different items, including Number 6, which we may or may not have time to cover, which is really looking to possible recommendations for other phases of the GNSO PDP, since the current (unintelligible) looks at just the phase, the current goes on in practice.

So the first item we come to is the GNSO review of the GAC communiqué. This is something that GNSO initiated on the back of a sort of suggestion or

idea that was generated almost a year ago now. And we've intended to pick it up for a couple of ICANN meetings, and done some work on the formatting, and finally came around to processing or reviewing the GAC communiqué in the format you see in front of you here.

And we communicated that to the Board, and the basic principle is to look through the GAC communiqué coming out of the ICANN meeting. And there was a concern that the GAC communiqué simply went - didn't necessarily get picked up in good time, or at least wasn't properly or formally reviewed by the GNSO to look for policy implications.

So the purpose of this is (unintelligible) and recognize where there is existing policy work going on; where there has been historic policy work; or where there is (unintelligible) future policy work. And striving, in a sense, as part of early engagement at another level or effective engagement, to do that.

And so that's where it stands. It's been sent forward and copied to the GAC. And I guess what we're doing here is both providing this update that I just have -- and anyone is welcome to add anything to it -- and also taking soundings as to whether there was any feedback.

I think there hasn't been any sort of formal feedback, so and although this isn't strictly a product of this group, it relates very closely to the work of this group. And so any comments or thoughts or points around that, particularly from GAC colleagues, it'd be great to know if this was well-received, badly received, or nobody's had a chance to look at it yet. Any thoughts or comments on this would be very useful. Go ahead, Manal.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Jonathan. (Unintelligible) I believe it's a very good initiative, and it has already been well-received by (unintelligible). So I think it's very helpful. I also believe it would be helpful for the Board itself. But again, how (unintelligible) GAC and GNSO expect any (unintelligible) responses from the Board? I'm just thinking out loud. We haven't discussed this before, but just

want to know whether we should expect something back from the Board in terms of feedback or something (unintelligible). Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Hello, (unintelligible). I think, Marika, maybe you can remind me if I'm correct, or anyone else who was on the GNSO Council call that's recently passed. I think what we agreed to do was first check that we had received a formal acknowledgement or not. And I think we were able to ascertain that we had received formal acknowledgement of receipt of this from both the Board and the GAC.

And I think it was our intention to then go ahead and say, well - to solicit any feedback on it. But I don't remember (unintelligible). I need to go back and check my actions and what was decided. But from memory, there was going to be a second follow-up that said, great, thanks. We're glad you got this. Now could you tell us if you felt this was useful?

And maybe we can save that for a face-to-face meeting, but it could be done in writing as well. So as yet, we haven't received that feedback, but I think it was possibly our intention to push for - maybe someone can remind me if I'm correct there. Marika confirmed in the chat that that's what she understands as well. Go ahead, Mark.

Mark Carvell: Thank you, Jonathan. And I think this is obviously a very helpful device for ensuring effective communication. I have to confess, this is the first time I'm reading it now on the screen. I think that's maybe partly due to August being primarily taken up with vacation and IANA transition and IGF work. I've just been conflicted in terms of time I can allocate.

But I think it does merit - perhaps there's something for Olof to consider submitting a reminder to the GAC -- look, this is the first such use of this review mechanism by the GNSO, and we should take note of it and advise if it needs refining in some way. Perhaps some of the text is a little bit dense. I don't know. As I say, I'm looking at it for the first time.

If there is any issues that indicate some kind of variation in understanding between the GAC and the GNSO, well that ideally would be highlighted quite prominently, perhaps in the (unintelligible) in the letter or in the brief intro to the matrices of details and answer to the question. Has this issue been raised before? And so on. That's minor suggestions. But I support this continuing. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Mark, those are helpful comments. And just to be clear, in my - I know - I'm pretty certain it was the same in the minds of others. And it's one of the things where you never quite know what kind of sense of territory you're stepping on. So it wasn't clear it would be well-received. So we were sensitive to how it was done. We warned of the potential of the fact we were working on something like this.

We clearly think it's a very useful thing, and it'd be really great to get broader feedback. So I agree with you. I think it would be very helpful if other - to stimulate additional feedback. I think that point you made about the possibility of (unintelligible) in bold typeface or another color or by whatever mechanism, issues where there does appear to be some sort of - that need to be drawn out, is a good idea as well. So that's great.

Olof Nordling: This is Olof. Just to confirm acceptance of taking on this little action. Will do so before going on vacation tomorrow morning.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Olof. So I think that'll be helpful if (unintelligible) picks things up in the post-August time frame, and hopefully gets others to pay attention there as well. Go ahead, Manal.

Manal Ismail: Thanks, Jonathan. I think it would be also good if an essence of this discussion (unintelligible) goes from GAC during our (unintelligible). Again it's (unintelligible). It would be also good to have this maybe as a topic of discussion with the GAC initiative.

I believe that (unintelligible) between the GNSO Council and the GAC leadership. Again this, I think, would be something helpful to discuss (unintelligible) highlight, as Mark mentioned, any difference in - thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead, Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Jonathan. This is Amr. For first sight, it's encouraging to be getting the feedback right now, and we'll certainly look forward to hearing more when the full GAC has had the opportunity to review this document. But apart from that, I think, as Jonathan said, this is not really - the initiative is not the product of this group. And certainly the GNSO Council will be looking to hearing more feedback from the GAC on it.

But as far as this group is concerned, I have a question on to what extent members of this group from the GAC may think that this initiative may be helpful towards furthering our own goals regarding things like the pilot project we have on the GNSO issue scoping phase, and GAC's early engagement in the PDP at that point.

Because part of the pilot project is, of course, to include any previous GAC communiqués relevant to an issues report for a PDP. And some of that may be addressed here, and may be helpful and constructive towards that end.

And so I was just thinking, even if you haven't had a chance to look at this stuff, when you do, it would be helpful to sort of keep that in mind and try to think about how this may or may not be helpful to quick-look mechanism committee being formed by the GAC to look at issues reports. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Amr. My sense is that these are parallel, yet relatively independent efforts. So that's, I think, the way I understand it. Go ahead, Mark.

Mark Cavell: Sorry, I was on mute. I just wondered if the question could be put again. I didn't quite understand the point - that this will complement the linkages on policy development. Beyond that, I didn't quite understand what the question was. Sorry.

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead, Amr, and repeat your thought.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Jonathan. And my apologies, Mark, for not being clear in my question. As Jonathan had said, this sort of - this effort is not a product of this group. And as he rightly said again, it is an independent effort to the pilot project that was initiated by this group, and the quick-look mechanism, which was a result of that pilot project.

My question to this group is, because part of the contents of this sort of document would address GAC communiqués to potentially GNSO projects or working groups, PDP working groups that are about to begin, and are actually at the issue scoping phase.

So, for example, if you look at Item 1 on the screen here regarding gTLD safeguards, you will see that there is GAC advice to the GNSO response about a PDP that is coming up, and where some of this might be - some of the issues brought up in the GAC advice may be addressed in the issues report.

So I'm just wondering if, for example, you have a quick-look mechanism committee set up to look at this upcoming PDP, and they look at a report like this one and sort of check the fourth column, the last column on the right, to see how the issues report is addressing a GAC communiqué to this upcoming PDP, I'm just wondering if the GAC quick-look mechanism committee would find this helpful or not.

And really what I'm trying to do is just sort of narrow down where this independent project is sort of helpful to the work that this group is doing,

because as Jonathan just stated, they are sort of independent projects. I think they're interrelated in some way. I hope that helps, Mark.

Jonathan Robinson: And just a quick comment there from Jonathan. I think a key point here is not to use the work communiqué to describe GAC input into a PDP. The GAC communiqué is a very specific output coming out of the meetings, really, the (unintelligible) GAC meetings. And it's a communication really direct to the ICANN Board, as I understand it.

And therefore what they were doing was saying, well let's go to the Board, from the GAC, the GAC communiqué. It doesn't really - the reason for work we did here was it doesn't necessarily make reference to or have any grounding in any ICANN policy work. So I agree with you. There is definitely - one needs to be coordinated and correlated in the way this works.

But it was a very specific way of - and this is where it arguably could have been (unintelligible). And GNSO is inserting itself, in one sense, into a communication between the GAC and the Board -- in good faith and intention.

But that was why it was important to be A, sure that this hadn't ruffled any feathers; and B, it was understood that it wouldn't - you know, what the (unintelligible) was, ready to make both the Board and the GAC aware of any existing policy work.

And you're right to the extent that existing policy work or prospective policy work had GAC involvement, or it could have GAC involvement via the engagement to other mechanisms. So they're definitely connected.

Okay, so this, and then Olof makes the point that the GAC communiqué's a little wider than straightforward GAC advice or the GAC advisor board, but the GAC advise could be part of a communiqué. Fair enough. That's a fair point.

Okay, in terms of time, we should probably move things on a little bit, but go ahead, Manal.

Manal Ismail: Sorry to keep you from moving, but very quickly, because you were working on (unintelligible) communiqué a while ago (unintelligible), and so it would be interesting to hear, not necessarily on this call, but communicate's (unintelligible) able to intersperse the GAC advice community.

We worked on the structuring of the communiqué. Then there was some confusion recently when (unintelligible) mentioned terms like (unintelligible), and things like that. It was taken (unintelligible) advice, whereas this was not what the GAC meant, because we assumed that everything under the high GAC advice to the Board is GAC advice that would trigger the ICANN (unintelligible).

So just to force the question while we're on the topic of - it would be good to hear your feedback on (unintelligible) communiqué as well (unintelligible).
Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Manal, and I see that's being captured in a note (unintelligible) something. So we can ask - we might even make that into a specific action to provide feedback as and when the next communiqué - or any time in and around the (unintelligible) and effectiveness of the GAC communiqué.

All right, let me suggest we move on to Item 3 then, which is to look at a review of the implementation of early engagement recommendations, so a quick look. Any comments or points? I think to the best of (unintelligible), the effectiveness or not of the quick - Jonathan. I'm still here.

I just was wondering if anyone had any feedback or comments on the early engagement recommendation today - quick look...

Man: Jonathan, you're cutting out.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. It looks like Jonathan has dropped out of the Adobe Connect, so I'm assuming he's trying to reconnect. Manal, do you want to - are you in a position to take over?

Manal Ismail: Okay. Okay, yes. So maybe we can (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Marika's hand was up way before mine.

Manal Ismail: I'm sorry. Thank you for letting me know. Marika, go ahead. I'm sorry. I missed your hand. Go ahead.

Marika Konings: No problem at all, Manal. So this is Marika. Just maybe from a staff perspective, some feedback from our side. And I think, you know, we've already been working through the process, as you know, twice. So we've done it for the next generation (IBS), or next generation Whois issue report that's currently out - for which public comment period just closed, as well as the new gTLD PDP, which has just been published as well.

And I think at least on the first one, I think something we did notice is that although we anticipated that it would take maybe longer for the GAC to come up with a response, I think in that case we actually received already the input before we had even published the issue report for public comment.

So it did allow us, of course, to already include that information in the issue report, and maybe allows as well for the GAC to verify that the input that they had provided is actually available there.

And one thing I think we may want to think about -- and again, we may want to do it at the end of the period, we said, I think, was five issue reports -- is I think we now have a lot of like letters going back and forth that we do publish

as sort of the public record, whether there's a way to kind of streamline that process.

And I also think, from the GAC side, maybe to think about what is the right timing, like when do they need the different notifications to align with the timing, because it looks like now maybe less time is needed to turn things around to provide input, which may mean that it's worth doing at a later stage.

Or whether that means that actually their input can already be part of the issue report itself, if staff notifies, you know, immediately after the Council or whoever requests the issue report, the GAC - may mean that input is already provided before the issue report is published, that can already be reflected in the issue report, and as a result, also be part of the public comment that people can provide.

So that may be something, you know, just some points that I think we've noted at least from the staff side. And I think from our side, we'll try to take not of those. And when we reach the stage of the formal review, we may be able to make some suggestions as well on where there may be opportunities for streamlining or enhancements to facilitate the process.

Olof Nordling: And this is Olof. On the very same note, Marika and I have talked about another aspect, and that is how to keep a record of the GAC input. And to that end, it would probably be most useful to see that the GAC input from the quick-look mechanism would be also entered into the public comment box - well in order for - that's at least a thought, in order to have a trace of it in some consistent manner.

Manal Ismail: Thanks, Olof, and thanks, Marika. Yes, like there are things that are good ideas, Olof and Marika. You have also answered a big question. So, Jonathan, if you'd like to take over, are you back?

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Manal. Can you confirm that you can hear me?

Manal Ismail: Yes, we can.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, thanks. Thanks. So I wasn't clear that we - I wasn't following it completely. So did we deal with Item 3 adequately? Or is there more to say about the quick-look mechanism so far?

Manal Ismail: I think we have heard from the staff side. Marika and Olof shared their experience on subjects and also had the GAC input (unintelligible) of the GAC input. Maybe if we had some more comments on experience items from the GNSO side or the GAC side?

From the GAC side, I think (unintelligible) now. Again, we didn't have the chance to discuss this within the GAC, but maybe from individuals' perspectives, we can hear from other GAC (unintelligible). Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: (Unintelligible). Marika?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Sorry, Jonathan. I didn't hear. I think you were breaking up again, so I didn't hear your introduction or your comments. But the point I wanted to make, and I think it also may serve to the next point, is that one thing the group might want to start thinking about is, you know, how should the review look?

Is it something we can already work on in the interim? What are some of the questions we want to answer, or like what kind of matrix or something we want to use to do that evaluation, and come up with recommendations on how to improve and enhance the mechanism? And as well, indeed, potential form for inclusion of it in the GNSO PDP (unintelligible).

And I think it also leads to the next question, a review of the pilot project. Probably some thinking needs to go in as well, like how should that review look? And how can that be done?

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. (Unintelligible).

Marika Konings: I can hear you fine now.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great thanks. So any other feedback or points at this stage? We've got - I'm just wondering what actions arise out of it if anything. I guess it's hard to me to see if there is I mean it's useful to have a couple of notes and their thoughts but is there anything that we take directly from this?

(Unintelligible) suggest that.

Mason Cole: Hello (Jonathan) it's Mason.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay go ahead Mason and (Mark) also put his hand up, go ahead.

Mason Cole: Yes, no I apologize I'm about to board an airplane so I have to jump off the call but with your permission I'll follow up with Marika after the call.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great Mason that will be good I think that will be useful and we'll share the notes if you obviously - that's fine.

Mason Cole: Okay, all right my apologies. All right talk to you soon.

Jonathan Robinson: And (Mark) - no problem Mason thanks for joining us at this time but (Mark) suggests that we get a paper out, a brief paper out to the GAC and on what is live at Camp Dublin and so that we get proper feedback.

And I think (unintelligible) Mason that will be very useful. So good, let's keep things moving then. (Mark) did you want to say, add anymore?

Mark Cavell: No, I'll help you keep moving. So it is in my comment and thanks for the reaction, thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: So yes we've captured that that's good and I see that we've got some support for that from Omar and (Menal) and Olga in the chat so that's good.

All right the next topic which is and it's unfortunate I guess that Mason has to go and maybe I mean that doesn't matter too much in the sense that I think we, you know, we can probably if it's not desperately urgent to take this up now but at some point we need to do some work on the pilot project, on the GNSO liaison to the GAC.

And both evaluate that and make a recommendation as to whether it continues or not, whether it continues in a modified form or not or if it's not successful. So we really need to and I think from my memory at the last GNSO call last year in a phone meeting what we decided was we would be receptive to recommendations from this group.

So it's something which again we may want to take back to the groups and get feedback on or because, you know, we might find it useful to talk to other GAC colleagues for example.

But essentially there was a receptiveness to this group providing a first attempt at how we might evaluate the success of this GNSO liaison to the GAC.

Any comments or thoughts at this stage on how we might do that or what thoughts there might be? Olga go ahead.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you (Jonathan), this is Olga Cavalli for the record can you hear me? No? Can you hear me?

Jonathan Robinson: No problem, you're no problem.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you so much for that. There is a lot of noise in the line I'm sorry. I'm not sure if my comment is for this topic of the agenda or the next one but some working group, in our working group in the GAC are revealing things related with new rounds of new gTLD's.

Like for example the community applications working group that (Mark) is involved in and (GO) names and community names those TLD's that I chair and also the other regions.

My question is, how can we start feeding some outcomes and some ideas that we have gathered within the GAC to your PDP process or to your general GNSO deliberations about this new round of new gTLD's?

Maybe it's for (5, 6) in the agenda or for this one. Perhaps the coordination with the liaison would be the first step. We were thinking about I believe in the (GO) names working group that what I am chairing is preparing a document with some outcomes and some ideas that we have concluded in the working group and submit it to the GNSO.

But perhaps you can give us some orientation on how to inject this information into your process?

Jonathan Robinson: Certainly Olga I think that's a good point. Let's see it's strictly not for this point. Let's I mean I think let's try and close item 4 and then pick up on this. And I think item 4 is really will be - has anyone got anything specific they would like to respond to item 4 which is on how we might review the GNSO liaison for the GAC and then we can come back to Olga's point on feedback into the (CDP) and so on?

(Menal) what are you responding to?

Manal Ismail: Thanks (Jonathan). I was going to suggest that maybe the (unintelligible) that (Mark) suggested that that's (unintelligible) and also (unintelligible) I mean it

could (unintelligible) and how smooth it is running and whether there are any new suggestions for improvement or enhancement because I feel that again related to the early engagement I mean the early engagement is partially (unintelligible) mechanism and partially the GNSO (unintelligible) the GAC.

So maybe (unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: I lost you at the end of that comment (Menal) but I think I got the gist of it and I think it's a really good point. It's really picking up on that it feels like actually this is given the fact that this group hasn't met for a while, given the fact that it's been summer holiday for many or at last a kind of August recess.

It may well make sense to provide a formal update or briefing paper to the GAC that can be copied to GNSO as well with updates on the work of this group and highlights really where key areas of feedback are desired. Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. One thing to take into account of course in relation to the review and I think you commented before that there may not be any rush but of course it is closely linked as well to the FY 17 planning.

So just something to factor in that I think for the previous two cycles where, you know, special community budget request had to be in I think by February or March.

So, you know, should the group recommend that they should continue on the path of special budget request? That is something to factor in that there is a timeline involved by which that would need to be known.

And similarly of course if this would become part of the normal budget if the recommendation would be to go ahead with this function but make it a standard feature it would also of course need to be factored into the budget planning for FY17.

So that's a little bit I think of timeline that (unintelligible) and want to keep in mind as you think about this.

Jonathan Robinson: Very good and pragmatic point Marika and I think in my mind there's no question about that. We need to when we communicate and this proposed short paper that will go out to the GAC seeking feedback on various elements it should include that we need feedback within a certain timeframe and either submit a - either make the liaison role part of the regular budget or the alternative date to get it as part of the special budget.

But in either case I think getting those dates into the communique would be very, into the communication on the work of this group would be very useful. (Menal) is that your old hand or a new one? If it is a new one - okay so that hand has dropped.

It's been noted your suggestion in the chat which follows on from what you were saying and is essentially consistent with what I was just saying that dealing with the form of briefing paper update on the work of this group and seeking feedback including the early, the quick look mechanism and the GNSO liaison.

Omar Kaminski: Thanks (Jonathan) this is Omar. Yes to start off I think (Menal's) suggestion is also a pretty sensible one, I support that. I just want to sort of add to what Marika said FY 17 and the budgeting issues.

Yes that is very important. I think that's why this sort of came up as an independent item on the GNSO council agenda during the last meeting. So thanks for pointing that out Marika.

It was suggested at that time that this group sort of takes a look and I think that's a good idea and the reason I do is because although the GNSO council may have aspects of looking at the GNSO liaison through the GAC that are

independent of the early engagement contract because of the budgeting issues that are pressing the budget.

But from our perspective the liaison role is a product of the group and sort of supposed to feed into the purpose of GAC early engagement with the GNSO proxy.

So as an answer to how this group could sort of review this role and perhaps give feedback or recommendations on the extent to which it is desirable for it to continue or evolve I think it would be a good idea to sort of evaluate the role within the evaluation of the different phases of the work that we do here.

So for example sort of evaluate the role of the liaison and the quick look mechanism, the issue scoping phase and as we continue to make recommendations on later phases of the PDP then we can also evaluate the role of the liaison within the context of the recommendations for these different phases.

So I think that sort of the review of the liaison will itself evolve as the roles of the liaison increase across time. For the time being I would recommend that we do continue and request if not a permanent budget allocation at least another temporary one until more work, until there is more outcome from this group and the opportunity to implement and review it. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Omar. So in essence we would try and repeat the formula for one more cycle. But it would be good to get broader feedback that that's a desirable outcome.

So anything we need to ask that question I think in our output to the GAC and seek from that if possible and just know the timeframe as well. I'll also note (Mark's) point in the chat which is I thought of the review as the design any review mechanism we should of course take feedback from the person that has been working in that role for Mason on that role.

I'm going to Olga's point here which I think you may have also been wanting to respond to Marika. I'll go with asking the question earlier then about feedback into I think the most recent emerging PDP on the new gTLD's that can run new gTLD's. Go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes (Jonathan), this is Marika. So to Olga's question, as you may be aware the preliminary issue report is currently out for public comment. And an objective of that public comment period is to provide feedback on the information that is in the issue report and maybe from the perspective is there something missing, are there any topics that the PDP should be looking at that have not be identified or any specific information that is not included.

And following that based on the input received the final issue report will be produced, it will be submitted to the GNSO council which will then decide whether or not to move forward with a policy development process on this topic.

And if or when the GNSO decides to move ahead a PDP working group would be formed and one of the first steps that working group would do is to reach out to all the ICANN SO's and AC's as well as GNSO stakeholder group constituency to ask for early input.

And that would likely be the right moment for the different GAC working groups to provide their recommendations on potential solutions or modifications or changes to the existing policy recommendations.

So I think that's probably the best sequence. So now the focus should ideally be on have all issues that need to be addressed been included in the issue report and that issue report is currently out for public comment.

And then after that there is the opportunity when the working group started work to provide early input on the potential ideas, suggestions,

recommendations on how certain things should be changed or where a new policy may need to be created as part of the PDP.

I hope that helps. I see Olga's hand is up so maybe I wasn't clear enough.

Olga Cavalli: No, no, thank you Marika this is Olga again. You were very clear. Just an additional question to your comment. Would it be useful for the working group for example (unintelligible) essentially and community names of new gTLD's make some comments as a working group in this stage of the process in the document that is out for comment now?

Marika Konings: So this is Marika. If I can respond I think on that specific topic there is actually a separate initiative that is looking at that issue that the cross community working group that is formed between the GNSO and the ccNSO.

And I know that several GAC members are participating in that as well and I know that a letter has gone out from I think the ccNSO and the GNSO to the GAC I think encouraging or requesting some further consultation or coordination around the work in that area as it is closely late.

So that may be a separate track where further information or exchanges need to take place. With regards to the PDP again I think the best thing would be to focus and I think it has been identified in the issue report as an area that needs further consideration and that is already being worked on in the CWG. So I think the idea will be that anything that comes out of the CWG will automatically feed into PDP and similarly when participation as well what the GAC will produce would also feed into that conversation.

So I think from my perspective maybe the focus should be in relation to that topic is there anything missing in the issue report that hasn't been identified? But any proposal for solutions I think are better suited in the PDP itself.

But I said, I think there is a request out from the ccNSO and the GNSO to have some further conversations around how to ensure coordination between the two efforts that are currently looking at this topic so that it can already be streamlining between those two efforts and exchanges of views. That's at least my understanding at this point.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Marika. I see Olga you have your hand up but now dropped so do come in if you would like to now. And I can just confirm also that there was a letter relating to the whole geographic and territory work.

So but that feels to me like something, well A, just check to make sure that that's known about and that feels like something which should come up at the point leadership call which we should have before the Dublin meeting apropos item 5 of this meeting.

So Olga go ahead your hand is now up.

Olga Cavalli: Yes thank you very much (Jonathan) and I'm sorry for taking so many times to microphone. This is Olga Cavalli. About the community working group on the use of country and territory names of new gTLD's.

The entire working group of the GAC and I think I have mentioned this other time so apologies for those that have already heard from me. It's focused in the names that are not in a list.

So it's a group that is trying to provide feedback to different processes within ICANN to the staff and to the GNSO to avoid the misunderstanding and problems we had with some number and names from region to region and places that are not in any official ISO organization list for the moment.

So I saw the letter and it's a little bit strange that many people in the GAC want to coordinate but I am the only one that when I can I join the calls and sometimes it's clashing with other activities.

So I will try to bring more attention into the GAC to have more coordination and participation in those calls. But I would like to stress the fact that those working groups the cross community working group and the (unintelligible) GAC working group are different they have a different focus.

So what we would like to inject and suggest to the GNSO and we are already doing that with ICANN staff is some conclusion and some outcomes that we have realized about the use of geographic and community names in the event of (unintelligible) not in list to avoid misunderstandings in the next round. So that's the focus of our work.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks for setting the record straight or at least clarifying that from your perspective Olga that's helpful. It could still be useful to pick that up as one point I think even if we just repeat that message with the leadership of the two different groups when GAC and GNSO when we move I think that could be a useful one agenda item.

All right we've got five more minutes and we did not think we would probably get through item 6 (unintelligible) at the next meeting but certainly a good point on item 5.

And the ongoing communication coordination are current mechanisms like GNSO (unintelligible) the GAC which we've obviously done and GNSO GAC leadership call prior to every ICANN meeting is sufficient or do other mechanisms need to be considered?

Well I mean my thought is that we haven't really developed those fully yet and I'll open this by saying I suspect they are and we've got to make sure we do them and we should maybe ensure that we do have a leadership call before the next meeting so that we then have an effective face-to-face meeting.

Are there any other thoughts on this topic item 5? (Manal).

Manal Ismail: Just to ask about this current state of funding, we'll have the regular call with GAC leadership. Is this just one call before (unintelligible)? Actually I'm not aware of this visit of how things are currently managed on a day-to-day basis.

Jonathan Robinson: Good point. So now there is I think the short answer is no we don't, there is not regular call set up. I think there was most recently or quite recently a plan to make sure we had at least one call prior to each face-to-face meeting.

And indeed from memory we had one prior to the last meeting and here we proposed to ensure that there is at least another one take place. Since that is one of the product agreements that there will be or sorry one of the products of this group is that one of our mechanisms serve.

The short answer is they haven't been happening on any kind of regular basis. I think the current proposal and working assumption is that we will have at least one intercessional call and it will be relative to each forthcoming face-to-face meeting.

Okay it sounds like we've had a bit of catching up all of us collective catching up with one another to do which has been useful. I suppose what we should do is now skip to item 7 since there is just 2 or 3 minutes before the top of the hour.

I think we've got quite a few next steps in the form of actions and various things to take place. The first thing is when should we meet again? It feels to me like we could potentially usefully meet too long from now, probably a couple of weeks from now may not be a bad idea, two, three weeks from now.

How do others feel? I mean I think we've gone onto a three weekly cycle previously and maybe that's about the right amount of time for it not to get too long before we meet.

It will probably bridge between now and Dublin. Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I actually had two points. First, on (mistakes) I know we don't have time to discuss it. I would like to encourage everyone to look at the document I circulated because it has some ideas in there but it's definitely kind of where others should provide input as well and then suggestions (unintelligible) the group they want to look at.

And for the next meeting and as we do have quite a number of topics I think that require further work and also taking into account the Dublin meeting is not that far away and I would actually like to suggest that maybe in 2 weeks' time may not be a bad moment to pick things up and continue the conversation which would be the 22d of September.

Jonathan Robinson: There seems to be a couple of (unintelligible). I'm in support of 2 weeks that seems reasonable. So let's put that in the diary then let's schedule for 2 weeks from now, same time I think and then we can pick up these various points.

So we can circulate the notes, the recording will be available. I'm trying to encourage others to participate including, you know, first from the GNSO an example to be here today will (unintelligible) encourage them.

And there's quite a few takeaways I think. Any other final points anyone would like to make at this stage any other points please raise your hand? I'll circulate the notes, the action items and the plan to meet then again in 2 weeks' time.

I see (Mark) says there's a problem for him on the 22d. Let me just having agreed to it check my own diary.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I've seen that there is an accountability working group meeting that runs until well it runs in parallel to this call.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes I wonder if we shouldn't just make it later on the 22d rather than change the day. Later on the 22d how do you feel with that?

Olga Cavalli: Can you do 1500 UTC?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes 1500 UTC was suggested. Okay let's lock onto that then if that's okay, 1500 UTC unless there are any objections. Sounds like we've got a few yes' at least.

Yes make the suggestion of 1500 UTC let's seek feedback and I think we'll provisionally schedule it for that unless there are - I noted that (Mark) will be a bit late.

I mean the alternative is we doodle for that Tuesday, Wednesday time. Let's see what (Mark) says and then. Okay so there are let's do a doodle for Tuesday, Wednesday. Let's set up two or three times for both days and let's try and secure a meeting for Tuesday, Wednesday two weeks from now.

And we'll do that just so we - I'm not sure we can stick to the 22d at 1500 UTC, we'll probably have to doodle and get the best response. It's not a bad way of engaging people to be in the meeting as well.

I see (Brian) is now showing that as well. So we can - and I'm not sure when you joined (Brian) but welcome and let's make sure we engage you and everyone else when the right time permitting.

Okay well let's call it a day for now. We'll still have a meeting in 2 weeks' time and we'll pick up the actions in the meantime and review them when we fully come back together.

Thanks everyone talk to you in 2 weeks' time.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you bye.

Marika Konings: Thanks bye.

Man 1: Thank you bye-bye.

END