

**ICANN
Transcription
GAC GNSO Consultation Group meeting
Wednesday, 20 January 2016 at 14:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GAC GNSO Consultation Working Group call on the Wednesday 20 January 2016 at 14:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-gac-15dec15-en.mp3>
On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#dec>

Attendees:

Government Advisory Committee

Manal Ismail, Egypt, Co-Chair of Consultation Group
Mark Carvell, UK
Pedro Matos, representing Ana Neves, Portugal

GNSO Council

Philip Corwin, Councillor

GNSO Liaison to the GAC:

Mason Cole

Apology:

Jonathan Robinson, Co-Chair of Consultation Group
Paul McGrady, Councillor
Amr Elsadr, Councillor
Jorge Cancio, Switzerland
Suzanne Radell, USA
Olof Nordling

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings
Glen de St Gery
Julia Charvolen
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: The recording has started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much (Tony). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the GAC GNSO Consultation Group meeting on the 20th of January 2016.

On the call today we have Manal Ismail, Mason Cole, Mark Carvell and Phil Corwin.

We received apologies from Jonathan Robinson, Paul McGrady, (Eile Taday), Jorge Cancio and Olaf Nordling.

And from staff we have Marika Konings, Julia Charvolen, and myself Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all too please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you Manal.

Manal Ismail: Thanks Nathalie and welcome everyone to the call. And apologies for not circulating an agenda for today but again Marika circulated those - the documents we discussed in our last call and this basically constitutes our agenda for today.

So following our discussion on the last call Marika has circulated an updated review of the GNSO liaison to the GAC.

And review of the quick look mechanism and rolls documents have been designed by the staff in collaboration with the confrontation group leadership in order to draft recommendations for the whole confrontation group's review.

In addition a new document was also circulated and this outlines the different stages of the CTT and possible improvements to be considered.

So we'll basically through the three documents see if we have ready feedback or comments for now.

And maybe under the second agenda item we can discuss the next steps that has to do with the three documents and maybe have some deadline for providing feedback on the three documents particularly that we don't have everyone on this call. So we need to agree on a later time to have it as a deadline for the comments and finally confirm the times and dates of our next meeting.

So do we have any comments from the agenda before we start?

Okay seeing none then maybe we can move right away to the GNSO (move on) through the GAC review.

And Mark I note your comment in the chat room and I believe I'm not sure many have been able to read the documents as well.

So maybe we can - we've already gone through the documents on the last call. The only new part of the document is the concluded recommendations that are proposed based on the feedback that was submitted.

So maybe we can go through the recommendations and see if we have any direct feedback now or later over the email.

So there were a few questions that composed the document overall and we had a few members commenting. And mainly for again these are nation's experience in the role of the GNSO liaison to the GAC.

And from those comments the - we tried to conclude a few recommendations that are proposed subject to our discussion and related communicators with our constituencies, the GAC and the GNSO.

So the first recommendation and this has to do with the overarching question which is whether the GNSO (unintelligible) contributed to the facilitating that early engagement in the GNSO to the team.

And recommendation here (leads) that the Consultation Group is of the view that the GNSO is on for the GAC in conjunction with the other improvements recommended by the GAC GNSO confrontation group has positively contributed to the GAC engagement with the GNSO.

As such the Consultation Group recommends that the GNSO liaison to the GAC is transformed from a pilot process to a (unintelligible) to the objective to provide timely updates for the GAC on GNSO policy development activities in order to complement the existing notification processes as well as answering questions in relation to these GNSO activities that GAC members may have.

Furthermore the liaison will be responsible for providing the GNSO Council with regular updates on subjects including on GAC activities specifically in so far as these relate to issues of interest to the GNSO.

Objective of the liaison mechanism is in combination with some of the other mechanisms that the council that the Consultation Group is exploring as well as existing engagements (here) will need to facilitate effective early engagement of the GAC as well as generally assists with the flow of information between the GAC and the GNSO.

So do we have any immediate reaction to this recommendation? And I have one question that I believe this is a bit long or a bit longer than the rest of the recommendations.

So maybe if we can work a little bit longer drafting we'll make it - I mean concise and to the point and the rest can go as a rationale for this recommendation.

But I think the rest of the recommendations are really shorter and more to the point.

This is again a proposal and I wait to hear from you, so Mark?

Mark Carvell: Yes. Hello Manal and hello everybody. I hope you can hear me.

Manal Ismail: Yes. We can hear you.

Mark Carvell: You can hear me? I know I had a problem...

Manal Ismail: Yes.

Mark Carvell: ...with the phone this morning. You can hear me right, great.

Well yes I think you're right just on - first of all of the presentational point perhaps we could enumerate the elements of the recommendations so that will make it more concise and easier so number the various parts. So the - providing currently updates to the GAC.

I also wondered if we ought to have the word regular. And I'm thinking that in terms of not only present at GAC meetings but periodic written submissions to the GAC by the GNSO liaison person on a regular basis to maintain the profile of PDP related issues and to flag what's coming up.

So I just wondered if we - if the recommendation could actually add the word regular to that particular element of the recommendation provide regular and timely updates to the GAC.

But the rest of it is fine, very keen for this to become a permanent arrangement. Thanks.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Mark. And I can see that Marika is already taking notes of what you have of your comments.

So I think yes in principle I don't see there's a problem with this as a Consultation Group recommendation.

So moving to the next recommendation which has to do with the objectives...

Marika Konings: Manal this is Marika.

Manal Ismail: Yes Marika, go ahead. Sorry I didn't see your hand.

Marika Konings: Yes. I just wanted to note because one thing the group may want to consider because I think that the document in the form that it is currently in it's still more of an internal discussion document to, you know, kind of structure our thoughts I think or at least from my perspective I think ones that probably goes to different groups we may at least want to take out that first part of, you know, individual views and comments and just basically focus on, you know, what our recommendations are.

And then we can of course refer back to those that wanted to see, you know, some of the discussions that went into it but maybe for, you know, review purposes for the different groups it may be easier just to focus on, you know, what the actual recommendations are and some of the background info.

And that may help as well then to organize it in a, you know, more structured way and a clearer way even with numbering or whatever format that that may be a way of addressing some of the concerns flagged.

Manal Ismail: Thanks Marika. Yes this is a fair point. The structure would definitely be different when you circulated them, makes sense that it would include the individual views but the recommendations of the confrontation group as a whole. I know that Mason also agrees with Mark comments.

So the following recommendation has to do with the objectives. And this was in response to a question if there isn't an objective that's still relevant and if not how should it be designed?

And in that respect the proposed recommendation is that the Consultation Group is of the view that the original objective is still highly relevant but recommends that in addition to the existing engagement group regular (unintelligible) calls are scheduled between the GNSO liaison to the GAC. And the GAC suggest areas to a person that all relevant information has been received by the GAC and progress is being made following which regular speakers update is provided by liaison to the GNSO Council.

So again do we have any immediate reactions to this recommendation? And Mark is this an old hand or a new one?

Mark Carvell: It's a new one. If - can you hear me on that Manal?

Manal Ismail: Yes, yes I can. Please go ahead.

Mark Carvell: Does this mean coordination calls to the entire GAC first to the GAC and the GAC secretariat? I just wonder if that's going to be too much for this particular confirmation task I mean the GAC secretariat? Yes.

But regular coordination calls between the GNSO liaison oh I see I'm reading it incorrectly. Sorry, between the GNSO liaison to the GAC and the GAC secretariat. It is sorry, with the GAC secretariat. Yes I'm sorry, I am studying it correctly now. So I don't have a problem. Thanks.

Manal Ismail: Sorry...

((Crosstalk))

Manal Ismail: Can you hear me? Yes I lost audio and I reconnected again.

Mark Carvell: All right.

Manal Ismail: Sorry for that.

Mark Carvell: No I....

Manal Ismail: Mark I believe you said you're fine with this?

Mark Carvell: Yes. I am I saw this was envisioning calls for the GAC but it's solely with the GAC secretariat and I think that is appropriate.

Manal Ismail: Yes. It's with the GAC secretariat. And it is based on feedback from Mason that being not on the GAC mailing list sometimes not everything is that clear to him.

So there's a suggestion that he can coordinate closely with the GAC secretariats and even have coordination calls. So this is where this recommendation comes from.

And I note also that Phil is fine with this recommendation.

So I have just one suggestion I was thinking that maybe we can change the box into (and). So to believe the Consultation Group is of the view that the original objective is still highly relevant and recommends that (unintelligible).

Because I feel the bulk of this we are going to propose something contrary to what we said at the beginning that the objective that is highly relevant. So but I needed to - need to bring the speakers. I don't have a strong position here but just proposing an and instead of the (unintelligible).

So Mark and is better and Mason agrees so then we can do these things.

The third recommendation has to do with the liaison responsibilities and whether these responsibilities are still relevant and current. And if not how should these be resolved.

Again based on feedback received the contract facing group recommends that the responsibilities as originally formulated are still highly relevant and should become part of the description of the GNSO liaison through the GAC (unintelligible).

So this is a pretty straightforward recommendation confirming the responsibilities as currently drafted. So we have any feedback on this or any reaction? I can see Mark I think.

Okay confirmed, perfect. The following has to do with the skills and the experience and again whether the skills and experience as drafted before are still relevant and current. And if not how should views be revised?

The recommendation reads the Consultation Group recommends that the skills and experience as originally formulated are still highly relevant and should become part of the description of the GNSO liaison to the GAC (unintelligible).

So again its straightforward recommendation to confirm (unintelligible) experience has been (unintelligible).

Seeing no request from the floor I move forward with this working (text).

Does this match how the GNSO liaison to the GAC has operated today? If not how should this be updated?

And the recommendation here reads the confrontation group recommends that the (practical) working as originally formulated are still highly relevant

and should become part from the description of the GNSO to the GAC
(unintelligible).

So again confirming the work in practice. And I note that Phil is okay, and
Mark. (Unintelligible) has (unintelligible). How about (formulas)?

Mark Carvell: Yes sorry Manal, I was still on the previous one actually. I just...

Manal Ismail: Where does...

((Crosstalk))

Mark Carvell: ...outgoing person means somebody who's very energetic and excitable,
interactive as well as somebody who is leading. So I'm - I was just suggesting
a minor tweak.

So a former or recently departed GNSO councilor. I'm still on the skilled one
(please).

Manal Ismail: On the skills one, okay. I'm not sure. Can someone help me find where the
words outgoing were? (Unintelligible) outgoing (unintelligible).

Okay Marika I think you (got) this because I - frankly I can't find it so...

Marika Konings: I think it's actually in the skills description on the left-hand side I think there's
one that talks about the skills required and I think it suggests somewhere
there although I haven't exactly found it yet either. But I think it's also
(unintelligible) we've got an outgoing council member which I think is a term...

Manal Ismail: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...we do use and when this council changes over but I see Mark's
(unintelligible) as well that's...

Manal Ismail: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...just a former...

Manal Ismail: Yes. I got the point now. Sorry, I was looking at the recommendation itself but not the rest of the GAC (unintelligible) paper. Thank you Mark, duly noted.

So Mark are you also okay with the following recommendation which states that the council group recommends that the practical working as written and formulated are still highly relevant and should become part of the description of the GNSO liaison to the GAC (unintelligible)?

Mark Carvell: Yes. I'm fine with that.

Manal Ismail: Okay. And the following one has to do with the removal. Should the removal clause remain as is? So the Consultation Group recommends that removal close as originally formulated remain relevant and should become part of the description of the GNSO liaison to the GAC (unintelligible).

And following it has to do with the selection process. Are there any concerns about the selection process as it was conducted for the pilot project and any changes or enhancements that should be considered?

And here the Consultation Group recommends that the original selection process is adopted to respect duration and periods instead of specific dates so it can be used as a reference for selection process because the draft originally has specific dates for this round of - the initial round of selection process.

So here the recommendation is to generalize the - those specific dates into durations and periods so that we have general guideline for the selection process.

Seeing no requests to the form I move to the term limits and whether there should be a term limit for this (unintelligible).

They Consultation Group recommends that there is no term limits for this (unintelligible) but that the liaison is de-confirmed by the GNSO Council in its position at least a (circulation) whether this is every year or two years.

Thanks Mark for confirming that the selection process is okay and Phil okay with no term limits but prefer annual reconfirmation.

So can you have this as every year? Marika (unintelligible).

Marika Konings: This is Marika.

Manal Ismail: Yes Marika. Go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes. I just wanted to note that this is something I added. It wasn't something that was specifically discussed. You know, Mason commented that from his perspective that there didn't need to be a term limit.

But as we've done with the pilot and be - maybe worth considering having at least some kind of confirmation from the council on a yearly basis so at least it allows as well for review by the council, you know, whether the liaison is now functioned is as expected or also for the liaison to indicate that they, you know, whether they still want to continue or, you know, whether they had enough and would like to get out of that role.

Manal Ismail: Thanks Marika. Phil go ahead please.

Phil Corwin: Yes Phil here. I prefer an annual review for two reasons. One, with no term limit if it's completely open ended it's going to be harder to find volunteers to fulfill this role if it's not year to year.

And second I think an annual review which would just mean the council engaging in a conversation with the liaison provides a good opportunity to talk about how things have been going and what might be changed from year to year to fulfill the goal.

So I think it's just good to take a look every year and make course adjustments and also not lock the liaison into a more than annual commitment on this.

Manal Ismail: Thanks Phil for that point. And at the end it's also up to the GNSO (unintelligible) to decide on this. So nothing much to add here so but thank you.

And Mason also I think was (unintelligible). Thanks Mason.

The following recommendation has to do with formalizing the GNSO role in the GNSO operating (unintelligible).

And the question was should the role of liaison be formalized in the GNSO operating procedures?

The Consultation Group recommends that the role of the GNSO is formalized in the GNSO operating procedures as outlined in the other recommendations in this (unintelligible).

So I'm reading more comments in the chat room. Could you remind me of how to handle the liaison (unintelligible) or better leaving. That's something (unintelligible).

Mark Carvell: Yes I was sort of wondering if there was like a sort of the council would have some sort of deputy arrangement with for whatever reason the liaison person was not able to continue to undertake the role at short notice. Is that covered elsewhere? Forgive me if I - if it is?

Thanks.

Manal Ismail: No it's not covered and thank you for bringing this up. So the proposal is okay. Marika you have a response? Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes (unintelligible) off mute. So this is Marika. So basically just to look at other liaisons that are currently in place I don't think there is a system of, you know, a backup of or a deputy.

And I think there are occasions where the liaison cannot participate or is not available.

And looking at this we have a GNSO liaison from ccNSO and as well from the ALAC but they typically participate in our meetings but they will send apologies if they're not available. But there are other ways of communicating them - with them if there are any specific issues.

So for this type of role it may create too many layers if - to also add your backups and alternates.

And but maybe that is something that if there would be an occasion or by the liaison says, you know, I'm going to be out for the next six months that on a case by case basis the GNSO can then review is there a need to temporary, find a temporary replacement until the person is back or, you know, in that period no specific activities were seen or can be, you know, picked up by the council leadership for example in their role.

And so that might be that may be an alternative path instead of maybe building too much of a structure into this for probably occasions that may not arrive hopefully that often.

Manal Ismail: Thanks Marika. Okay Mark are you okay with the response from Marika. Should we move forward?

Mark Carvell: Yes thank you Marika yes thank you. Well yes that's fine. We just have to be mindful of what could happen and if the council could kind of swing into action to ensure there isn't a long gap without somebody picking up the liaison responsibilities. That's fine yes. Thank you.

Manal Ismail: Okay perfect. And this brings us to the last recommendation and it has to do with participation of the liaison in the GNSO Council.

If the GNSO liaison to the GAC considers to be a non-voting member of the GNSO Council and the recommendation here reads the Coordination Group recommends that the liaison is invited to attend GNSO Council meetings but is not considered a non-voting member of the GNSO Council.

Again this is based on the feedback we got from Mason I guess. So do we have any immediate actions for this? Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I'm just realizing that we may need to clarify that not being a non-voting member doesn't mean the person is a voting member. So I need to check I'm not sure how we refer to the other liaisons.

As I said we have two other liaisons (unintelligible) to participate in council meetings but I don't think they're considered members of the council as such. So they - I can double check what, you know, what role or what title they have I think in the descriptions.

I don't know if it's in the operating procedures or the bylaws but that may be a way of at least clarifying that by not being a non-voting member doesn't mean that we're suggesting that it should be a voting member.

Manal Ismail: Thanks Marika and yes you have a point and I was chuckling when I was reading this now. So yes if you are able to make this a little more distinguished (unintelligible).

And I note that (Pedro) representing (Anna) has joined the (unintelligible) (Pedro). So I think this meeting is - we have gone through the first document and it is - the GNSO we'll move onto the GAC.

And if we don't have any further comments we can tend to the second document which is (unintelligible).

Marika Konings: Manal can I just ask for one clarification because I just seen Mason in the chat now noting that he thinks the liaison should be a non-voting member of the council which I think is not what he said in his original comment or maybe he initially interpreted as that the question was whether the (unintelligible) liaison should be a voting member of the council.

So maybe Mason you can clarify what you mean by that because they say if it's a non-voting member it would kind of have the status I think as, you know, (unintelligible) the non-voting and NomCom (unintelligible) and counted as well as a council member which I think and I think Glen is on the call so he may be able to confirm.

Where I think we currently we do not count the liaisons as a member of the council and I'm trying to think if it has any specific impact other than just a naming but that may be something we need to think about.

Manal Ismail: Mason I see your hand so go ahead please.

Mason Cole: Mason speaking, no you're right Marika I don't - I don't intend for the liaison role to be a member of the council per se but to be fluent in council work. So it's important that the liaison be present at council meetings and participate in council work but not - I agree with you not - I'm not going against my original recommendation. So pardon me for my missed typing there.

Manal Ismail: (Unintelligible) I can see that Glen also has commented in the chat room so. I'm not able to do this quickly so I advise that we do these offline and make sure (unintelligible). So now moving to the GAC (quick look) mechanism and again actually (unintelligible) and the (quick look) continues (unintelligible).

Specifically for the GAC (unintelligible) and agree to have this (unintelligible) answered on (unintelligible) for a minimum of three contractors GNSO PDP after we submit it both back to the GAC and the GNSO council on how it affects (unintelligible) recommendations where and whether or not those should be (unintelligible).

So far the (quick look) mechanism has been assigned for two GNSO (unintelligible) and may need to issue a report on the next (unintelligible) registration (unintelligible) service and issue report on the new gTLD (unintelligible).

We also have the (unintelligible) observations on the (quick look) mechanisms and (unintelligible) they offered that less time is needed by the GAC to provide input than initiative (unintelligible) and that the (unintelligible) input (unintelligible) will be passed on to the PDP working group.

And finally that maybe we should consider how to ensure (unintelligible) back and forth between the GAC and the GNSO. There were also a few issues for discussion mainly what is the experience from other (unintelligible) others who are involved in this process and the GAC (unintelligible) so on.

And are there any improvements that can't already be either defined and finally (quick look) mechanisms (unintelligible) engagement, any engagement of the GAC (unintelligible).

This document (unintelligible). It's basically described how two PDP's got the (quick look) mechanism (unintelligible) how those two PDP's were - how communication went, how the exchanges happened aside (unintelligible) communications (unintelligible) the GNSO is also the GAC and how the GAC (unintelligible) based on the (quick look) mechanism.

What standard are we seeking (unintelligible) formalized and typed. The first answer the GNSO is informing the GAC to (unintelligible) a request for initial report and then the GAC (unintelligible) concerns to see (unintelligible) any additional information needed.

And certainly the GNSO is (unintelligible) of the opening of the public comment period and the board have the GAC (unintelligible) public input from the GAC (unintelligible).

And indicate whether additional time is needed to provide the response (unintelligible) and of course any point the GNSO is anticipating on this (unintelligible). And finally the (quick look) mechanism response that maybe other input is populated and defined in the (34) and covered for the GNSO council for consideration.

So this is basically how the (unintelligible) in the past two PDP's and how it (unintelligible) group work in other PDP's. So Marika let's see if you could help, are we going to come to or show some recommendations here from the - for the council - from the council - from the (coordination) groups as a (unintelligible) or this is just for discussion and seeking further to do that and I can see your hand is already raised so go ahead please.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I actually wanted to make two points. First of all thinking we need to update the document to reflect that we actually already had a third PDP for which the (quick look) mechanism was also used which is the issue report on the rights, review of the rights protection and mechanisms and all gTLD's.

And secondly to know that actually that the last part of the document is actually the proposed simplification or generalization of the process. I think already our process as, you know, it was outlined it included quite a number of steps.

And I think, you know, part of the reason was that there was the anticipation that it may, it might take more time for the GAC to actually come back on some of these issues.

But I think now in practice we've seen that actually the turnaround time is pretty quick. So it may be possible to take out some of the steps out of the original process which, you know, at one time were very bureaucratic and also, you know, requiring then as well the posting of communications.

Well now basically the proposal is that, you know, the formal response would be committed as part of the public comment forum. That it's very clearly marked and when submitted that, you know, that is a response of the (quick look) mechanism which of course may also include any other input that the GAC may have on the public comments as part of the public comment period.

And that would then as well be, you know, noted as not just part of the summary of the report and as well any updates that needed to be made to the report itself.

And in cases where additional time would be needed I think hopefully those are more than exception than the rule the GAC could then communicate that through the liaison so that, you know, staff is at least aware that that will be

forthcoming or, you know, extend potentially that the public comment forum is needed.

So basically this is what is here as they did a proposed simplification of that process to have less (unintelligible) and a bit more predictability and be aware if something needs to be submitted and by whom.

I think then the question is and, you know, of course one question is, you know, does the group agree with this proposed simplification and generalization of the process.

And then the second question is now we had the minimum of, you know, three PDP's in which a curriculum recommend was applied and, you know, should there be an additional (unintelligible) PDP's that, you know, would be done under this modified or whatever modification is (unintelligible) proposing process or do you believe that, you know, possible modified process is all ready for incorporation into the PDP manual as, you know, one of the steps that is required as part of the PDP.

And again that may be something you may want to think a little bit about and (unintelligible). And I think the GNSO recommended a minimum of three PDP's. It didn't say, you know, after three PDP's there had to be a final answer.

So maybe something to think about for the consultation group as well also thinking, you know, potentially about the life span of the group and, you know, what timeframe you want to set for the group to finalize it and how that would tie in with, you know, potential extension of a review of this mechanism.

Manal Ismail: Thanks a lot Marika and this is very (excellent). Thanks for reminding us of the third PDP (unintelligible) at the stage that we can provide some commentary view as we can today or if we can also agree that - hello.

Marika Konings: Manal I think we lost you for a couple of seconds.

Manal Ismail: Yes I lost all of you too and I got reconnected again so I'm very sorry for this. So again the question to the group is whether we would like to provide our review after three PDP's or we would like to give it a little bit more time for one or more, two PDP's to decide.

And if we are going to supervise our review now whether this simplification summarizes (unintelligible) and whether this would be far from the (unintelligible) that is followed in any PDP report.

This has been - this was being implemented on a trial basis. So and I can see (Mark) has commented in the chat room. Basically I conclude that the (quick look) (unintelligible) working and on that (side) we are now familiar with the issue report.

We just think that the two issues are in the second (review). GAC (unintelligible). So if you can't really see more structure across the GNSO and the GAC.

And I fully agree to (Mark's) comments. So if we don't have any further comments for now I think we are in a position to maybe at least acknowledge the positive (unintelligible) on having the (quick look) mechanism.

And I agree with the (unintelligible) are being proposed to (unintelligible). But again we can leave this (section) open for a while on the mailing list to deal with more comments from others and can decide on that (unintelligible) comments in that (unintelligible).

So we have eight more minutes. So (Mark) you're indicating that is it too early to find and (define) improvements and we need more experience. So I mean this is (unintelligible) or - and we can have this (unintelligible) go ahead.

Mark Carvell: Yes thank you but well yes I have two which would take us up to the end of the year is that right? A rough place at times (unintelligible). That's more off the top of my head suggestion. Thanks.

Manal Ismail: Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I think the current sequence we've seen on PDP's is probably not the standard. So at least from my perspective I'm not envisioning any new requests for issue reports anytime soon.

And, you know, this of course doesn't mean that there aren't any because anyone can, you know, I mean a councilor on the board or an advisory committee can make such a request but at this state there's nothing and it's (unintelligible) on the schedule.

And of course there's also the question of bandwidth from a GNSO perspective of course, you know, with this potentially three PDP's that, you know, are heading into the working group phase and will require a substantial amount of community as well as staff resources.

So I think it won't even be a question if it, you know, it would be possible to run so many PDP's in parallel. So it may actually be a bit longer and then back again.

That is not to say that, you know, waiting for a couple more to gain that experience especially some of the suggestions and simplifications to the process are, you know, implemented and tested.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Marika. Well I think maybe we can move the discussion over (unintelligible) and maybe (unintelligible) now to chat and on the mailing list to figure more feedback and more input on the way forward on this particular document.

Having said that and given the time I don't think we will be able to go in the meeting of the new document. Our findings (unintelligible) but let me at least (unintelligible) the document provides and already more of the early engagement of the (unintelligible) committee.

That are we getting (unintelligible) as well as those that are being recommended by the GAC from (unintelligible) group. And the same it also shows the engagement for (unintelligible) part of the existing GNSO committee.

So again I think it is a very (unintelligible) statement that summarizes anything we have discussed, everything we are discussing right now and even things that we haven't discussed here.

And I see Marika's hand is up so Marika it's an excellent statement, thank you and go ahead please.

Marika Konings: Yes thank you Manal. This is Marika. Yes just to note that indeed, you know, it doesn't include all the engagement opportunities because there are already some that are, you know, we send out announcements and, you know, ask for input.

So some - we didn't capture everything here I think we did that in another table but this already focuses on those specific items that are the result of the recommendations of the (CG) as well as, you know, some of the ideas that have been suggested especially in relation to the working group phase.

And then we've also added for council deliberation as well as the board vote two potential ideas, suggestions that will need further consideration and review by the consultation group as well but maybe other suggestions of items that need to be (scored).

But we just wanted to make sure as well that, you know, as part of this table you have the whole framework of, you know, the different phases and the PDP and where, you know, already (evolved) here.

What questions of course and what stage (unintelligible) seek out our engagement. But again it's kind of following that process through from maybe the early phase of the PDP where I think already a lot of improvements have been made.

If you're looking at more final stage of the PDP and seeing are there any other mechanisms or engagement tools that should be explored. So a lot of our situations in which there may be divergence between, you know, GNSO recommendations and, you know, GAC advice.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Marika. And again are there (unintelligible) and I do recommend it when we go through the (unintelligible) and provide any comments (unintelligible).

Now given the time I think we have to quickly (unintelligible) on the way forward. I see we are in different stages in the (C) document. So do we need to have different deadlines for commenting on each document and (unintelligible) or suggestions?

I personally believe the review of the GNSO (leads) onto the GAC document. We have already accomplished a lot on this and we can have a sooner deadline than other two documents (assigned).

Open the floor to (unintelligible) anyone who would like. So (Mark).

Mark Carvell: Yes...

((Crosstalk))

Mark Carvell: ...the review of GNSO liaison to the GAC (unintelligible) document. This looks pretty much finished isn't it? I wonder perhaps a final round of the members of the consultation group and then it would be submitted to first the GNSO and the GAC is that the way forward but we do that pretty quickly well in advance of (Marrakesh)?

Is that thinking of colleagues or thinking...

Manal Ismail: Yes (Mark) (unintelligible) and I think we are in both stages of this document we can propose maybe a deadline by the end of this week or maybe Monday if you want to get one more day for commenting next week.

And I agree that the earliest (unintelligible) anything that we need to discuss (unintelligible) in (Marrakesh) the earlier we circulate it the better of course. So I think because the team (unintelligible) we can agree on this by early next week to give other (unintelligible) if they have any (finding) comments.

I think we can also circulate the few questions we have on the (quick look) mechanism and see back on this maybe the week later or so. And then the (third) document on the PDP (unintelligible) of the different recommendations maybe a week later.

Let's see offline how this should work backwards from the (Marrakesh) (unintelligible). So we can circulate something more specific (unintelligible). So Marika can you please remind me of our next meeting when we propose to (unintelligible)?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I don't think we confirmed that meeting yet but I think we said before that we would try to rotate on a three - a meeting every three weeks which would take us to the 16th of February at 1400 UCC assuming we would go back to our original meeting slot.

And that would of course align nicely with the dates we've set now for deadlines because that would, you know, give the leadership a week to basically look at the comments received and input provided and prepare for that meeting and, you know, even determine whether a meeting is needed or whether, you know, some of the issues can be dealt with through the mailing list.

Manal Ismail: Thanks Marika. So let's make plans to again (unintelligible) with (Jonathan), my co-chair for this (confrontation) group and again we will circulate it on the mailing list of course.

So any other comments before we close? (Mark) is this an old hand or a new one?

Mark Carvell: Sorry it's an old hand but I just added that many of the EU GAC representatives who will be in (unintelligible) from the 28th. So I'd be very happy to report on the view and the issues we've discussed today at that meeting to help get my colleagues, my European colleagues fully up to speed.

I mean there's an obvious problem we're all overwhelmed by IANA transition and finalizing the GAC responses chartering organization. So there's always a fear, you know, this important work is lost from view.

Anyway I can do my bit for the European colleagues at least. Thanks.

Manal Ismail: And this will (unintelligible) thanks (Mark) (unintelligible) and yes I do recognize that the load of other issues we have. I'm sorry for leaving things word by word but I was just getting (unintelligible) everyone was able to go through the documents.

So and this (unintelligible) on the agenda and so I apologize for this. I thank you for the truthful discussion and sorry to keep you 4 minutes after the hour.

And we will continue our discussion over the mailing list. Thanks everyone
the call is adjourned. (Unintelligible) important too, thank you.

END