ICANN
Transcription
GAC GNSO Consultation Group meeting
Tuesday 15 April 2014 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 15 April 2014 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. The audio is also available at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-gac-20140415-en.mp3
On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#apr
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/

Attendees:
Government Advisory Committee
Manal Ismail – co-chair - Egypt
Ana Neves - Portugal

GNSO Council
Jonathan Robinson – co-chair - Registries Stakeholder Group
Amr Elsadr – Non Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG)

Apology:
David Cake – GNSO vice chair
Suzanne Radel - USA

ICANN Staff:
Marika Konings
Olof Nordling
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Thank you. The recordings have been started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, (Laura). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the GAC GNSO Consultation on Early Engagement call on the 15th of April 2014.

On the call today we have Ana Neves, Jonathan Robinson and Manal Ismail. We have an apology from David Cake. And from staff we have Marika Konings, Olof Nordling 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 over to you, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Nathalie. In discussion with my co chair, Manal, before the call, I did understand from Manal that we had an apology from Suzanne Radell as well so if you could record Suzanne's apology please. Okay. Thanks, Nathalie.

Look, I think we've got to be pragmatic here. And, Manal, I'm sure you'll feel free to chip in. We've set out an agenda and it's clear that we've got a challenge here to get some new momentum after our meeting in Singapore.

The really good news about Singapore was it really felt there were a couple of things that went very well; one, the joint meeting seemed to go very well and the sort of informal gathering afterwards was also very, very useful in terms of building the bridges and creating opportunities for understanding.

And those are sort of clichés but my feeling was very, very clear that we had both the basis of the practical work we had been doing and the relationship building that we had been undertaking really was - had the power to pay dividends.

So while it's a little disheartening that there's so few of us on the call today I think we can talk through a couple of things and then try and communicate them out to the group.

So I guess the first question is, although these are recorded it would be good if we could capture - and maybe I'm going to ask for help here from Marika and Olof to just capture some key actions that come out of here and get them out to the group so that we make them feel that they have been part of the meeting that we can use the meeting to productive ends and sort of on a no objections basis.

So my thought here - and, Manal, by all means tell me if you have any concerns with this - my thought is to the extent that we can we should try and make decisions here and then communicate those out to the group and give, you know, a short period of time then for any objections.

But providing no objections are then received on email we can then go forward with those decisions. And it just gives us the opportunity to keep things moving a little because my concern otherwise is we sort of - we don't have a formal quorum but we could be - we could just find ourselves a little bit at an impasse here in terms of making progress.

So let me pause for a moment and see if Ana - well two things really, one if staff has got any comments or concerns with capturing those, and that's Marika and Olof to put names to you both. And, Manal, I see your hand is up so fire away with any thoughts you have.

Manal Ismail: Yes thank you, Jonathan. Actually it's a very good proposal and would make things more effective. And I would also note one of the (unintelligible) outputs of our meeting in Singapore is (unintelligible) after the charter of the working group which means implicitly that the GAC is fine with what we have (unintelligible) charter so we have (unintelligible). And I understand also - so is this part of the GNSO Council also?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes thank you, Manal. That's a good point and thank you for reminding us. The Council did indeed have the charter up for vote at its meeting on the

Wednesday of the Singapore meeting and indeed the support for the charter was passed unanimously with the full Council. So that was good.

I see the action item - the first one - has already been captured in the notes which is wonderful. This is a very good tool, this Adobe. Marika, I see your hand is up.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. That's actually the point I was making what it can try to do is indeed capture action items as we go through the agenda and just note them in the Adobe Connect so all of you can as well, you know, correct me or add items that I may have missed as we go through the meeting so hopefully that will indeed be helpful.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah so that's great. Thanks, Marika. So just a minor modification to your - and it's a proposal to capture action items slash decisions from the meeting and circulate these to the full group for input or feedback slash ratification really. Thank you, Marika, that's great.

All right, Olof. Olof, your hand is up but we don't hear you.

Olof Nordling: Oh sorry, I was on mute. Just to say that I won't compete with Marika on that one because, you know, Marika is like (unintelligible) when it comes to keyboard, it goes very quickly; much quicker than I can do.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Olof. I'm sure she will maybe pass something across to your desk in due course but I'll leave you guys to negotiate that. But thank you.

All right so looking then at the sort of formal agenda as it were the first thing we wanted to do was talk about the schedule between now and London. Now I did a quick count and when Manal and I were working on this agenda and from memory there's about - that gives us the opportunity to have about four meetings between now and London.

So I think we should capture that schedule and circulate that. So the first thing we'll do is communicate the schedule. And I was going to suggest to you that last time it worked very well to add - and although some had some reservations I think it did work well to squeeze in one additional meeting immediately prior to the London meeting.

And that - so we would have our last meeting, if we were doing it on the schedule on Tuesday the 10th of June. My suggestion is we add one additional meeting on Tuesday the 17th of June so that we have five meetings which leaves us both five meetings to work with and an opportunity to capture, you know, any last minute work on our presentation or something similar.

So it's really, yeah, exactly as you capture so well in the notes there, Marika, it's really preparing - that last meeting is preparation so four working meetings. Thanks, Manal, I see your tick up in the box. So let's work with that schedule and we'll try and work - thank you, Ana as well, noted.

And I see we're now joined by Amr so welcome, Amr. You'll see we're recording the actions in the right hand - in the notes column of the Adobe and we're trying to not (unintelligible) the fact we've got a relatively low attendance try and talk through some key points, yeah, so good. I acknowledge, Amr, that you can hear me and I realize you can't yet talk because you are dialed in but you'll track us via the Adobe audio and we'll note your attendance and work with you as we go.

So the next point then - and I think we could potentially swap these around and maybe that's worth thinking about is the next three points under Item 1 - and they're not necessarily have to be dealt with in that order is thinking about our objectives for London.

I wouldn't mind a reminder from a GNSO colleague as to whether my memory is correct here but I think there was a question at least asked in the

GNSO about additions or subtractions to the group. And then making sure we're tracking our funding application.

So let me just pause for a moment and just - can I be reminded if we did indeed have that conversation in Singapore or somewhere where we were asked at least what the opportunity for (unintelligible). And I think from memory our GNSO answer to (unintelligible) that not in our (unintelligible) of the work group because we've just - A, we've got an effective balance in our members and we (unintelligible) and, you know, building (unintelligible). And whilst that shouldn't be exclusive (unintelligible) got to.

Thanks, Amr. I don't know if (unintelligible) or Marika if you have a memory of that but certainly that is how I remember it. But nevertheless we have - thanks, Marika, I see your hand is up. Fire away.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I think as I recall I think it partly was inspired by the fact that the charter was on the agenda and normally a next step following a charter adoption is that there's a call for volunteers. So I think there was some confusion within the Council whether indeed new volunteers would be take on at this stage.

But I think indeed as you clarified that, you know, we have a relatively set number of members. It may not be appropriate or feasible to add new members. But again it may be up for discussion especially since I think one of our representatives has resigned from this group where there's a need indeed to fill that position or, you know, whether to continue as-is with the membership.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah. Thanks, Marika. That sets it in context very nicely and that reminds me. So really (unintelligible) for the group - two questions really. (Unintelligible) we - I hope it's been - it's clear to everyone that Mikey has said he (unintelligible) or has already stepped down from (unintelligible) activities. So to that extent we have a vacancy, if you like.

(Unintelligible) the amount of work we have to do my proposal would be we fill that - we refill that vacancy (unintelligible) but that's my proposal. Proposal 2 is that we discuss whether we (unintelligible) or helpful to have other additions to the group. So maybe we should separate that into two distinct proposals. (Unintelligible) proposal the discussion point should we replace Mikey?

Okay I'm hearing that my audio isn't that great either which is not good. (Unintelligible) land line, I'm coming in on a Skype line (unintelligible). Yeah, thanks Nathalie. I (unintelligible) dial out or in. Let me go and let me (unintelligible) for landline and I'll do that. In the mean time maybe (unintelligible) contribution on that.

But give me one minute and I'll locate a phone but if anyone would like to make (unintelligible) replacing Mikey whether we think it's appropriate to add or (unintelligible) from the group.

Manal Ismail: (Unintelligible).

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Manal. I certainly think it would be a good idea to replace Mikey. He was doing quite a bit of work and I don't expect his replacement to come in and fill his shoes straight away. Not all, actually, I think we all need to try to pick up bits and pieces of what Mikey's been doing with this group. But I do think in terms of answering that question I think it would be a good idea to go out and get a replacement for him.

And we can do this on the GNSO Council side. There was at least one other member who was interested in joining this group who raised the question that Jonathan had raised a few minutes ago.

In terms of adding more members to this group I think that this is something that we as a group need to decide. We need to discuss the pros and cons of

this -- I guess. Whether we feel we need to add more members. I suppose this depends on the work we plan to accomplish between now and London and beyond.

And whether we think it's a good idea to add more members or not. I can't necessarily think of any down sides to adding more at least not from the - not from the Council side. And I - but I recall this item did come up and the question came up at the GNSO Council meeting in Singapore. I did recommend that we do definitely have to go back to the full - consult with the group with our GAC colleagues and discuss this at more length and see what it is that we're going to do.

Typically in the GNSO working group like Marika said, a call for volunteers would be made after a charter is approved. In this case it's not the same thing, we're not operating under GNSO operating procedures. And I think honestly we didn't consider membership in this consultative group as part of the charter when we were writing it up. So kind of took us by surprise when it came up in Singapore.

But (unintelligible). Jonathan, I've been trying to just consume as much time as possible...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...there's a couple of thoughts I'd say in response. And thank you for coming in on that. I mean, to me I think we, as I say I'm going to put on the table a proposal for this group that we do replace Mikey. Second, we need an additional team lead to work with Suzanne on that particular work stream.

Now there, unless it's - I would think the idea would be that person came from within the existing group because they are up to speed. And one of the issues that this group's got is that we need to keep the momentum going.

So I guess my second proposal to you is that that we fill the team lead spot with someone - an existing member of the group rather than - and so that's my second proposal. My third - thank you, Manal, I saw a bit of support from you and also from Amr to a portion of that so that's the second proposal.

And then the third is that I - my (unintelligible) I understand the dynamic of the openness but my thought here is that when we came into this group it was slightly unconventional. It originally looked like it was going to be, you know, GAC maybe chair and a co chair. Certainly from the GNSO Council side we had the chair, both vice chairs and then we added some other members to make sure we were balanced.

So my temptation is I don't want to be exclusive but - well maybe it's something to discuss further. But my worry is, is we - once we open up we risk, one, upsetting the balance; and, two, breaking with the momentum. But I'm very happy to have this discussion - with more participants in it. My suggestion is provisionally we don't open it up but subject to further discussion on it.

So (unintelligible).

Amr Elsadr: Hi, Jonathan, this is Amr. On your second point of replacing Mikey as the - as a - to work on the process a bit with Suzanne I would like to volunteer for that but I would also like to - I do some work on the SCI which is very process-oriented and I'm also on the Policy Implementation Working Group. I've generally been paying a lot of attention to the process bit of GNSO work. And I think I've given Marika a bit of a hard time on that so she can vouch for me I think.

But I would be interested in working with Suzanne on this. I would have to warn folks though that between now and May 15, which is another month, I will be a little busy; I might not be able to contribute as much just within this

one-month period. But beyond that I'd be more than happy to work with Suzanne on it. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Amr. And that's been noted in the - Marika's note-taking, yeah. So over to you, Manal.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Jonathan and thank you, Amr, for volunteering. Actually I think from the GAC side also we need to look into our membership because - and I owe you a reply on this. I think we didn't have the participation from Costa Rica and I didn't even see our colleagues at the last meeting. So I'm not really sure whether (he) will continue to participate as the GAC member or not. So maybe I have to clear this directly with him.

We also have an apology from (Mark) which will continue for maybe some time due to unforeseen circumstances. So I think also from our side we have to look into our membership.

As you mentioned, Jonathan, I won't really call for volunteers or ask for members. But if you already have someone who's interested that's probably - be dedicated and contribute. I would say we shouldn't turn the request, so...

And maybe I - hearing this I would reiterate the group membership just by way of updating the GAC and see whether there is someone interested to join. But I won't ask for (unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Manal.

Manal Ismail: Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: If I understood you correctly then I think the suggestion there is to, A, check whether Costa Rica is, you know, Carlos is still interested in participating. I've had some contact with Mark but I'm - I believe his intention is to return. But one option there is that there's a temporary alternate;

someone, you know, who's willing to work in the short term in his place. The slight danger with that is of course make sure it's someone who's committed and up to speed.

The audio is not great so I hope I captured that correctly, Manal. By all means just come back in on audio or on chat. Go ahead, I see your hand is up.

Manal Ismail: Yes, I'm sorry. Yes, you're right. And also I think (unintelligible) we have two alternating members so we've been hearing only from one member. So, I mean, we have many members in terms of numbers but we cannot really assign the work group properly. That's (unintelligible) participating so - and this is what I'm to hear from my side with members apart from Mark.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great, Manal. Well I think that's...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Sorry, go ahead.

Manal Ismail: I will seek clarification from Spain whether they are to be considered both members just (unintelligible) and also from Costa Rica. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Manal. That's great. I think (unintelligible) captured in Marika's note it (unintelligible) potentially reconfirm the GAC membership and you can always come back to us on that. Yeah so that's good there. (Unintelligible) we can achieve between now and - well there's a funny (unintelligible) Marika (unintelligible).

So my question is do we have confirmation or do (unintelligible) situation will be resolved in terms of this proposed liaison. So I don't know if there's an answer to that question.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Jonathan, it sounds that you're correctly - and your line was breaking up a bit. I think you were asking for the standard of the funding application. So we submitted all the papers on time. I think now there has been an internal review process. I think we already checked the applications. You know, first is the objective and strategic priorities for the year.

And as I understand it according to the timeline that was provided by the Finance Department, the ICANN Board is expected to make a decision on all the applications received at its meeting at the end of April which I think is on the 30th of April. So presumably shortly after that we would receive a confirmation on whether the request was granted or not.

Jonathan Robinson: So, Marika, it's Jonathan back on again. I'm just going to have to work with this Skype line it seems for the moment that's - do our best. Please let me know in the chat if the audio does break up badly or if there's a problem.

But if you could just confirm that date then.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. (Unintelligible) in the notes 30th of April is the Board meeting and then I guess it just depends on how quickly decisions are scheduled. But I'll also make sure to follow up on that internally.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great. So from our point of view, from the group's point of view I think we'll know then, you know, we can schedule that in our minds for the, you know, for discussion. We're going to continue to work on that anyway as part of our work and be aware that a decision maybe is possible as soon as our first meeting in May then.

Next thing then is objectives between now and London. Now I don't know how much we can cover of this now and if anyone's got any suggestions but really having got the schedule out, I mean, certainly for me at a sort of philosophical rather than a practical level it strikes me that we really - I was

thinking we should try and ideally think about what we want to achieve to present at London.

Given that we presented the two work streams, the charter, the structure of the group all of those, you know, we really laid the foundations in Singapore and the question then is well what might we like to target ourselves as deliverables for London.

And it may be that we can't answer that now and we can just take some suggestions. But, Marika, at least if we could record that there's a - we need to try and capture or define some deliverables for London so we know we're working towards some particular target. I think that would be helpful and I think that's - Manal was where you might have been coming from. But I see your hand is up so let's hear from you.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Jonathan. Actually I think we did very good progress. And the documents are in a pretty good shape all standing for assessing the different alternatives, the pros and cons of each whether the work complementing each other whether they are mutually exclusive, whether we can have more than alternative.

So I would say we'll probably be focusing on the different alternatives. I mean, on an optimum scenario we can have this exercise done by the London meeting and we can then present an overall vision of how things should work. But again I won't the discussions. I'm not very sure how time consuming this may be. We might not be able to decide until we get into those discussions and see how things could (unintelligible). Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Apologies, I was on mute. Manal, I do think that we are on good progress. It's Jonathan speaking. Amr, please fire away.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Jonathan. This is Amr. Yeah, I agree with Manal that I think we are in pretty good shape. Right now we've already done quite a lot thanks to the two teams working on the different - the two streams.

I would suggest that - (unintelligible) I did have a question. I know that in the GNSO Council we approved the charter for this consultative group. I was wondering whether this is required or has it been done on the GAC side just to sort of get that out of the way that would be helpful to know.

On - regarding with how to move forward between now and London - Manal has said yes it has - thanks, Manal. Regarding what to do between now and London I think it might be a pretty good idea to just really, as Manal I guess said to just finalize the two work streams and see where they sort of have common aspects and try to hash out some of the details on how we would like to get these things done.

I was also wondering if the - if this group might want to maybe by London when all this was done and it's well documented and available perhaps on our weekly to sort of present these in detail in London and ask the community whether there is any sort of comment or feedback on that. And perhaps ask for a public comment period on these two work streams and just sort of get as much input as we can on the detail because when we did present them in Singapore it wasn't in so much detail.

So perhaps we could also provide a window of opportunity for the community give feedback on that following the London meeting and based on that have a final version that we can start working and identifying action items to start taking on the two streams. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay interesting idea, Amr. And one way of handling that - one practical suggestion there might be to present where we've got to in London and following London have a 30-day period in which we could take further additional input.

Let's think about that a little more though because one of the issues we've got - is this balance between the value of a meeting being - assisting us in taking decisions, in other words we could present to the GAC and/or the GNSO in London and potentially get them, as we did previously on the charter, to support us at the next level.

So my suggestion is we - we keep that as a proposal, as a potential way of working but let's see how our progress goes because for example, we may be in a position to present proposals ahead of London. I mean, this is possibly ambitious. But just let's - my suggestion is let's do the work for another couple of meetings and then see about process either closer to or immediately before the London meeting, you know, in terms of public comment or how we cement the outcomes or get further input into the outcomes. Ana, your hand is up.

Ana Neves: Yes, thank you. Well I was thinking about this ideas from Amr. Is it that we are going to discuss or to kind of vote the lines that we should start work on from London on work? I mean, so we are not working together for the time being. So your proposal is to present some action, some lines where we could work together. And then to vote and then to start the work together? Or, well, at least it is how I see the scene is to start to work together for moment.

Jonathan Robinson: That's a very good question, Ana. At first I wasn't sure that we - were talking cross purposes but I think your point being there that this is a really interesting question. It's what can we expect coming out of London? Now we at one point put a time table together that saw us - the work of this group - and we need to be very, very clear on this because we saw the work of this group continuing through Singapore, through London and essentially finalizing our work by LA.

Now what I think I'm hearing you say is, well, when you talk about "we" you're talking about the work - the effective working of the GAC and the GNSO together. Will that commence from London?

Now this is really interesting because in some ways the work of this group is the GAC and the GNSO working together. Quite whether the changes proposed by this group get implemented as soon as London I think that's ambitious. But I hope I've understood your question properly and interpreted it. Yeah, so I think I did get you properly there, Ana.

So, yeah, it's not, at this point personally - and I'd welcome - I see, Manal, your hand is up and I'll come to you. But it's not clear to me yet how far down the track we'll be with the work of this group. My understanding of what Amr was saying was we'll be looking for further endorsement and/or comment of the work of this consultative group in London not finalizing it and cementing it at that point.

Let me not dominate and hand over to Manal for any comment or point you want to make, Manal, and then others please come in.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Jonathan and thank you, Ana. Yes, I think by London we can maybe have the (unintelligible) interim thing that would be (unintelligible) basically the (unintelligible) the GNSO liaison to the GAC.

Other than that I believe we will be (unintelligible) as you rightly mentioned, Jonathan, blessing from both the GAC and the GNSO to what I hope will be an overall vision of how this should work. I mean, (unintelligible) chart showing the PDP and how things would go and having answered all the issues that we have already raised, the timing of seeking GAC input, how the GAC input will be handled, what if the GNSO and the GAC didn't agree on this.

I mean, we have a full scenario for the PDP thing as well some suggestions for enhancement in our day to day work. Having said that also I think we have to get in touch with Heather also (unintelligible) intended to have a quick chat with her in Singapore which didn't happen.

Just also to get her insights regarding the day to day work and maybe both secretariats also would be a great asset to hear from they have issues in day to day operation or suggestions for enhancements.

So basically I think by London I hope that we would have both a full scenario for the PDP thing - the early engagement of the GAC in GNSO PDP as well as a few suggestions on the day to day operation between the GAC and the GNSO and hopefully have the blessing of both the GAC and the GNSO.

And then we can get started in implementing some and seeking public comment. But probably this is going to be after London. Thank you, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Sorry, yes. I'm using a soft mute and I'm used to using a hard mute so I was on mute there. Thank you, Manal. Let - I see Marika's hand is up so let me let Marika make a comment and then I will try and see if I can capture effectively where I think we're at and summarize what I'm hearing on these various issues so Marika over to you.

Marika Konings: Yeah, thanks Jonathan. So this is Marika. Just maybe a suggestion whether it would be helpful if Olof and I maybe work on a little timeline that maps out the meetings between now and London and possibly also identify, you know, topics for each of those meetings as that may, you know, make it easier as well for the group to decide what is indeed feasible to achieve by London and what would need to be prepared in order indeed to meet those objectives.

So I don't know if that's helpful but I definitely can, you know, work with Olof on something that we can then share, you know, maybe first with the chairs and then with the fuller group for your review and feedback.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, thanks Marika. That's a very practical suggestion and it's helpful. Certainly my sense is that would be very useful. So in a sense we end up with a working time table of activities and we'll be able to see, as you say, practically what we can achieve.

There's something else which I think we do - there are a couple of other points which I think we do need to do. I'm not sure that this meeting of the whole group is the only thing we need to do. I know that, for example, Mikey and Suzanne had a very productive time when they met just the two of them in shaping up some of the work.

And it may be that we want to get together as the leads of the different work streams periodically and so that's something I might suggest that we can make some good progress there. Or I'm open to any other techniques or suggestions that anyone's got but that certainly is something we need to break off into the work streams and try and build some of the content in there, some of the answers to the questions or prospective answers to the questions.

Manal, yes I heard you on meeting with Heather and I think that's a very good idea so perhaps that's something you could set up. And maybe it's just the two of us meeting with Heather in the first instance, making sure she's properly briefed and brought into where we're going and any questions or issues she had. So certainly very receptive to that.

And then the other point which Ana has been making, which is a very good one and I know, Amr, you supported this in some ways as well so that's Ana supported by Amr, is that we've got a challenge here. And I think in building out the time table that Marika suggested we can do that. But it's really about

how to properly work through the work, make sure we get the endorsement, support of our groups and give them the time to consider what we're doing and experiment with practical solutions in the meantime.

So I think - let me just make sure I'm checking your comment. Yeah, I think, Amr, I think we're reading your comment that we sort of move forward, try and build some work in the two work streams, which are effectively suggested now I think all - or hopefully reflected. Take some time to do that and then that time table - and we'll weave that into the time table of meetings and activities and targets that we're going to work.

I hope these things will coincide where we manage to both make good progress to the satisfaction of the group and continue to consult iteratively and bring the respective GNSO and GAC groups along with us in - on this journey.

Good. That sounds like some very practical outcomes. Let me just turn my attention to the agenda again and be subject to being reminded by you on the call if we've - we need - it feels to me like we've worked through - although we haven't gone in detail into the specific work streams. I'm not sure we can or would want to at this stage. I think we've dealt with them at a higher level.

So I'm feeling like we might have covered enough ground here for this meeting but let me pause and see if anyone would like to put up their hand or suggest something in the chat for either any other business or items under Items 2 and 3 that I might have missed off at this point.

Amr, your hand is up; please go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Jonathan. This is Amr. I just wanted to give some - an idea of how I read the contents of the documents describing the two streams. It seemed to me that the day to day stream was more of an in depth exploration on how to

manage the overall process just sort of getting into the nitty-gritty stuff of what is required from both sides in dealing with the process overall.

And so I see them both as very interlinked and perhaps one stream can be used to fulfill the goals of the other stream which is the overarching goals of this group I suppose.

And I think moving forward at this point as we finalize both documents we might really want to see and identify how each item in the day to day stream affects the overall process and what we were trying to achieve would not. And I just wanted to point that out and say it might be a worthwhile thing to take a look at as well. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Amr, if I can come back to you then - it's Jonathan - with a question. Are you - in saying which you expressed I think pretty clearly but is your concern that we might end up working in a sort of slightly siloed effect when these two are very interrelated? Is that your concern?

Amr Elsadr: It's not so much a concern as trying to think of - about the most effective way to approach solving the puzzle of where we want GAC to be engaged as early as possible in the PDP at the GNSO. So it's not so much as a concern as what is perhaps the most effective way to have the approach.

And so in looking at the overall process it might be helpful in that respect by seeing what is the progress being made and addressing each item in the process we're really trying to work out - work those out using the items we're identifying in the day to day - the day to day stuff.

And we might - when you discussed pilot projects a little earlier perhaps we can start identifying these pilots on each one of the day to day streams and see where they fit into the overall process and see if there are any - if there's anything that we're missing, anything that we need to do better. So it's just a suggestion but I don't really think I'm concerned. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Amr. I see your hand is up, Marika, next.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just wanted to point out - and I put the day to day operation document on the screen or at least the latest version thereof because I think one of the things that we still need to work through as well I think first of all the need is making sure that we have the objectives from both sides, from the GAC and the GNSO right. You know, are these the things that we're trying to achieve, you know, by mapping out what could or should be done with regards to day to day operation between the two organizations.

And then basically underneath that there are a number of options that I think have been thrown out as part of the conversation that maybe further explore - and I think as we've mentioned before, you know, either one, two or maybe all of these could be potential part of that process for day to day cooperation.

And I think as some have already suggested as well maybe some of these would need to be tried out on a, you know, a experimental basis to see what works and doesn't work.

But I think the idea would be as well to work through each of these to really see if are those ideas feasible and indeed if we implement it would those address the objectives that we've set out at the start of the process.

So I think that's probably one of the next work items as well to look into and hopefully from there indeed will be - we can derive indeed which ones we should move forward on whether it's on a, you know, permanent or experimental basis first, how the evaluation would take place and how that in the end would as well fit into the overall picture also in combination with some of the enhancements or changes that may need to be made in relation to, you know, the PDP cooperation and early engagement in that aspect of policy-related work.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so thank you, Amr, I note your comment in the chat that you feel Marika has expressed through her, you know, some of the points that you were making in another way which is great.

So one thing I want to double check with colleagues on the phone now - on the meeting now is so if we take this approach that we've talked about I recall that we talked previously about doing this in a way where we dealt with these during the course of these two weekly meetings.

That we didn't - that everyone needed to be informed and engaged with the work, is that - am I correct in remembering that so that when we next meet we will start to step through these items and start to talk about them. Is that how others would see the work of this group going or do we break off and try and make some progress?

I mean, I think they're not exclusive but I do want to check that that's the expectation of what, you know, for Manal and I in planning the next meeting and obviously Marika and Olof in trying to schedule what we might achieve is that a correct memory and a common expectation that we will come to and star to work through these as a group?

Just trying to understand what the shape of our next meeting might be like or are we expecting that the two different work streams with the team leads will go off and make some progress and then report - I guess that's the way we probably do it is that the groups - the team leads try and work with bringing some progress to the group for further discussion. It's very - the mechanics of making progress that I'm grappling with a little.

Manal.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Jonathan. Actually I'm flexible to how the rule does work. But I think we should be utilizing the mailing list more efficiently meaning that I would like to see more substantial discussions on the mailing list and then

have (unintelligible) after because we will not be able to go through substantial discussions on the call.

It would be more efficient that we do this over the email and then conclude on the call. Having said that and as Amr mentioned, (unintelligible) quite interrelated. And I think the work leads have already shaped the skeleton that we will be following in our work.

So I think the work leads now could drive the discussion and (unintelligible) the views over the mailing list and then come to shape things further (unintelligible) at some action items. But I would really like the substantial work done on the (unintelligible). But again as I said at the (unintelligible) I'm flexible, the more efficient way to do this I (unintelligible) happy.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks, Manal. And I see the comments in the chat as well. I mean, I think it seems to me that we can make progress in a number of ways and we pretty much got to that. We're going to set out a work plan which will be very helpful. It will set our - and that will need to be discussed and agreed to make sure we're on the same collective page as far as that plan - time table. And Marika and Olof have kindly agreed to do that.

It's clear that we won't be able to achieve all we need to by simply having four one-hour calls between now and London so somehow we have to make interim progress and that's going to be, I expect, via a combination of email - discussion on the email list.

And also it maybe that we need to set up meetings, you know, one to one or smaller meetings that deal with some of the substance and attempt to flesh out some proposals for the group, you know, some ideas that try to answer these things.

So I feel fairly confident that once we shape up the work list we should be able to start to make the sort of structure of how we work and the objectives we should be able to do - make that sort of progress.

So, yeah, I think that's a reasonable plan. I see quite a number of items that we've managed to pull together as a set of points coming out of this call. And I think that's - providing we can make sure we are - we engage the rest of our group properly and I know we have a variety of issues with that that we talked about through temporary or longer-term challenges we should be able to - you know, we should share this - the outcomes of this discussion with them.

But it feels to me like there's - I've got reasonable confidence that we have a plan here. So we are coming towards the top of the hour. And we've got the set of bullet pointed action items that we will - and/or outcomes that we can share with the group. Are there any other comments or missed points or anything else that anyone would like to raise or do we feel satisfied that we've covered enough for now?

Thanks, Manal, I see you're happy at this point. I think that's a good - we've restarted the momentum pos Singapore which was our objective. We've got a set of things to work with so I'm pretty pleased with that. That's not a bad outcome for today.

So, you know, with that it's probably enough to bring things to a halt. Just give one moment to hear from Amr and then, yeah, agreed, Amr. And that's what - that's - Amr makes the point that we need to get the feedback from the group via email which is exactly what we agreed to do at the outset noting the limited attendance and I agree. And that's why Marika has captured those action items.

So those action items will be circulated to the group as agreed by this group on the meeting today subject to no objections I would suggest for the next

seven days. So we put this out to the mailing list; say this is what we agreed at today's meeting but acknowledging that there was limited attendance.

And in fact it's not a bad practice anyway to allow for any objections, concerns or modifications over the next week on email. So that would be my suggested way forward that we put this out to the group and we work to these actions and to these agreed points but of course subject to comment or input over the next week.

Good. Well thank you very much, everyone. That's been a productive session. And I think we can call it to a close for today and we'll look forward to those notes being circulated, Marika and it seemed to be very diligently prepared. And we'll hope to get further input or comment or support on those on the mailing list.

So, Nathalie, I think that brings the meeting to a close and we can conclude the recording.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. (Laura), could you please stop the recording? Thank you ever so much.

END