

ICANN Transcription GAC GNSO Consultation Group meeting

Thursday 1 October 2015 at 16:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GAC GNSO Consultation Working Group call on the Thursday 1 October 2015 at 16:00 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
Manal Ismail – co-chair – Egypt
Mark Carvell, UK
Ana Neves, Portugal

GNSO Council

Jonathan Robinson, Chair

GNSO Liaison to the GAC:

Mason Cole

Apology:

Carlos Raul Gutierrez
Avri Doria

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings
Olof Nordling
Karine Perset
Julia Charvolen
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Recordings have started. Please proceed.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much (Chuck). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the GAC GNSO Consultation Group call on the 1st of October, 2015.

On the call today we have Manal Ismail, Ana Neves, Mason Cole, Mark Carvell, and Jonathan Robinson. We received an apology from Carlos Raul Gutierrez. And from staff we have Marika Konings, Olaf Nordling, Karine Perset, (Unintelligible) 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 Ismail: Thank you Nathalie. Welcome everyone to the GAC GNSO Consultation Group conference call. We have circulated the agenda yesterday I guess, and which is just basically the same agenda Marika circulated earlier - the call that was cancelled.

So I hope you have the chance to see the agenda and think about the different items on - so let me first start by asking if there are any comments on the proposed agenda. So okay good, then we can proceed (obviously) with the first agenda item.

So first we would like to review other phases of the GNSO PDP and discuss any other possible opportunities for GAC early engagement. So just to reflect our minds as you may recall we have this (unintelligible) GAC early engagement at the very early stage of the GNSO PDP which is the issues open and has concluded with two main recommendations -- the GAC quick look mechanism and the GNSO liaison to the GAC.

We'll be discussing both of those recommendations again later on today's agenda. But for now we would focus on the following stage of the PDP which is the PDP initiation and working group.

So basically we need to discuss how to further enhance the GAC GNSO engagement at this stage. So Marika would you like to walk us through the

initiation phase? We can always take comments and then continue to the working group phase if you don't mind.

Marika Konings: Sure. Thanks Manal. So this is Marika. So as Manal noted, the first two slides basically are in the area for the ground that we have already covered as part of our earlier conversations and the quick move mechanism that was proposed.

So basically what I've done is in Slide 3 and 4 tried to map out the next phases of the PDP and tried to identify - first of all outline what is the current process and that is what you see highlighted in the blue wide boxes. And then in red I've included some suggestions on, you know, what could be potential ideas for additional mechanisms or ways to ensure a GAC early engagement.

And it might be helpful - as I know not everyone may be as familiar with the PDP process as others - to just maybe walk through this part of the process and that will hopefully allow you then as well to identify what could be potential ideas or suggestions that we may elaborate on further that would facilitate and encourage GAC early engagement.

So basically what we're looking at is the initiation phase, so after the issue scoping phase. Afterwards the final issue report is submitted to the GNSO council and the council is then expected to take a decision on whether or not to initiate a policy development process.

Just a small note there that in case the issue report was requested by the board there is no intermediate vote by the council and action moves straight on to the review of the draft charter which is at the second box on the top.

So the process currently prescribes that if the issue report was requested by an advisory committee and the council decides not to initiate a PDP at that stage there's an option for the advisory committee to meet with the GNSO

council to discuss the rationale for not initiating the PDP, following which the advisory committee can ask for a reconsideration, for the council to again consider whether or not to initiate a policy development process.

It may be worth noting that this is actually something that was added to the PDP process as part of the last review that took place. And actually in practice this has never been used so far. Think there have been if I recall well I think there have been two instances if I'm not mistaken whereby an issue report was requested by an advisory committee.

And I think in both those instances a PDP was initiated. But in either case those two instances predated this option for the kind of engagement between the GNSO council and the advisory committee that requested the advice, the preliminary issue report in the first place.

So I noted here as well of course the same option would exist to the GAC if an issue report would have been requested by the GAC and the GNSO council would decide not to initiate a policy development process.

So if the council does decide to initiate a policy development process, the next step is for the GNSO council to consider a charter for the PDP working group. And as part of our current process, a draft charter is included as part of the preliminary issue report to allow for a public input and comment on that charter so that that can already be incorporated as staff produces its final issue report.

So that's basically - so the council has the choice to either review the charter that had been prepared by staff and possibly modified through the common set that had been (received). It may also opt to decide to form a drafting team to either take that charter as a basis and, you know, adapt it based on input that may have been received from some council members or constituency or stakeholder groups.

Or it could decide to completely start from scratch and form a drafting team to do that. As a brief note the reason why we're now including the charter as part of the issue report is that one of the - and they call them GNSO PDP improvement as an attempt to try and see if there are potential parts of the process in which the PDP can be streamlined and sometime can be gained.

And in this case if the charter aligns with this news of the council, they have the ability to immediately adopt that, following which a working group can immediately be gathered and formed.

So what I did note here that in those cases where the GNSO Council would decide to form a drafting team, such a drafting team is typically open to anyone interested although I think most of the times it's not something where we can really broad call for volunteers as charter drafting is considered as a very narrow exercise which kind of needs to be taken that those that join that effort don't mistake it with the actual work that needs to happen in this PDP working group.

But for example what I've highlighted here, you know, one option that this group could consider that in this case the GNSO Council decides to form a draft DC and maybe especially in those cases where the PDP was - or the issue report was requested by an advisory committee, maybe a specific invitation should go out in those instances to the advisory committee or the GAC to advise them to participate in this element of the charter to make sure that the views of the group that's requested the issue report in the first place are taken into account and heard.

So that's, you know, the red box you see here. I said at this stage it's not limited per se, but neither is it specifically called out that, you know, outreach beyond the GNSO needs to be done if and when a drafting team is formed to develop a charter.

So basically once that step is complete, the charter has been adopted by the council, it basically moves up to the next phase in the process which is the GNSO working group phase. And that is what you see on Slide 4.

So basically at the start of the process a call for volunteers is launched and that is described in the GNSO PDP manual that a call for volunteers needs to go out as broadly as possible. So this typically gets posted on, you know, GNSO Web site, ICANN Web site. We include it in the different newsletters.

But it also typically goes out as, you know, an individual message to all the GNSO stakeholder groups' constituencies as well as all the SOs and ACs including the GAC of course. So I think as you all know, every GNSO PDP working group is open to anyone interested to participate in.

So once the working group is formed there's also a requirement for the working group as initial stages of its work to reach out to the different SOs and ACs to obtain early input.

So typically that's done in the form of an e-mail communication in which the working group may identify specific questions or - I know as well there have been instances where the working group has developed a survey that is really intended to, you know, gather information at a very early stage, different viewpoints from the different groups on the specific issues so that they can be taken into account as part of the working group deliberation.

And what you see here in the red box - I think that is something that was foreseen as well as part of the quick look mechanism -- that for those issues that the GAC had identified as having specific public policy implications and that would also be the triggering point for the GAC to start validating more substantive input that then could be provided at this stage.

So the idea is that that would be aligned and it would be interesting to hear from GAC participants on the call if that is something that is already

happening for example on those PDPs that are currently flagged as, you know, having public policy implications and specifically thinking for example about the new gTLD next generation (RDS) or what comes after Whois, a PDP that is moving into its next phase shortly.

So basically after all that input is gathered, you know, the working group reviews that and develops an initial report which then is published for public comment. So the idea is then that of course that public comment announcement goes out as well to all the different groups and they're requested to provide their input.

And here I put in a suggestion - and again these are just suggestions as part of the conversation. You may have other ideas of suggestions on - or what may work at that stage. The one option would be that at that stage the GAC could of course take that initial report and specifically review it against the input that has been provided and how those issues have been addressed.

One other thing that for example could be considered is whether there should be a specific obligation on the working group to provide specific details in its initial report on how it is addressed or how it has considered the GAC input and specifically in those instances where it may have disagreed with that input to provide a rationale as to why it has taken a different approach than what the GAC has recommended.

So based on the input that is provided as part of the public comment period the working group then reviews all that input and there is an obligation as well for the working group to go through each of those comments and provide feedback on how it's considered those comments and also provide an indication as to where changes have been made based on the input provided.

So that is also a document that is provided with the final report to the GNSO council so that it's clear to the council and as well anyone that has provided input what has been done with the input and, you know, why it was or why it

wasn't taken into account as the final report was published. So that basically ends this phase of the work.

I haven't done yet the next phase, which is the council deliberation stage, and I think that is probably an area where additional consideration may need to be given to what options exist because you can think for example about if a working group decides not to agree with the GAC input that has been provided while the GAC strongly feels that, you know, there is a good reason why it should be factored in.

Maybe there are opportunities or the need for further engagement between the GAC and the GNSO Council to discuss that or whether it's something that's taken back to the working group. So I think there's some further thinking that may go into that part of the conversation.

So I think that basically covers what I wanted to share and really would be interested to hear now what ideas or suggestions you may have as a group on what other things we may want to explore, whether some of the suggestions I've provided, is it worth writing those out in more detail for further consideration because I think the idea would be similar to what has done with the quick look mechanism.

If we can identify specific ways in which early engagement and input can be encouraged that we may pilot them in a certain way and try out whether it actually works so that after that we can see whether we need to kind of formalize some of those engagement opportunities either as standing passes or whether those should be written into the PDP manual.

I see a question from Mark that he didn't understand the reference to the streamlining opportunity for the PDP and I can briefly comment on that. I think as many of you know there are always quite a bit of criticism on the side that a PDP takes pretty long. You know, if it gets through start to finish, you know, easily looking at two to three years.

The part of an exercise that the council undertook to look at what are some of the opportunities where potential streamlining can be done to, you know, gain some time of course without undermining, you know, the process as it stands in the multi-stakeholder model.

So one of those opportunities that was identified that was instead of waiting for the initiation of the PDP and then form a group that would start developing a charter which -- because we mapped out some of the timelines -- which could easily take another six months. We said why don't we explore the possibility of including a draft charter as part of the preliminary issue report.

The community can comment on it and provide feedback. And then at the final issue report you can incorporate any feedback that may have been received and at least at that state council has an opportunity to either, you know, adopt that charter if they feel that it, you know, scopes the issue well and it outlines the issue as it has been - as they have been captured in the issue report.

Or it can just say no, we actually don't like that charter. And we still form that drafting team and go through that separate process. But just as an example I think for the last couple of PDPs I think most if not all actually the council initially adopted the charter together with initiation which basically means that indeed a six-month period has been gained on the overall timeline of the process. So I hope that makes more sense.

Manal Ismail: Thank you very much Marika. So Mark I hope this addressed your question. I can see your hand, so go ahead Mark.

Mark Carvell: Yes thank you Manal and thank you Marika. Yes it does. I think it's - could be quite important. I mean the GAC may take a view after considering the issues related to a potential policy development, that there is some urgency. So the

GAC may say you know let's really take two, three years. Could it actually be speeded up and what are the opportunities for doing that?

So I was just sort of quite interested in that as a point for consideration at that early stage. I think that's quite valuable. That was my reason. Thank you.
Thanks for the response. Thanks.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Mark. Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Manal. Hi everyone. I think this chart - and Marika's explanation was very helpful and educational to me and I hope to others. So it's very useful to capture that flow and that position. I suppose what we perhaps need now almost is - I hope I'm not jumping the gun here - but we almost need a menu of or a list of options...

Manal Ismail: From the (unintelligible) I heard that it is. I didn't see whether there are other suggestions or ideas that we can also consider at this stage. So...

Marika Konings: Sorry, this is Marika. My audio just dropped for the last few minutes, so I started capturing the first part of Jonathan's suggestion but I didn't get the rest.

Manal Ismail: I think Jonathan was saying that it makes a lot of sense that we invite the advisory committee or the requester of the PDP to participate. And I also - but again Jonathan you can repeat yourself if you feel I'm not reflecting that accurately.

And also he suggested that we can see what other suggested mechanisms we can use at this (step) which I also see is a good suggestion and a good point here on the slide to pose agree on the red box and see whether we can introduce any other (unintelligible) mechanisms at this stage. So I think at least we can take this as agreement to introduce this invitation, specific invitation. The GAC would provide input to the drafting team, right.

Okay if we don't have further comments, I can - please Jonathan. Jonathan go ahead please.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes just to be crystal clear, that specific invitation is if and when the GAC in this case or in fact any other advisory committee was the initiator of the issue report because normally we would expect the GNSO to be generating its own policy development process and work within and to initiate it. But there's a special example where the GAC or another advisory committee or group might initiate a PDP.

And under those circumstances, the suggestion that I responded positively to was we should then explicitly invite that group as early as the chartering phase, notwithstanding Marika's point about the fact that the substantial work gets done in the working group. It just makes sure that that group that was, you know, instrumental in initiating the work is instrumental in architecting the issue report as well. Thanks.

Manal Ismail: Yes thank you for highlighting this Jonathan. It's an important point. Definitely inviting the requestor themselves would help put everyone on the same page early enough. So Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Something to note as well, and of course I don't think that - we didn't need to spell out every step of the way but you could see a situation as well where the council is actually considering adopting the charter together with the initiation where the GAC could for example - if they do believe further consideration needs to be given or discussion.

I think nothing would prevent the GAC from reaching out to the GNSO Council saying, "Hey actually, you know, we have some concerns about the charter. Can we talk about it?" Or, "Are you wanting to consider forming a drafting team to have an ability to discuss it?"

So I think as well it's important that I think that the GAC sees as well that even if it's not formally spelled out there are other ways in which - you know, at various points of the process there are ways to engage with the GNSO, you know, through, you know, chair communications or, you know, sending a letter or other ways to make sure that, you know, views are heard at an early stage in the process.

Manal Ismail: So can you say here that this specific invitation would go to the GAC like in two cases if the GAC initiated a request for a PDP, which I don't happen till now? Or if the GAC quick look mechanism responded positively and said they are interested in a specific PDP. Does this make sense? Olof?

Olaf Nordling: Thank you Manal. Well actually I was rather going to jump on something that Mark mentioned in the chat. And also that well the very useful development that Marika has sought here to line up various ways on proceeding beyond the quick look mechanism. And just to comment because Mark mentioned should GAC proceed to form a subgroup at this stage probably yes I think.

Well there are a number of ways and there have been - this is basic concept but not in depth. And as far as I know we have - for example in one case tried to draft the next step into an existing GAC working group.

Other option is of course to establish a new GAC working group or a subgroup of some nature. Or to have a rapporteur. And it has even been mentioned that operationalize the consultation group to have a role in that regard which I just mentioned it but we are at very early stages in advancing the steps beyond the quick look mechanism.

And so there are things to be done, and I would suggest that this becomes one of the core discussion points at the GAC GNSO meeting in Dublin. So thank you.

Manal Ismail: Thanks Olof for the response. Yes I didn't notice Mark's question so thank you. And let me say I understand this is already taking place now. I knew that at the GAC we already have talked considering those subgroups whether - as you mentioned Olof - an existing working group or otherwise.

Immediately after responding to the quick look mechanism I mean when we receive the alerts from the GNSO through the liaison and then we respond positively on a certain topic that the GAC is interested and this would imply public policy issues, then I believe we immediately start looking into how are we going to organize ourselves internally in the GAC to forming and developing into this.

And I think already we have a topic or two that we're assigned to already assisting working groups. But I stand to be corrected of course. So if we don't have further comments on this stage we can move to the following one regarding the working group. I can see Mark Carvell. Please - go ahead please.

Mark Carvell: Yes thank you Manal. Well I think Olof was signaling we should discuss this stage and put modalities, potential modalities and options, at our joint meeting in Dublin. I think that's a good idea if I understood Olof correctly. So we need to feed that into the agenda setting for the GAC GNSO meeting in Dublin. I think...

Just one thought - kind of related and I don't want to sound like anticipating more doom laden situations, but if the GAC at this state felt it would be against the policy development there might be an extreme situation like that I suppose. Would we require specific process if the GAC were to go back at this stage and say, "Don't even think about it.

This is - if you go down this route of developing a policy on this issue you won't have the governmental support"? How do we accommodate that

situation? Is it covered in the existing, you know, timeline planning? So I'd just like to make that as one point to make. Thanks.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Mark. I don't think it is but I'll give Marika the floor. But I also have a similar question. I'll see if it's related. So Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. So I think, you know, as part of what we're doing now is trying to identify indeed what are all the steps in the process in which, you know, GAC early engagement can be encouraged and by which as well, you know, the GNSO can respond to that and, you know, engage in conversations and discussions around that input.

But I think as well as we look back at the charter I think there is this question. And I think that's why we apparently as well started at the starting point of the PDP and are working our way towards the end of it. But of course there may be a situation that even going through all these steps of the process there may still be a situation whereby, you know, the GNSO Council does policy recommendations that do not align with GAC advice and where - the GAC position - and whereby the GAC may provide a different set of advice directly through the board.

And I think one of the questions in the charter - and I don't remember exactly how it is worded - is indeed whether this group should also look or could consider what kind of mechanism should be put in place to deal with those kind of situations without, you know, having to put the board in the position of, you know, choosing one child over another.

Are there then at that stage further kind of engagement or consultation mechanisms that could be envisioned that would allow, you know, the GNSO and the GAC to get closer together and try to work through the issues before the board is brought in to make a decision?

But of course I think at least from mine and maybe staff's perspective of course the hope is by having all these early engagement opportunities we won't get into that kind of situation because hopefully the concerns are considered and addressed at a very early stage in the process and through this the continuous engagement on both sides as well we increase understanding of what the issues may be and solutions can be found that are mutually acceptable.

But nevertheless I think it is a scenario that, you know, by going through the different phases we'll - at the end we'll end up in that potential scenario. And I think the idea is that hopefully we'll have some ideas and suggestions and as well as what kind of a process could be put in place or used to deal with a situation whereby there may be a different views maybe at the end of the process that are being put forward to the board.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Marika. Actually yes my question was going to be what if the GAC provides an input that is not in line with whatever the GNSO has in mind. But again back to Mark's question.

And Mark do you see a possibility that the GAC can - at very early stage see that this topic - we should not proceed in discussing this topic or initiate a PDP for a certain topic despite the fact that we've already passed through the initial quick look mechanism and we already will have responded one way or another - either that the GAC is not interested or the GAC is interested or the GAC may be interested at a later stage?

So maybe what you mentioned probably could fit early in the issue scoping phase, earlier than this phase. But again I'm not sure. I'm just thinking out loud. So Mark go ahead.

Mark Carvell: Well Manal, yes, what I was thinking was okay we were signaled at that earlier stage interest by the GAC. This is an issue that does raise public

policy concerns. It may be quite a complex issue. But that fact will be readily identifiable. The GAC will need to look at this seriously and provide input.

And then, you know, that interest will mature to a level of greater understanding, greater exploration of consequences and then - and also GAC representatives will have consulted stakeholder groups at the national level and within the administration as appropriate.

And, you know, the trend may be towards this is a non-starter, you know. But that will take time and maybe by this stage, the charter stage and, you know, developing maturity as I say of the issue and expectation and understanding. Governments may feel this is not going to go anywhere, you know. I'm just thinking of that kind of scenario. It may be a very extreme and highly unlikely scenario but conceivably it could happen.

I know, you know, from that we all do in government, sometimes we hit on a great idea and then talk to people, consult and gradually it gets demolished and put on the back burner and eventually maybe even completely dismantled as too much effort, too controversial, whatever. So I'm just thinking of that kind of situation.

It's possible conceivably that might happen but it's not apparent in the early stage of the quick look and the initial issue exposition. Thanks.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Mark. Yes it's a good point to be taken into consideration of course. I think part of our work here is to also look into the extremes and where conflicts happen. So thank you again. So I think we discussed this stage thoroughly and we can conclude - I mean elaborate on this over e-mail and when we receive the notes of the meeting.

So not to - I mean we're running out of time so if we can go to the next stage and also focus on the new steps, the tools and boxes where input is requested from the GAC and also the GAC will have an opportunity during

the public comment period to see how its input has been reflected or considered in the document.

And again here do we need those boxes used with - I personally do. And do we have any other suggestions or any further steps that need to be (unintelligible)? I personally think here we will need to think maybe of two things - what if the input provided from the GAC to the GNSO does not align with what the GNSO has in mind. So it is that early clear that the points of view do not align.

Again when the initial report is out and does not consider the GAC input or the GAC input is not reflected as the GAC would have hoped then again what happens here? So Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I think building on what Manal said and also the comments that Mark made, I'm wondering as well if something could be foreseen here. And again I think it's something then as well for probably GNSO representatives to consider, whether there should be some kind of dialogue.

And I don't know if that should happen at the working group level or at the GNSO Council level between the working group and GNSO Council and the GAC if indeed input is provided. And as part of the initial report the working group has actually decided that, you know, for whatever reason not to go ahead or not to agree with the GAC input, whether at that stage some kind of dialogue should be foreseen.

But I think the question is currently like how would that dialogue be managed or by whom and how can you make sure as well that it doesn't of course either disadvantage other groups that may have also provided input and feedback.

So I think it's something where indeed I think it is important if there are ways and mechanisms that dialogue can be promoted and mutual understanding

and as well mutual solutions can be found but how to make sure indeed that it's framed in such a way that it's not seen as a kind of bilateral negotiation between two parties but also at one level to that kind of conversation take place.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Marika. Yes you're right. And also Mark indicated that liaison role here is important to ensure the effective coordination between the GAC and the GNSO which also Mason confirmed.

So again I think those would be also points for discussion with our constituencies during the meetings in Dublin. So do we have any further comments on this phase of the PDP and how to engage the GAC earlier at this stage Olof?

Olof Nordling: Well...

Manal Ismail: Olof? We can't - yes.

Olof Nordling: Yes can you hear me? Very briefly that is one of the boxes that a committee is formed. And I think we shouldn't preclude what precisely the mechanism would be from the GAC side. As I said in the experimentation stage on the next step, though it could be a committee, it could be an existing working group, it could be some kind of other subgroup. Could be - and so on.

So committee in inverted commas or something just for clarity so people don't think that this is a - if we present this to the whole GAC that this is a foregone conclusion. Thank you.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Olof. Yes, good point. And I think we will need to consider those while drafting our complete recommendations. I also will be following what we did at the earlier stage of the issue scoping. Any further comments on this agenda item? Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Just responding to Mark's point, he says GAC should see you draft of final report. Just a note that all working group products or every single draft, those are always publicly posted. So those are already available at an early stage.

And I think we touched upon that point before and it's not something specifically called out here but there's something you may want to reconsider. And I know that there are certain concerns associated with that.

But whether you would have either some on - either the whole committee or one person from the committee or whatever form it may take in the GAC actually follow the working group conversation so that person would also be in a position to at an early stage flag if our specific issues that are not, you know, going in the direction that aligned with the input that has been provided by the GAC.

Or if there's a misunderstanding around, you know, what the GAC has provided, I know that there's constraints that may be associated with that, but of course a person cannot speak on behalf of the GAC unless I guess it's the confirmed GAC position. And some may still see that person as a kind of way to engage with the GAC so it would need to be very well scoped.

But something along those lines would make it - may make it easier for the GAC to follow along the process and be able at an earlier stage already see whether something goes in the direction that, you know, is in support or aligned with the GAC position or not.

And something for example that I know I think some GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies do, they have - you know, they have multiple people from that group participating. But they typically assign one person as the kind of lead who is responsible for as well briefing back to the group but also taking messages to the working group on behalf of the stakeholder groups or constituencies.

So it is something that, you know, the GAC may want to consider if there's value in exploring something along those lines. That may also help keeping up to date as the working group goes through the motions and allow the GAC as well to provide, you know, guidance along the way - again, especially when it comes to clarifications or information that may be missing from working group deliberations.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Marika. And I'm just minded that we only have ten minutes remaining for the call and we still have two agenda items. I know this is an important one so we can continue this discussion and utilize the mailing list. And we can fine tune and come to our recommendations on the mailing list.

So if we don't have any other (unintelligible) comments can we move to the following agenda items? Okay so it's review of the implementation of the quick look mechanism. And here I think it would be good to quickly note which PDPs used the quick look mechanism. And how did this work in practice? And again if we have any suggestions for improvement.

So let me ask first if we know how many or what are the PDPs that already use the quick look mechanism. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. So as far as I'm aware I think there are two PDPs for which the quick look mechanism has been enacted. The first one is the purpose of gTLD registration data or this next generation RDS and PDP.

And the second one is the new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP. I think for both of those we kind of followed the process where I think Mason provided official notification to the GAC secretariat that initial report had been requested on those topics for both and we would get feedback back from the GAC, which at least for the RDS one has been incorporated and I think that feedback was also submitted to the public comments.

And if I may at least from a staff side I think there's a bit of streamlining we may be able to do with regards to the communication aspect. I see now there are quite a few e-mails that go back and forth. And actually at least from my personal perspective it looks like that the GAC input is actually coming much earlier than we had anticipated when we developed a process because the idea was it would give very early notice so that the GAC input would be provided as part of the public comments.

But I think what we've seen now is that the input is actually already provided when we're still drafting the report, which of course is very helpful but it wasn't how we initially had set up the process. So that may be something to reflect upon as well as I think where we need to see how we can make sure that communications are publicly tracked and traced and we need to think of what would be the best location to do that as some of it has gone now to e-mail communications.

Although they're asking as well, some of it had been submitted to the public comments forum so it's also there in the public domain. That's at least from my personal perspective some of the feedback. And maybe it's helpful and I think that was requested as well in the last meeting.

I can work with Olof and we can kind of write up, you know, what has happened so far, maybe from at least from both of our perspectives, also provide, you know, some input from a staff perspective where we see there may be opportunities to improve or modify the process.

And then of course I just need to hear as well from others like, you know, Mason who's actively engaged in that process to see, you know, what are other points that the group may want to consider or think about. And to know that I think a third PDP for what you'll use as well is coming soon, which is the one on the RPMs.

And I believe what we said for at least the recommendation I think the GNSO Council made one day, you know, supported this process whether there should be at least I think five PDPs for which the mechanism would have been used along with, you know, the consultation groups in review and suggest whether it's working or not, whether modifications need to be made.

And I think at that stage further consideration can be given as well to should this be formalized and written into, for example, the PDP manual.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Marika. Good to know that this is an effective mechanism. So Olof, go ahead.

Olof Nordling: Thank you and continuing along that line, from the GAC side I think we're not entirely sure whether it would be useful to provide input earlier than what's actually planned or if it's been rather a drawback. So that would be interesting to know as well from the GNSO side.

As you mentioned Marika we've - the group has supplied the quick look comments too early perhaps. And I just wonder was it too early? Or that's part of the evaluation of course but are there advantages and drawbacks of early noting? Thank you.

Manal Ismail: Thanks Olof. Definitely could be interesting to hear some GNSO colleagues whether that very, very early input might have its own drawbacks as well. So Marika? Go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. To Olof's specific question I think the down side is that it may create more work for the GAC because I think at least from, you know, GNSO perspective or from, you know, staff perspective responsible for drafting issue reports, the idea was more the quick look mechanism would look a bit, preliminary issue report and kind of say oh wait, you know, you're missing things.

And, you know, the GAC input is not properly recorded here - although if of course it's early - provided the early stage we can really make sure that it's in there.

But now it may mean that it's actually a two-step process for the GAC where on the one hand, you know, you've provided at a very early stage the input that staff can incorporate and then once the issue report is public for public comments, you may need to have another look to make sure that we did it correctly and whether there's still anything that, you know, you want to comment on, which...

Yes I mean, from my perspective I don't think it's a bad thing but of course it would put more work on the GAC part or the quick look committee to do that in that sequence. So I think that is something where the GAC may want to consider if that is indeed do you want to make that a two-step process or whether you say okay let's actually wait until the preliminary issue report.

And if indeed, you know, you still need to raise that flag on whether, you know, it has public policy implications or not but, you know, the BC can see at that stage whether GAC input or advice has been provided at earlier stages it actually captured or not. So...

Olof Nordling: Thanks a million.

Manal Ismail: Perfect, thank you. So could you kindly - I'm sorry could you please repeat the three PDPs because Mark I think is asking about the third one - before we move forward?

Marika Konings: The third come that is coming - and I think we expect it will be published probably right before Dublin is on the review of the rights protection mechanism, so that's new (DRP) and the other (RPMs) that were introduced as part of the new gTLD program.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Marika. So I think we can conclude on this agenda item. We can put our - this feedback in I think. And again I think it's something to be said with our constituencies during our joint session. And maybe also hear back from them if there is any specific feedback from their side.

Let me ask first so can we afford to to postpone the fifth agenda item on the review of the GNSO liaison because we're almost at the hour? Or will we have a problem with the timeline for the fiscal year budgets and so on? Or let me also ask the relevant question, do we plan to have another call before Dublin? Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Maybe just a suggestion here and, you know, maybe what staff can do as part of the - take up this conversation - maybe we can have a look back at the original, you know, call or job description we put together and see, you know, have those - because I think we set out as well what the objectives were and we can maybe see it easier.

Put those together and maybe work as well with Mason to identify are there any specific questions which you'll be asking. And maybe that's a helpful starting point for the group to look at.

With regards to timing I actually just confirmed what the FY17 budget planning cycle is. And I know that they've I think just kicked off that conversation. But as a - I think a point of reference for the previous round I think any special budget requests needed to be submitted I think in the February/March time frame. So there is some time.

The only thing of course is to know that if - you know, it would be good indeed if there is a strong indication already from the group that this is something that should continue and may already something as well that you may want to put on the agenda for the joint meeting to see indeed if, you know, what I said, what are the perspectives so far? Is this helpful? Is this something that should become a standard feature?

And of course we can already, you know, share that and see if it can become integrated as part of the budget as one of the standing slots which of course doesn't mean that at the end of the day we'll decide that it's no longer needed.

Then of course we can just, you know, pull it off there. But at least at that stage we may not need to do it any more as a special project and have a special request. But we integrate it as part of the standard budget if indeed both the GNSO and GAC give an indication that this is used for and expected to continue beyond the current term duration of the pilot project which is the end of this fiscal year.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Marika. So I think at least we can - as a way forward - we can at least conclude that it is a useful thing to continue. We agree that it continues. We can work the details and hear also from Mason. So can everyone stay like five minutes more and we can hear from Mason also his feedback? So if we don't - Mason go ahead please.

Mason Cole: Hi can you hear me Manal?

Manal Ismail: Yes, yes we can.

Mason Cole: Good. Mason speaking. Generally speaking I think the liaison role has gone fairly well. This (consultate) has spent quite a bit of time establishing process and not as much time engaging with - between the GNSO and the GAC on the process. As Marika pointed out there's been - there are two PDPs where GAC input has been forthcoming and one more coming down the line.

So you know it's my hope that the liaison role has been helpful to the GAC in terms of organizing its capability to have input into GNSO processes. And I think we're there. It's just a question now of actually providing the input and

reconciling that input with the direction of the GNSO as it was previously discussed.

But I'm very happy to review this role. I think it would be a healthy thing to do. And maybe there are improvements even that can be made to the role going forward.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Mason and yes we're equally happy with (unintelligible) and we can all feel the difference. And we can also hopefully hear from you if you have any challenges or any suggestions can facilitate your thoughts. We will be more than happy also to work on this.

So again mindful of the time and I do apologize that we're a bit late, so do we have any further comments or now or anything - does anyone have anything to raise under the AOB agenda item?

So if not, one final question - do we foresee another call before Dublin or we can continue online over e-mail? So let me put it the other way. Do we feel a need for another call before Dublin? So anyway, again this is something that we can agree on the mailing list.

Yes I would have hoped that we can have maybe another one to conclude before Dublin. I'm aware of the very tight time and that too many things running in parallel. So again I can understand if we choose to continue this over the e-mail. But again we can take this online later.

I do apologize for keeping you late and thank you all for your participation. And if no one else has any other comments we can conclude. So... Seeing none, so thank you all for joining and if you can please stop the recording and the meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

END