ICANN Transcription GAC GNSO Consultation Group meeting Monday 23 November 2015 at 20:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GAC GNSO Consultation Working Group call on the Monday 23 November 2015 at 20:00 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
Suzanne Radell, US
Jorge Cancio, Switzerland

GNSO Council
 Amr Elsadr, Councilor
Paul McGrady, Councilor
Phil Corwin, Councilor
Carlos Gutierrez, Councilor

GNSO co-Chair
Jonathan Robinson

Apology:
Ana Neves, Portugal
Mason Cole, GNSO Council to the GAC
Olga Cavalli, Argentina

ICANN Staff:
Marika Konings
Olof Nordling
Nathalie Peregrine

Jonathan Robinson: So hi everyone. Welcome back to the GAC GNSO Consultation group.

And Manal and I will co-chair this meeting this evening.

So we are the co-chairs of the group. And we met earlier to discuss and prepare some of the detail around the agenda.

Particularly we obviously would like to welcome new joiners to the group which tonight we have or today we have Paul McGrady and Phil Corwin, so welcome both of you from the GNSO.

I believe everyone else is on the call has been with us previously.

We thought we would finish it in the call by just making sure we very briefly recapped where we - where this group's origins are.

And that is based in a long standing desire to make more effective the interrelationship and interworking between the GNSO and the GAC.

And in particular to make sure that GAC input which may become advice to the ICANN Board as part of a formal process was received as early as possible in the process.

And this not only made sense to those of us who were involved with setting up this group in the first place but is actually in effect or is a response to formal recommendations of both I believe the previous ATRT Accountability Transparency Review Team pieces of work.

So we decided to let the group form in many ways with its own working methods. We wanted to keep it in some senses I think informal is the wrong word but define its own modus operandi rather than be caught within the title of something like a working group.

So whilst we might operate in many ways similarly to working groups in either the GAC or the GNSO we specifically call the group a consultation group.

And we decided to form it out of equal numbers of parties approximately at least if not absolutely religious about it but balanced participation from the GAC and the GNSO.

And certainly initially from the GNSO side we put myself in as GNSO Council Chair, plus the two vice chairs plus three (unintelligible).

At inception stage there was no GNSO liaison to the GAC and an equivalent number of participants from the GAC.

And subsequently we developed through the work of this group the trial which is now into its second year of the GNSO liaison. So the GAC had agreed that, that GNSO liaison should be and should at least remain part of this group.

I think those are the key points that set out what the sort of origins of this group. We're going to talk a little bit more about the substance of the work of the group today.

But let me pause and make sure that if I've left out anything material from a general perspective more specifically from a GAC perspective Manal can come in on that just to make sure the nothings been left out.

Come in Manal if I've left anything out or you'd like...

Manal Ismail: Oh thank you Jonathan. No nothing to add to this. I think you covered everything quite very well. Thank you.

So would you like me to see...

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. I think we've covered the key point. I suppose what we were going to do we've covered the membership. We wanted to talk about the membership within the constitution of the group which you saw up in front of you in the beginning in any event.

And I guess the one point was whether there would be any further changes to that. And so we remain open to that.

That's what I would do this level setting. And I think you were going to talk. So let me head over to you to talk about, you know, operating mechanics Manal go ahead.

Manal Ismail: Thanks Jonathan and welcome to everyone. So our consultation used to have conference calls every other week but to accommodate the workload of community discussions on IANA transition and ICANN accountabilities this is we changed our calls the frequency of our calls to every three weeks.

I think with the continued foreseen (unintelligible) on the short term at least we suggest to continue with the same frequency every three weeks.

And so this leaves us between now and the ICANN meeting in them or Marrakesh with something like four (unintelligible).

I have quickly checked the calendar and I think if we are to keep our calls on Tuesdays as we used to have then we can have calls on Tuesday, 15 December, then fifth of January, then 26th of January and then 16 February.

And we can still have an additional call if need arise between 16 February and the ICANN meeting in Marrakesh which is the week of five to ten March.

So we think it might be more effective if we prepare a work plan that would include those four calls in Marrakesh and try to allocate some proposed deadlines and deliverable in preparation for the meeting.

Also in order to have more fruitful calls we need to have more interactive discussions and brainstorming on the mailing list and leave the calls to (unintelligible) and/or converged use.

And we also need to ensure maximum possible participation through the phones. So we will be circulating the schedule of the calls.

We hope that you book your calendars. And we would appreciate if you can flag your own availability early enough before any calls so that we can consider rescheduling if necessary and possible.

So I think with this we may just need to confirm that we're keeping the Tuesdays and confirm the slot as well. And then we can circulate the calendar and a work plan later on the mailing list.

So Jonathan over to you just to make sure also I covered everything. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Manal. Yes I think it's good to get - so provisionally I thank you very much for actually doing the homework on those dates because that's useful.

And so I think what we'd like to do is circulate those out and make sure we get invites in people's diaries because a significant problem with more of those we can consider moving them but provisionally they are I believe it was 1400 UTC we were working at on those particular dates.

Any questions or comments from anyone on the call at this stage in and around the genesis of the group, the description of the work so far and the logistics of points?

Okay. So let's work I do see Amr saying it would be ideal if the calls were a little earlier. There's a balance I mean we've got a largely at the present time sort of Europe, Middle East Africa stroke US type access around which we work.

So it may be that that's an optimum time. But let's if there are strong feelings about the time let's see if we can shift otherwise that may be where we end up working.

We could do a doodle on a couple of options or some kind of check on a couple of options. But yes thanks and Marika does confirm that we were working with the 1400 slot.

Okay. Well mindful of time in this particular here that we've got now thanks Amr for your willingness to accommodate despite the preference.

So let's see where we get to with that get but let's get that out provisional schedule provisional time and see any other feelings from those who are not on the call at this point.

And then really I guess we then move on to (unintelligible) to start look at the item of substance for the group in three different categories.

I'll deal with the first one and then Manal will deal with the second two. So the first one is a piece of work we are required to do which is really to lay the groundwork for reviewing the work of the GNSO liaison to the GAC.

I described this sort of the origins of that - is coming out of this group. We are - the appointment has been running from midyear mid-calendar year.

And so we are into the second year. And have the opportunity we believe that Manal and I have talked about this as we have the opportunity to review this in advance ideally of the next face to face meeting the ICANN meeting in Marrakesh.

That will allow us to put forward a proposal to effectively the chartering organization the GAC and the GNSO of this group and recommend a way forward.

The detailed description of the role is on the document in front of you on the screen. And you can resize and page through that at your leisure.

This should have been out I believe this has been circulated to the group. But what you have in front of you the initial doc around describing the initial document describing the background and detail of the role and some responses from the current liaison Mason Cole.

And Mason's put his comments in red and then additional comments from Manal or questions that Mason's been subsequently either responded to. So we've got a working document.

I think what we might seek to do is put it some kind of table of review but really this is an opportunity for us to review and discuss the effectiveness of the role what may or may not change about it.

What we might need to do preemptively is apply for community funding in advance of whether or not we determine with the GAC and the GNSO whether we would like to seek to have this as a more established or permanent fixture in the ICANN policy structure because the budgeting process might preempt us by requirement deadline in advance of the Marrakesh meeting.

So I think those are the main remarks I or we wanted to make around that. Are there any comments, or questions or points about how we might review the role or how - or any thoughts on that timing and that - so it's our intention to build this into some sort of structured review.

I am not 100% sure from recollection what the GAC is expecting. I know the GNSO has in effect delegated this back to us as a consultation group to formulate a review and a recommendation.

So it's my expectation and our expectation that we need to do the work to evaluate this. We are best qualified as the sort of initiators of the role and having the direct experience of it to go through it and to make the recommendation.

So my anticipation is we will be, you know, we'll go through this systematically and out of that will come an evaluation that says we either propose to continue with this as a trial a third year of trial which seems to stretch it a little bit, or that we propose to institute it as a more permanent feature or we propose to abandon the role.

I guess really what we need to do like I say is systematically go through these questions and formulate it into a set of black specks which describe what's going on, our red test which our red test which then describes the actual (unintelligible) and then a recommendation.

So what I hope will come out of this process is that we well be recommending some course of action with regard to holding on to the role or not and that we'll have sort of a coherent recommendation to both the GAC and the GNSO.

Feel free to come in with any input. But if there isn't any at this stage and you want to contribute on list we can do that. But seeing that I see Carlos would like to make a point. So go ahead.

Carlos Gutiérrez: Thank you very much Jonathan. This is Carlos Gutiérrez for the record. I just want in terms of the timing and the permanency or not I want to recall that we are also trying the early engagement into the PDP for a certain period of time.

So ideally we should think - try to synchronize the time holds because as far as I remember we said we're going to work some early engagement in PDPs at least for a number of PDPs if I'm not wrong.

And we should also think about from the point of view of the GNSO we are looking know consistently at the communiqué.

And there is a question of course if we are going to do that permanently or not. So we have three venues of cooperation open right now the liaison, the early engagement PDP and our review of the communiqué.

And I think all three efforts should be run under the same time perspective or apply the same questions you would just ask about permanently or not. Thank you very much Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Carlos, thank you. So in essence - that's a good point. We were going to come to - we were going to look at these discreetly.

But if I understand in other words look at that quick look and the remaining potential PDP steps and another work we might do again as background to those Paul and Philip have joined us.

It was known as the quick look which creates a mechanic way the GAC can give in effect a form of initial indication as to the level of interest and/or any concerns.

So yes I get - I think I'm - so maybe I will consider handing over to Manal since she's going to look at that but I guess it's an integrated point.

So let me come to Amr next after you Carlos and then Manal has got her hand up anyway. So I'll probably hand over to her at that stage. Go ahead Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Jonathan, this is Amr. And yes I think I was just going to say something pretty much in line with what Carlos just said.

The pilot program for the quick look mechanism is for at a minimum three PDPs. And so far it's been used on two.

There is a potential third in the works right now on the rights protection mechanisms review. So that may serve as a third one but - well I think so far the role of the GAC - the GNSO liaison to the GAC has been rather successful.

If not only in terms of fulfilling the function but also in terms of helping this group develop its recommendations. And that may be true for the future.

However if we do not want to recommend that we institutionalize this role and make it a permanent one as opposed to a pilot sort of a program we could sort of do this together with the quick look mechanism.

So if the quick look mechanism ceases to be a pilot program it becomes a permanent one then perhaps the role of the GNSO liaison to the GAC can become permanent along with it.

It - I would not object to doing this earlier but if we don't do it earlier then a reasonable approach might be to institutionalize them both together. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: So I guess, you know, on the issue there with that point made by Carlos and Amr we'll be if we have indeed completed sufficient the minimum number of quick looks on PDPs prior to Marrakesh if we're going to make those recommendations, if we're going - the challenge with reviewing the two simultaneously or in parallel is that we haven't done enough quick looks yet although as you rightly point out Amr there may be a third one coming up soon. So that's just the only logistical point.

Manal Ismail: Thanks to Jonathan and thanks for the feedback from everyone. I thought we have agreed to review the whole thing after five PDP but again I stand to be corrected.

I (unintelligible) that this was brought up during our joint meeting in Dublin. And the GNSO liaison to the role of the GNSO liaison to the GAC was very positive and welcomed by everyone in the GAC. And we already extended this I believe for the coming year.

I think in order to again consult with the GAC on having this as a permanent thing I think we have to pose this question early enough before the Marrakesh meeting and then expect a reply by then.

Again I don't recommend that we go with this question during the meeting because then we won't get an immediate response.

So it's good that we're having this discussion now. I think we can fine tune the feedback from Mason and from everyone else as well.

And we can have our own recommendation. And then go back to the whole GAC membership and seek their advice. And of course to the GNSO as well and either finalize this intercessionally or most probably going to be at the Marrakesh meeting but we have to share something in advance early on to be discussed within the GAC first. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: So it seems like - I mean it seems clear that we will want to review and make recommendations on the GNSO liaison to the GAC in a sufficiently timely way that it proceeds the right deadlines prior to Marrakesh meeting.

What's not yet clear is whether we will have the time or sufficient experience to do the same in relation to the quick look but we - that - it may be that that's something we could do.

Why don't Manal since we've effectively moved into the next session next section under Item 2 Bullet Point 2 which is a review of the quick look mechanism why don't I hand the chair over to you for this and the next bullet as we had discussed anyway. So I'll pause at that stage and let you lead us through this and see where we can get in this.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Jonathan. So the objective of this as well as to review the use of a quick look mechanism to date which was so far applied to the issue report next generation registration directory service and also the issue report from the new gTLD subsequent procedures. And I believe there is a third one on the way like I think we mentioned.

So we have agreed to - following five PDPs that we will report back to the GAC and the GNSO seeking their advice on whether to continue the quick look mechanism as is, or define it or stop it.

And there was an action item from a previous call for staff to provide an overview of the PDPs for which the quick look mechanism has been used and to provide feedback from a staff perspective.

This memo has been circulated with this past preliminary observation which were mainly that less time was needed by the GAC to provide input and also substantive input was provided so it was originally anticipated as part of the public comment.

That this input will be passed on to the PDP working group to consider in due time. And that further consideration needs to be given as to how to ensure public tracking of those correspondence as back and forth between the GAC and the GNSO.

So I think it would be good to hear from everyone else who was involved in this process today. Maybe we can also have a similar review document like the one for the GNSO liaison to the GAC.

We can discuss any improvements already identified to fine tune the process as we go. And once we feel it is I mean mature enough and working smoothly enough we can institutionalize this along with the GNSO liaison for the GAC of course after consulting with our constituencies.

So I think with this I'll leave it here and maybe ask whether people have immediate reactions for now on the quick look mechanism and how it's working or any specific ideas for how we can review this mechanism along with the GNSO and move on to the GAC.

So any immediate reaction or comment? Amr. Go ahead please.

Amr Elsadr: Oh thanks Manal. This is Amr. And my first reaction is that I'm actually glad to hear that the time needed to provide input about a quick look mechanism that this actually provided seems to be more than is needed.

So yes I think that is certainly a good thing and a welcome observation, I think certainly more desirable than conclusion that the time is insufficient. So that's certainly a positive in my book.

As far as I'm looking at the document on the screen and I read this a little earlier, the second bullet I also had a sort of a quick thought on that regarding a substantive input provided during the issue scoping phase or the use of the quick look mechanism.

I think it is important to also manage the expectations of GAC members who provide this input so that they understand that the substantive input will be provided - will be considered during the PDP phase and not the issue scoping phase.

I think that's just important to make sure that this is done effectively just to avoid any sort of disappointments with what folks find after providing this input. Thanks.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Amr. I assume you have finished? The voice was breaking so I didn't hear the last part.

But again yes out of the experience itself obviously GAC's response came quick enough even lesser than anticipated and substantial enough even more than what was anticipated again which is a good find to us all. But anyway any other comments from now?

Again we can continue this online definitely and have - maybe have some deadline for receiving feedback and compiling a review document.

But if we have any further comments for now if not Jonathan anything to add before we move to the following agenda item?

Jonathan Robinson: I think it's okay I mean it's - I think we've covered what we need to for now. Thanks.

Manal Ismail: Okay perfect. Then the following agenda item is on reviewing the remaining PDP stages and any possible enhancements to facilitate the GAC early engagement.

There were flowcharts circulated on the mailing list. We had a brief discussion on those flowcharts before.

But maybe to refresh our minds and you also have new members we can quickly recall again the objective here is to consider additional engagement opportunities in subsequent phases of the PDP namely the initiation phase and the working group phase.

As colleagues may recall we have discussed GAC early engagement at the very early stage of the GNSO PDP which is the issue scoping. And we have concluded with two main recommendations, the GAC quick look mechanism and the GNSO liaison for the GAC.

So now we need to focus on the following stages of the PDP and basically see how to further enhance that input as (from) pages.

First for the initiation phase at the end of the issue scoping phase the GNSO Council receives the final issue report and decides whether or not to formally initiate the PDP.

If the issue report is requested by ICANN board the PDP is automatically initiated. And if the GNSO Council decides not to initiate the PDP the advisory committee that's requested the issue report has the chance to request a meeting to discuss the rationale for this. And following that may request a reconsolidation if it still believes a PDP should be initiated.

Also if a charter was submitted together with the final issue report the council can decide to adopt the PDP Working Group charter and at the same time as the initiation.

And if this chart really needs more work then the drafting team is created to do this and such drafting team is open to anyone interested to participate.

Again the suggestion here which is included in the red box that a specific invitation to participate in the drafting team could be sent to the GAC and this could apply in those cases where the GAC has provided a positive response to the quick look mechanism and has made the original request for the issue report.

So the red box indicates the new suggestion which I believe was more or less positively received last time when we went through this flowchart.

So the question is how we find with this as it stands now? Do we have any further suggestions at this stage before we move to the working group phase on the following page?

So Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: No I was just noticing Amr's point in there in the chat that Marika made about your response about the timing of the quick look mechanism in the process so just to make sure we make clear have a common understanding on that.

(Unintelligible) so let Marika respond and that's a good spot then. That's helpful. Thanks Amr for noticing that. That's yes.

Manal Ismail: Yes thanks Amr for the question and thanks Marika for the response and thanks Jonathan for bringing it to my attention.

We don't have any further comments from this flowchart maybe we can move to the following phase which is the working group phase.

So at the start of the working group phase and again I stand to be corrected with anyone from the GNSO side of course.

At the start of the working group phase a call for volunteers is circulated including to the GAC Secretariat.

The GNSO PDP Working Group solicits early input in the form of a request for inputs communication that is sent to all respective groups.

With respect to the GAC the original idea was that a positive response from the quick look mechanism would trigger a process within the GAC that would allow for finally separation of such input.

So the GNSO PDP Working Group receive - reviews all the inputs received and develops an initial report which is published for public comment.

If GAC input is provided then one of the suggestions was that this -our coordination group could consider a possible recommendation that the CDC working group is expected to address in its initial report how GAC input has been considered and taken into account.

The GAC could - would be informed of the opening of the public comment period and of course encouraged to provide input. And again this could for example be based on the input provided initially through the quick look mechanism.

The GNSO PDP Working Group again received the news and considers the comments received. And finally the final of course is submitted to the GNSO Council for consideration.

Again the new suggestions are also highlighted in (red). So any - Marika please go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. One point and I just want to make is in relation to the early request for input which is one of the requirements that the working group has and typically does for the prior early stage of its work I think the typical time frame that is given and I think that's due to working group guidelines case I mean it should be at a minimum I think of 35 days to get stakeholder groups and constituencies time to work on that.

So I mean something to consider especially for GAC colleagues whether the timeframe between indeed the quick look mechanism which I think the idea was is that should trigger some kind of process within the GAC if the response is yes to the quick look mechanism it would already allow the GAC

to start thinking about that substantive input until, you know, the working group has actually initiated.

And then of course but also there's 35 days period that is given is that sufficient to provide that substantial input? And indeed how does that link with the quick look mechanism?

Does that provide sufficient trigger or of course there's always a risk as well that even if the GAC may say there is, you know, public policy implications it doesn't necessarily mean that a PDP is initiated.

So there's also of course the risk that some work may get done which then, you know, it doesn't get taken any further because the GNSO Council may decide not to initiate a PDP.

So I think it's probably for GAC colleagues to think a little bit about, you know, what is the ideal timing to start working on the substantive influence, you know, to make sure that indeed it's not wasted time but at the same time also that there's enough time for the GAC to do its work around that and to be able to provide that input at an early phase to the working group where it's, you know, really the most important and most relevant to the group's work.

Manal Ismail: Thanks Marika. Yes Amr please?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks. It's Amr. And yes certainly agree with Marika's observations and wanted to just add that if the role of the quick look mechanism is going to involve into input at the PDP phase or possibly if another committee is going to be established to really sort of come up with a substitute input that needs to be provided at - during this phase.

I believe an ideal time to provide this input would be early on in the PDP phase that when the working group, the PDP Working Group as all are

required to - I see Manal's having a little trouble hearing me. I hope my audio is not problematic for everyone. But I'll try to speak a little slower.

I just wanted to stress that a very - an ideal time to provide substitute input is very early in the PDP phase when the PDP Working Group is facilitating input from the different SOs and ACs.

This isn't per se a public comment period. It is only a time when the PDP Working Group reaches out to the ICANN community and not beyond.

But the input provided at this phase really helps the PDP working group the sort of frame it's future discussions but the very long discussions that take place in order to draft an initial report.

So this would be a great time for the GAC to provide input at an early phase in the PDP. And then of course it could - the GAC could opt to provide input during the public comment period following the publication of initial reports. Thank you.

Manal Ismail: Thanks Amr. And your voice was breaking to this but I got the comments and thank you.

So (Olive)?

(Olive):   Yes thank you Manal. And just...

Manal Ismail: And Jonathan afterwards. Sorry I missed your hand.

(Olive):   ...to reflect on - the Marika's question whether it would be - the time would be sufficient.

And from in the GAC what has already happened is that the very first quick look mechanism for the next generation registration directory services which

is well due to become PDP then but the thought was and the decision was to assign the follow-up in the future PDP to an existing GAC working group notably the one on public safety.

So that in such a situation where there is existing working group that has a scope that's consistent with the upcoming PDP it may be well relatively easy to fit into the timeline.

But there are also situation most clearly where it is not an obvious fit to an existing working group and where that kind of approach needs to be developed.

So there has been thoughts within the GAC and by the GAC leadership and one decision on how to assign the further work following the quick look mechanism. But they're not always an obvious solution to how this shall proceed.

So thank you, just a little comment on what has been happening so far.

Manal Ismail: Yes thank you (Olive). And yes we were lucky enough to have that working group in place for the previous (DVT)s. And now we are stress testing the quick look mechanism thing where we don't have an existing working group in place.

And as you rightly mentioned it's an ongoing discussion at the GAC right now.

So Jonathan sorry to keep you waiting. Go ahead.

Jonathan Robinson: Well no you did not keep me waiting. I was in turn. I was behind (Olive) and that's just fine.

And the - I had a question really. I wondered if we at any point have recommended anything out of this group that should the quick look mechanism an interest.

Do we at any point recommend that the GAC then form some sort of group to track the work of the PDP from this point on or is that A, have we recommended and B would we see that as within our remit to make such a recommendation or should we just leave it up to the GAC to decide how to manage their own tracking of such work? Any thoughts on that would be welcome to me anyway.

Manal Ismail: Sorry Jonathan. It's probably a poor connection from my side. So have we as a consultation group ever recommended that the GAC do work? I'm sorry.

Jonathan Robinson: No problem. And I'll - the question was have we recommended that the GAC form a group to track or work on policy development work that - it has to be of interest by a quick look mechanism or has the GAC taken such as step themselves. And do we think it's within the remit of this group to do so?

Yes and then (Paul Wright) says that he feels the GAC should best organize themselves (unintelligible) the situation. And Amr confirms that we haven't made such a recommendation but we could.

Maybe that's something to think about as we continue our work not on debate but merits and the issues around that.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Jonathan.

I can see others typing too. So maybe you're on the same point as well.

And meanwhile I was also bring again another point food for thought also that we still have it on our to do list which is what if after the early engagement

there is still disagreement between the GAC advice GNSO thoughts on the topic.

So and I think we have it on our charter that the Consultation Group should consider mechanism that may be put in place to deal with such situations which the GNSO policy recommendations do not align with the GAC advice.

So this is also a point that we should be thinking of and considering to provide the recommendations on.

And I can see (Suzanne) saying that perhaps this suggestion could be held as an outstanding issue for further consideration based on the results of the initial group mechanism and GAC input in the current and standing PDP so yes that's definitely a point to be further considered.

So any further comments on both pages of the PDP before handing back to Jonathan to wrap up?

Thanks (Suzanne). Yes, noted.

Okay Jonathan over to you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Manal. I think that we've covered things fairly well.

I had three points on my notes for the wrap-up really. One was to consider the developments of a work plan to track progress against. I think we are committed to doing that.

Certainly we really want to encourage as much discussion as possible on the mailing list so we can formulate documents and then in effect do the fine-tuning during these meetings.

And then the other thing we wanted to do was confirm the next meeting time and date.

And we in essence confirmed that at least we penciled that in and propose to send that around to the list by communication of the next meetings and also an invitation to those meetings, a calendar invite and request if anyone has either current, you know, or ongoing problems in those meetings that they let us know as soon as possible.

So I think we've covered what we hoped to. It's a little short. It's scheduled for an hour but I think me and I hope everyone else up to speed.

Now let me pause and see if anyone has any final questions or issues that they want to deal with.

You want - go ahead and then go to Thomas.

Manal Ismail: Just to suggest quickly that maybe we can have some deadline for providing feedback on the different topics.

We don't have to do this right away. We can agree on the deadlines on the mailing list but just flagging that it may be good to be progressing and putting some deadlines particularly to privatize our work.

I think the (middle) part is almost in a better shape that we can conclude maybe earlier than other parts like the later stages of PDP.

But again it would be good that we have some deadlines along with our work plan when we circulate it online. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Manal. I hope I's become clear to everyone that we mean business here. And I can see you're been driving us forward a little bit which is good. We'll make good progress that way.

Carlos hear from (unintelligible).

Carlos Gutierrez: Sorry. I cannot hear you very well Jonathan. I wonder if I can speak know? Can somebody confirm?

Jonathan Robinson: Please go ahead.

Carlos Gutierrez: Thank you very much Jonathan. This is Carlos for the record. Thank you very much.

I think for the first document it makes a lot of sense or it's clear to me how we can make progress in the mailing list because it's pretty down to earth and straightforward.

With the second document the charts we - the decision trees we have been looking just now in the second discussion it's a little bit more difficult how we can make progress with this - with this decision tree.

Does it mean we're going to read every box and we can suggest another box or do we have to confirm the red boxes?

I would greatly appreciate some advice on the second document. Thank you very much.

Jonathan Robinson: Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I mean from my perspective or at least I think staff's perspective, you know, having put this document together our idea was that the red boxes are just idea suggestions.

So if there are any other ideas or suggestions that you think that the consultation group should reconsider I think that the hope that that will come

back on the mailing list or if you believe that the ideas that are put out there, you know, don't make sense or not in this form that feedback should be provided as well.

Because the hope is I think that similar to the quick look mechanism is that once we have a sense from the consultation group that, you know, either these ideas or other ideas should be further explored or, you know, worked out in detail I think that would be the next step similar to what we did with this group mechanism.

We initially had it in the flowchart form and is noted I think what is actually in this document is where, you know, we started the conversations and then the actual implementation where we started working out how would this look in practice we added some more detail or it looked a little bit different from what is in the flowchart. So I think that at least from our perspective I think would be the next step in this (parcel).

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Marika. That's clearer to me and clearly to Carlos as well. So that's very helpful.

Well we've just run over the top the hours so I think with that we will call it a day and wish our US friends and anyone else who's celebrating a Happy Thanksgiving. And we'll look forward to meeting again in the future. I think that's going to get us back on track.

So thanks to all of you and obviously to my co-chair Manal and his staff for supporting us. And we'll look forward to working with you again in the future.

Marika Konings: Thanks all.

Man: Thank you all.

Woman: Thank you very much (Cheryl). Thank you very much (Cheryl). You may now stop the recording.

Man: Bye-bye.

END