ICANN
Transcription
GAC GNSO Consultation Group meeting
Tuesday 27 May 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 27 May 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-20140527.mp3

On page:

http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#may

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:

http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/

Attendees:
Government Advisory Committee
Ana Neves - Portugal
Manal Ismail – co-chair – Egypt
GNSO Council
Jonathan Robinson – co-chair - Registries Stakeholder Group
Avri Doria – Councillor - NCSG
 David Cake, Vice Chair – NCSG

Apology:
Volker Greimann – vice Chair – Registrars Stakeholder Group
Suzanne Radell - USA

ICANN Staff:
Marika Konings
Olof Nordling
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Thank you. Recordings are started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Carolyn). Good morning, good afternoon - good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the GAC GNSO Consultation Group teleconference on Tuesday 27th of May, 2014.

On the call today we have Ana Neves, Manal Ismail, Jonathan Robinson, Avri Doria. We have apologies from Volker Greimann and Suzanne Radell. 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: Hi. It's Jonathan Robinson, co chair of the Consultation Group together with Manal Ismail who's on the call. And I'll be chairing the call today.

It strikes me that we've got a very thin group so thank you to those of us - those of you who have joined from both staff and participants from the group. This is - but it puts us a somewhat difficult position, I feel. So I wouldn't mind some guidance. I think we could possibly talk informally through the agenda and go through it but quite how empowered we are to make any decisions or really push things forward I don't know. So I'll welcome any comments or input on that from you, first of all, before we kick off.

Yes, Manal, go ahead.

Manal Ismail: Yes Jonathan. Thank you. This is Manal. I think (unintelligible). I think we can go through the agenda as you suggested and try to come up with (unintelligible) included and then pose the question on the mailing list and try to conclude things on the mailing list. But I think it's worth the discussion and coming up with the list of issues that we want to take decisions on. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Manal. And I see in the interim David Cake has also joined us at least in the Adobe Connect room. So, David, just if you could confirm you're on audio as well?

David Cake: Can you hear me? Can you hear me.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, David. It's a little distorted (unintelligible).

David Cake: Okay.

Jonathan Robinson: So thanks. David, just to let you know that audio isn't good at all but it's good to know you're on. I suspect you can hear okay so that's a good - that's fine. All right so we've got - just going to run through briefly then the - as you can see on your screen in front of you the output from the previous call. And I will try and make this as efficient as possible because I don't want to spend too much time going over old ground.

But key points were really that we considered having an informational update prior to London. And that's a topic of specific discussion for this meeting so we won't go into that now.

I'm trying to scan through this and see what particularly - one of the key areas that I think is outstanding and I'd like to capture as an action, and ideally with one or more members responsible for it, possibly someone going in the first instance or reminding me where we are on it is the role or sort of job specification, in quotes, because clearly it's not a job as such, but for the liaison.

Do we - has one of us, and it may even have been me, has one of us committed to draft an initial specification here? So my point is to start - thanks, Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I actually already prepared a first draft which I sent to you for review basically looking indeed at, you know, more from a GNSO perspective indeed what will be the requirements of the role, what will be some of the criteria and also already starting to think about what will be a potential selection process for that.

So I sent that to you for your input, you know, before being able to share that with the broader group and maybe first, you know, sharing it as well with Manal and Olof to also get GAC perspective in there, you know, before we share it with the broader group for discussion.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so my apologies for that. I had a feeling something was going on there and I just - that's something I've missed. So, Marika, if I could ask you to note that, as an ongoing action item, and if you could please also commit to send it to myself, Manal and, Olof will make a first pass on it and then share it with the group for further feedback.

Good, we talked about cross checking with the work plan and making sure that what we were doing actually was consistent with the work plan and the set of actions. Has that been - has anyone done that check? I wouldn't be surprised if you had been through it, Marika, but I wouldn't mind any comment if we, you know, how well synchronized that we're actually doing is with the original draft of the work plan.

Okay, thanks. So, Manal, go ahead.

Manal Ismail: Yes, thank you Jonathan. Actually I tried to check the work plan. It's quite flexible so I think we will be (unintelligible) whatever we achieve into the work plan.

I'm mindful that we have two remaining Consultation Group calls and two remaining work lead calls so I think we have to plan accordingly that we

accomplish what we need to accomplish for London in those four remaining calls.

And I think we're pretty concrete on what we would like to achieve in terms of both work tracks so we have to make sure we do this (unintelligible) progress on the calls to make sure we finish (unintelligible). Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Manal. That was pretty much my experience. I did go through the work plan and felt that it was, similar to you, that - and that we were reasonably clear on what we were trying to achieve by London so appreciate that confirmation.

Is there anything else that anyone would like to comment on the previous action items that we should be covering before we move onto the main agenda? Is there anything else that anyone would like to highlight just skimming over that list leisurely and if there's anything that you think should be covered that needs particularly highlighting?

I mean, most of it's just guidance for where we're heading I think from the last time. Okay good. Let's move on then onto Item 1 of our formal agenda which is to review and/or comment on the briefing notes.

So this is something that I guess Manal and I have been through together and we believe it represents the position of the group to date. Obviously there's an opportunity to comment via redline or perhaps even preferably leaving the pen with Manal and myself and do commenting using the document comment feature if you do have comments or issues with it or that you'd like to be modified or added.

I sometimes find that's a more potentially effective way of working where one or two hold the pen and others comment to provide input but I don't feel too strongly about that. Any comments, thoughts or inputs on that document? I'm

not sure if, you know, Avri, David or Ana, staff, have had the opportunities to read or comment on that.

But I think importantly I'd like to highlight as well that the timetable that we propose to work on - we're proposed to, at the outset of this call, and maybe this is worth recording as an action item, Marika, is to say that this document will - is available for circulating and discussion on the list up until Friday at which point the members are I guess encouraged to provide input and feedback and which point we will finalize it on Friday and propose to publish this broadly as a reflection of the work of the group within the GAC and the GNSO as of Monday next week.

Olof, please go ahead.

Olof Nordling: Thank you, Jonathan. Well just a little comment. Of course you can make some small edits but I think it's a very fine document in a very (effective) way tells what - where we are.

One thing, very simply, at the end there are resources in square brackets and I think we just quite easily just could make a reference to the wiki page on the GNSO website where everything is.

((Crosstalk))

Olof Nordling: ...at the very end of the document.

Jonathan Robinson: That's a good point. And a fair point. We may, I mean, I take your point that essentially it's all covered there. We may want to pick out one or two other highlights we could say - all the work of the group is open and tracked here and that specific highlights might be A, B and C so there may be a way of doing both but it's a good point. Thank you.

Manal, go ahead.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Jonathan. Yes, just to note that I have already shared the dates we agreed upon on the list. But again it would be good if Marika sent a reminder. I also agree with inserting the wiki. I think this could go into the resources - the very final part of the brief where we should insert the URL along with the URL of the survey if it is ready by then.

And I also note that we have in red the number of - the total number of the workgroup members and this also has to be inserted. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, that's a good point. I forget where we were with the document in terms of reflecting the link to the survey. I suppose that's a good point. We haven't got on our agenda here, or am I wrong here, the survey comes up in consider material for London.

So provisionally, Manal, I agree with you, it would be good to have a link to the survey. I just wanted to make sure that others are comfortable with the content of that survey. But, again, that's something we could refine between now and Friday.

I think it was a very good first draft, that survey, and on the first pass didn't have a whole lot of additions to offer. So, again, Marika, we could take that as an action to republish or re-link to the survey on the list at the end of this call and tell our colleagues that the intention is to publish this survey as a link from the briefing notes on Monday next week so we need feedback by sort of close of the day on Friday of this week.

Just let me know if you disagree with that. And, Marika, I see your hand is up.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just to note that the actual link that we're using now is just for preview purposes. So, you know, when Friday comes I basically need to finalize the survey and then I can provide you with the link that would, you know, go to the live survey basically.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes thanks for that clarification and understood. So for the purposes of sharing it with the work - with the Consultation Group that we're working on now we can continue to share that draft link. And then as of Monday next week or as of close of late Friday once we decide we've finalize things we can send the link out - the final link. Manal, go ahead.

Manal Ismail: Yes thank you, Jonathan. Just on the second (quote), I think, although the wiki URL would include all the documents and all the recordings I think maybe in addition we can also bring specific material to the attention of our constituencies like, for example, the tool documents - working documents of both work tracks.

I mean, because if we just provide the wiki URL then people would go through the link and then find (unintelligible) of information and might not get into the details of each and everything on the wiki page.

So maybe in addition we can also put a specific links to both work track documents or maybe the survey as well anything we would like the people to - specifically look into, I mean, it's good we have the recordings but we are not expecting feedback on our archives or the recordings but we really need their feedback on the documents and the survey. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Manal. That's in line with my thinking as well. I agree, I think it's very useful to highlight that all documents are available via the wiki but the group specifically highlights A, B and C documents. And right now I think those are three very good suggestions, the information on the two different work tracks plus the survey.

So, you know, there may be some additional one or two other additions but I'm in favor of the documents being updated to reflect that - in that way that seems sensible. And thank you, Ana, for your comment earlier on the

proposal; I think that related to the production of the survey by the deadline and then linking back into the document.

All right, I think that covers for now the briefing notes. So unless I see and other hand or concerns we have a direction and a timing for that briefing note which will be useful for a number of reasons; I think for the obvious reasons but also it happens to come out ahead of our GNSO Council call next week and it's reasonably timely as far as the ICANN meeting is concerned.

One thing that was bothering that I don't think we can fix it all is there's a sort of well-known deluge - document deluge that takes place ahead of the ICANN meetings. And I think that - from memory that's three weeks ahead of the meeting so unfortunately we're going to be caught in that deluge I suspect. Can anyone confirm with me when those documents - when the document deadline is for ICANN 50?

Not to worry. There's not much we can do about it in any event. We will still target getting it out for Monday. I just don't want to get caught absolutely in a storm of documents and our work gets lost in that. But we will probably have to live with whatever it is.

All right, our next opportunity is to move on to talk about the day to day work track. As you know full well there are two work tracks within this group. Yeah, Marika confirms that Monday is indeed the publication deadline for Monday so I think that is as it is but we might have to do a bit of work to make sure that our group is aware that as part of that now what's now going to become the deluge of documents our work will be published.

So we've narrowed down for the present for focusing the run-up to London, I hope I'm expressing this correctly, really focusing in on three particular options which is what we know as A, F and E.

And just to remind myself and you for what A, F and E are, make sure I get this right, A is of course the GNSO liaison to the GAC. And I think what we are doing here to try and capture the item on A is we're going to be doing two things really; one, we'll be indicating our intention to our respective organizations to go ahead with this liaison.

And, two, we will be providing a specification or what's expected of the individual undertaking that work and making that clear and essentially seeking - this is really a important point I think and I'd like your feedback or understanding - common understanding of this.

But I think we - our intention is to go into London saying this is what the group recommends. Can we get, GAC, your support for this? And, GNSO, your support for this? So that's the way I'm expecting we go into do it. Thank you. And I see a checkmark from you in the Adobe Connect, likewise, Manal.

So that's currently our understanding. We take this proposal into the meeting subject to any final refinements. And actually when you look at the related points, which is - I think it's E and F - they are essentially quite closely connected as it's described as well in the briefing.

Let me go on because E is about further developing and expanding early awareness and notification while really what we're saying is there what we've decided to do there is publish and work on the survey because without the survey and understanding how effective the current setup is there's no - there's a questionable benefit to doing further work on it in this group without having proper data to work with.

And then of course, just reminding myself of F, which I believe I should know. Why am I struggling to see F?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. F is the group of existing GNSO Council PDP liaisons interacting with the GAC. But I think we discussed that that might be a mechanism for the liaison to actually use or work with as they do their tasks.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, precisely, Marika. Thank you. I just wanted to make sure it was that - that was my memory and I was - but thanks for that prompt and those in the chat, Avri and Manal, that helped with that.

And, yeah, so essentially the discussion we had was initially I think that was presented in the work group schedule as those these would be working directly with the GAC. And I think we sort of went back on that a little and have subsequently agreed that really these are potential resources to the liaison.

And it's covered in the briefing notes, this understanding in this way, that these are potential resources to the liaison. And if necessary can be brought into an interaction with the GAC as if you like specialists or experts on the area. And I think - that's where we got to.

So thank, Avri, you note that you think this is an effective idea. I'm pleased with the idea as well. I don't think it was mine so I can hopefully say that because it seems that it's a useful way of, A, adding to effectiveness to the role of the liaisons; and, B, utilizing that well in this context.

So my feeling is we're pretty settled on this. I'd quite like to read through the documents and those three options one more time and make sure - there's probably more detail particularly on the liaison and really drilling down into the detail of expectations there as much as possible so that those - the expectations aren't not met and we actually meet them properly.

So unless I'm missing something here I think we're fairly well resolved and what our goal now is to really tighten up each of these three as we've started

to do in the briefing note and then convert this into communications material which is the briefing note and the presentation for London.

Manal, I suspect you're going to remind me of what else needs to be done. Please go ahead.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Jonathan. No, actually, I was just going to ask about the level of details we are going to get into for London. I mean, the document as it stands it has so many questions, answers, comments, track change. Are we concluding in a different format? Are we proposing an overall scenario compromised of the three options or presenting the three options separately? I mean, how do we expect to present this to our constituencies in London? Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Good point, Manal. Now I'll take a stab at answering that. I think the way I would see us dealing with this is saying - describing it in the following way: We would say we've looked at six options. We've considered a series of detailed questions and answers in and around them. In order to make progress we decided to focus first on three options. They are not to the exclusion of one another or the others. But we - so we felt we were able to move ahead with those without compromising other areas.

And so then we would go into a little detail as to what we believe we have resolved, why we've resolved what we have and where and if there are remaining open questions for feedback.

But I think we probably need to be realistic that there is a limit to how much feedback we can expect on the detail issues. So for the most part I would expect we'd be trying to really tie down our communication on what the questions were, how we decided to answer them and where we think the right way going forward is, and then being mindful of feedback prior to what - an implementation set of steps after London.

But really we're looking for, I think, either ratification of where we've got to or, you know, criticism and a requirement to change or modify elements. And so I think it's a really fine line between providing an effective capability for feedback from our respective groups without making it so open ended that we kind of making our overall groups do the work of this Consultation Group. But I feel we can get that and I think we'll tease that out in drafting a presentation.

So probably what the answer to that is we should start to draft some - our communication material, our proposed presentation as soon as possible and that will flush things out. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. And just to speak to the document that's on the screen I think the idea more behind that was that it would be used or could be used by the group, you know, to capture ideas and suggestions and the conversation so that eventually that could actually be incorporated into any kind of report or memo or even if it's just posted on the wiki as the kind of background material, you know, should someone come back and say, you know, why did you choose that option or why didn't you pursue, you know, one of the others that we actually have something to show and say look, we actually did, you know, go in detail through these different options and here you can find our reference material.

So maybe what we can do, you know, while you're also working on the other documents, try to update this at least for A, E and F and capture some more of the notes and discussion we've had so maybe we can even just take that out and that could potentially be an annex or a set, you know, a separate document that we just post on the wiki so that those are interested to see a little bit more the background to the conversations and, you know, the options that were discussed or even discarded can do so, you know, through this material.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Marika. And I see, Manal is a supporter of that approach; I am too. I think that's very useful to try and make that document as current as

possible and we use that as a resource for preparing our materials, as I said before, but also make it fully visible which is what we would do in any event.

But, yeah, it could be preparing it in such a way that can be made into background material where we strip out anything superfluous and add, I mean, all of this is recorded and available anyway so that seems like a sensible suggestion.

So I'm clearly most familiar being a team lead with this day to day interactions area. And it feels to me like we are at a reasonable point there and we're okay to draw a line under this agenda item now. Is there any other comment or input anyone else would like to make on this particular item?

All right it seems sensible then that we switch to Item 3 which is PDP work track.

Olof Nordling: Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Olof, go ahead. Yes, please.

Olof Nordling: Just we need to be mindful that when we're talking about Option F what we're saying is a standalone option F, as it's written right now, and what we're actually talking about is a modified Option F where the liaisons, the GNSO Council liaisons to the working groups, act in support of GNSO liaison to the GAC.

So as it's written now in Option F, well, we should modify that in the presentation we make to the GAC and the GNSO in London.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, thanks Olof. Absolutely, good point. And you're absolutely right that should be - the modification - and maybe we should - maybe that's even just to be crystal clear it's useful to call it a modified or updated Option F. And I think and hope that that will be captured by both our jointly or co-authoring of

the presentation material plus the update that Marika offered to do to the document a moment ago to make sure that we got the document updated.

But, yes, good point. And, yeah, and so Marika confirms in the chat that it will be updated to reflect where we've got to. And that's critical, I agree. We needed the document to not reflect a state we were in previously when we moved on so hopefully a combination of updates to the document and preparing a current presentation will cover that.

So Item 3 then is to review the PDP work track and discuss and finalize some proposals for Phases 1 and 2. Now here the - just to remind you all, Phases 1 and 2 are the request for an issue report and the preliminary issue report.

I wonder how much can we say here. I see maybe an old hand from Olof and certainly a new hand from Manal. So, Olof, I'll just give you a moment to put down your hand or retain it if you wish to speak still. And the hand is gone so we'll move on to Manal.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Jonathan. And I have a few points to make here though I'm mindful that we don't have Suzanne and Amr who are the co-leads on this work track. But first of all I think 1 and 2 - and I stand to be corrected from Marika - I think Phase 1 and 2 extend to Step 4.

I think request for issue report and preliminary issue report this is Phase 1. And I believe Phase 2 is the issue report itself which includes Steps 3 and 4, (rejection) of PDP requested by advisory committee and Step 4, developing the charter for the PDP working group.

So I think those were identified as the objectives or as our target for the London - so I have more to add but I can see Marika has her hand up so if she's going to comment or correct (unintelligible) I defer to her and then continue if you don't mind, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Not at all Manal. Thank you. So we'll go to Marika and then revert back to you.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. And definitely not correcting or changing. I just wanted to point to the language I posted in the chat that confirms Suzanne's email which I think aligns with what Manal was same to indeed focus on, you know, the first two phases that we said we would focus on, just first two steps but I think we agreed that was two phases.

And just a small note, I also put back in the email in my response to Amr. We are actually in the process of updating the graphics to match, you know, new color codes and make some minor improvements. And one of the things we noted as well that the description issue report may not be the best description for what actually goes on in that particular phase.

And I think we are going to update that to call it initiation because it really talks about the vote on the issue report as well as, you know, formation of a drafting team to develop a charter which seems to align more with the term "initiation" I'll be issue scoping is really the phase where, you know, that preliminary issue report is published and initial conversations go on.

So I just wanted to note that we are in the process of changing that. I mean, don't know how quickly that will happen but when we have those new graphics we may just also update that here accordingly.

Jonathan Robinson: So, Marika, a couple of clarifying questions then before we revert back to Manal. When you say we are in the process of changing this you mean we are changing the way in which this is reflected in the sort of standard GNSO communications documents rather than just simply confined to the work of this group?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. That's correct. I'm specifically talking about the graphics - the graphics that we've also used as the basis for, you know, the outline here.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, okay. Because really there's two potential areas for confusion; one is within the materials of this Consultation Group; and, two, to the extent that the materials within this Consultation Group, in some way, differ or don't entirely overlap with those of the standard communication materials of the GNSO there's scope for confusion.

So you're essentially working to iron out those wrinkles and resolve any perspective confusion.

Marika Konings: Correct.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. Thanks Marika. And so then my second question then is, is can you just make sure for all of us and for the record we're clear when we talk about faces and steps, do we have a common understanding of these three things? Are we talking about four phases with multiple steps, there is many more than four steps, is that really what we're talking about here?

Because, I mean, this was back to Mikey's attempt to sort of distilled the PDP into quadrants and a simplified representation which was visually and practically very useful. But I just want to make sure that we all have a common understanding of phases and steps and so when we talk we know what we're talking about.

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika. I'm not sure if that was directed to me but indeed I think there - it may be good to have some clarification around that because I think the way it's currently in deed written is the phases are the steps.

Well, I think what we're trying to say is because before we didn't have those overarching categories so maybe we want to say indeed that the issue

scoping is the phase and within that there are I think for different steps and maybe that's something we can actually clarify. I think know it's actually two.

Maybe we can clarify that in the document that the phases are the high-level categories and within that there are different steps. And as I said before as well, the steps that are specifically included in this document are those that have the component of engagement.

And there are other steps in the overall PDP that, you know, currently don't have an engagement component. But of course it doesn't mean that, you know, the group may not want to consider that at some stage once I guess we've looked at what currently exists and have identified where there may be gaps or need to do, you know, additional work.

Jonathan Robinson: Think that Marika. It was directed to you. And I just wanted to make sure it has you are as expert as any of us in the sort of incremental points within the PDP process and so I just think it's very useful if we could try as best as possible is to ensure that we work with a common terminology in this group at least and that that overlaps as closely as possible with the actual terminology used in managing the PDP within the GNSO.

Now I know Manal has been very patient as I've asked these sort of clarifying questions. And I see Olof's and has gone up as well which may be a response. So let me just make sure that, Olof, if you want to respond to one or more of those clarifying questions before we come back to Manal.

Olof Nordling: Yes thank you, Jonathan. And it's Olof for the record. And just a suggestion, because I think we shouldn't overlook I the usefulness of the little graphics we have in the one-pagers that are distributed to the GAC, I mean, it's a straight line of the various phases.

And whether that's exactly like we are talking about it now but at least many of the GAC members would recognize those steps. And also the graphic is

very - well it explains very well, I mean, the simple fashion what's going on, the various steps.

So I would just recommend that we try to use that one when we make a presentation for London.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, I'm going to check this with you. You mean I think those sort of linear graphics which have a series of errors that run through different phases, is that what you are referring to, Olof?

Olof Nordling: Yes indeed. Indeed.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, okay. And because that's been regularly communicated to GAC members to the extent that we can refer to that type of similar visual reference points that'll be useful.

Olof Nordling: That was my thought yes.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, no that's helpful thanks. And I think - just checking that that's consistent with what Suzanne was referring to. Let's come to you, Manal, then I'll check Suzanne's comment in the chat or the comment that's been posted there on her behalf by Marika from her email. Go ahead, Manal.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Jonathan. And actually I was looking to Suzanne's email also because she also mentioned stages and phases and steps and this is where exactly we were talking then we need to be consistent because she said focusing (unintelligible) on the two first steps. So I wonder if she - here she meant to say the first two phases or two steps. I think we need to seek some clarification from her unless you and Marika already understand what exactly she meant.

But again, back to my point, I was going to suggest that in light of discussion - the interactive discussion in the column Issues and Questions, maybe we

should try to conclude and come up with a proposal that would be inserted in the proposal column.

I mean, just to see where it discussions concluded and we reached a proposal and where things are still open. And I think it would make our work easier to conclude from this specific column.

So before proceeding, again, I see Marika's hand so maybe this is a direct response to me. If you don't mind I will again defer to Marika.

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead Marika

Marika Konings: Thanks Jonathan. So this is Marika. Yes, I think in response, Manal, I think it would be helpful to actually indeed walk through the issues and questions because I think what we are, at least, you know, coming from the staff side or maybe GNSO side what we are interested to here and especially from the GAC perspective, you know, why some of the current mechanisms may not be working or what could be done to improve those.

I think we've been able to try to identify for each of the phases what currently happens. And I think been a couple of questions and issues have been identified with those which then hopefully may result into some concrete proposals on how we can improve the existing engagement opportunities.

And I guess eventually from there we may be able to look at as well, you know, are there any elements missing or do we need to look broader and to what, you know, currently exists and is available in relation to early engagement and input.

Jonathan Robinson: So, Marika, just to check that; are you suggesting that we do that walk through - is your sort of suggestion or proposal that we do that walk through in London during the course of our interaction together?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I would actually think it would probably work better if we do it in this group and maybe be able indeed to already come with some ideas or suggestions in London and just test whether people believe that, you know, that could work or maybe, you know, other ideas that may come up.

But maybe having an open discussion there may not be the most, you know, productive use of time and instead, you know, this group can think through some of these ideas.

And I think they can especially looking to, you know, the GAC participants in this group to identify how some of these things may work better instead of, you know, working groups sending a notice to the GAC secretariat or to the GAC chair or, you know, posting on the Website what are more effective ways of getting those requests across and being able, you know, to digest and provide feedback.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so I think I'm hearing three things then. I think what we are proposing to do is we - in and around this work - is clearly we're going to work on the survey and that will go ahead.

The second thing we need to do is make sure we are crystal clear with this group - and I'm probably going to be looking to you, Marika, here to maybe even write a very small briefing note on the phases particularly focusing on these early two phases, steps or - and make sure we are very clear on what the scope of our discussion right now is because after all, as we discussed before, this is all about early engagement.

And then third, that we tackle this systematically at our next call and walk through it step-by-step and make sure we understand, A, what the concerns or issues are and, B, how they might be mitigated so that we are in better shape to present and discuss this in London.

So that's my suggestion where were at - where we could make some progress on these three items but I know, Manal, your hand is up so let's see if that's coincident with your thinking or what else needs to be done.

Manal Ismail: Thank you, Jonathan. Yes, I fully agree. And thanks, Marika, I also agree to what you have typed in the chat. And this is my understanding also of our target for London. The first two phases which are issue scoping and (unintelligible). And, yes, this is my intention to conclude in the proposals column and like Marika I feel that we should do this here within the group and come back and go to London with some concrete proposals.

Like you said, Jonathan, we should not expect people to come with altogether some real-time feedback so we have to really (unintelligible) with some conclusions.

I had a general remark, these include a question, particularly on what Mike was proposing. I feel we should be focusing on GAC input or GAC feedback rather than GAC volunteers said making input that doesn't speak officially for the GAC.

Because, I mean, this option already exists and individual governments are always encouraged to provide their inputs. But I believe the core focus of our group and objective of the group should be a GAC input. So I hope we are on the same page in this. I mean, whenever it's possible to have a GAC position it's of much more weight to the GNSO process, I believe, rather than individual unofficially speaking for the GAC.

And that's it for now. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Good point. Thanks, Manal. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just a response to Manal's comment that, you know, I absolutely agree that of course whenever there is a formal GAC position or

agreement on an issue that that will be the most helpful to be provided back to the working group.

But just to note as well that in those cases where it doesn't exist it may still be very helpful or useful for a working group to, you know, get different governmental perspectives on a certain issue so that least that can be considered as part of the conversation.

So I think the concern is if - even if there's not a GAC position but there's no further input from government there's no way for a working group to actually take that into account even if it's not a unified position. And then there may be the issue that, you know, by the time it gets to recommendations that either certain governments have concerns or even at that stage maybe there is a more broader GAC position around an issue.

So I think at least from a working group position I think any input they can get at this stage is helpful with, you know, the most preferred option obviously being, you know, formal GAC input or feedback.

But I think, you know, most of them would also welcome individual input or at least, you know, outline of the different positions that may exist on a topic as that may already give some indications or where, you know, concerns or issues may arise as the working group goes through its process.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so they are not necessarily inconsistent and could be helpful to get the formal input on the way. I think that covers what we can do in this call. My feeling on the PDP work track, unless someone tells me something else, that's - our next item then, as we approach towards the top of the hour - and I believe we covered the bulk of this already is consider material for London which is both the survey and the presentation.

Now we've talked about timing for the survey and how that might be - proposals to modify that might be taken between now and Friday this week. We've also talked about starting to draft the presentation.

My sense is that this is something which is probably a responsibility that Manal and I should take a lead on. But I'm open to anyone else suggesting or providing any comment or input as to how we handle the presentation.

But I suspect it's probably something we should ideally commit to bring you a first draft of by the next meeting in two week's time. I don't know how you feel about that, Manal.

Manal Ismail: Yes (unintelligible) I think - yeah, I'm fine.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks. So that's something you can note, Marika, in the record of actions that that's - that - we've already made our notes on the survey and then the presentation is something which first draft will be shared with the group in two week's time, you know, or by two week's time for discussion at the next meeting.

I'll probably regret committing to that but nevertheless I think it's the right thing to do. That seems to cover Item 4. And then Item 5 is AOB. So let me throw it open and just see in case Ana, Avri, David, Manal, Olof, Marika, any of you have anything further you'd like to add or make sure we consider or remind ourselves of.

Okay sounds like we are in reasonable shape then. We've got quite a bit to be getting on with and hopefully it's well captured in the notes that have been taken by Marika during the meeting. So thank you very much, staff, for your support. Thanks to those of you who were able to be on the call. And I hope it's productive for those of you who are listening to the audio as well. Look forward to working with you all online in the interim. Thanks, everyone.

END