00:35:56   Jim Prendergast: thanks
00:36:41   Jim Prendergast: is this the latest work plan?
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1l9pIXkiu_d5zPVqTM09Z5BiJ1Y3-mhnwaZLPfDDcnI4/edit
00:37:26   Cheryl Langdon-Orr: more like logistically *impossible* at this stage ;-) but that is no excuse to slow down ;-)
00:37:38   Cheryl Langdon-Orr: OK!
00:37:41   Heather Forrest: Wow, that was a fun start to 2020
00:37:47   Justine Chew: Indeed
00:37:56   Heather Forrest: New approach: tell it as it is!
00:37:57   Cheryl Langdon-Orr: :-)
00:44:10   Justine Chew: Sounds like a plan, @Jeff, thanks.
00:44:20   Anne Aikman-Scalese:hand up
00:48:46   Justine Chew: I would be keen on looking out for new suggestions which no one raised or considered before on 'prior consulted topics'
00:49:39   Kathy Kleiman: Jeff, could you clarify what you mean by the "hybrid" responses?
00:50:34   Jim Prendergast: Agree Justine - especially in areas where we just asked open ended questions and had no previous recommendations.
00:50:54   Cheryl Langdon-Orr: @Justine I think that comes into the judgment call(s) @Jeff referred to but one would hope that all comments received will be read and considered but the focus and main analysis would be focused on the new work matters we specifically seek input on...
00:51:03   avri doria: perhaps, new perspectives on issues that had not been considered even if the issues had been considered?
00:52:37   Justine Chew: @Cheryl, sure, judgment call by leadership is practical, but it can also be re-considered by WG members which are also judgment calls themselves
00:52:52   Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes @Avri I would push for that
00:52:59   Anne Aikman-Scalese:COMMENT We should clarify on which sections we are NOT really seeking further public comment and do so section by section. COMMENT
00:53:49   Kathy Kleiman: hand up
00:57:01   Steve Chan: Hand up
00:57:37   Jeff Neuman : THanks @Steve....I couldn't come up with a term for that new thing
00:58:44   Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks @Steve, good summary of the concept
00:59:29   Anne Aikman-Scalese:Does "focus on the rationale" mean we won't publish the Predictability Framework" for public comment?
00:59:59   Alberto Soto: Sorry, I must leave the call. I have many problems with internet in the place where I am. They are too micro-cuts and I don't understand anything.
Kind regards!
01:00:16   Steve Chan: We haven't drafted the section Anne, but I believe that should actually be part of the recommendations/implementation guidance.

01:00:53   Justine Chew: @Jeff, will the list of CCT recommendations 'assigned to' this WG be re-reviewed at any point and/or addressed within the topics on which leadership/staff thinks each should falls under?

01:00:56   Anne Aikman-Scalese:OK thank you Jeff

01:02:29   Justine Chew: Right, thanks @Jeff. Looking forward to that, also.

01:09:10   Anne Aikman-Scalese:@ Steve - shouldn't you be deleting the phrase about the acceptance window commencing?

01:10:37   Steve Chan: @ Anne, updated…it was in brackets before

01:10:50   Steve Chan: Link for the document displayed here is: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1xDaENKupUoHSfIQ20klw0NYZK1Qwm43l56EvISHJi7Q/edit

01:11:23   Anne Aikman-Scalese:Re "Role of the SPIRT - may want to modify "launch' for consistency since we are sticking with approval of the final AGB

01:11:58   Steve Chan: Jeff, quick hand up if you don't mind

01:13:41   Justine Chew: 2. 2nd bullet, "With respect to the SPIRT" seems to be redundant text

01:14:30   Heather Forrest: In my view it's wise to utilise existing procedures where we have them and they are relevant.

01:15:56   Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Personally I agree @Heather

01:15:59   Anne Aikman-Scalese:@ Steve - the end of the rationale language has another reference to "launch"

01:17:39   Justine Chew: My concern would be timing

01:17:56   Justine Chew: +1 to what Jim raised

01:18:20   Heather Forrest: When we get there, I'd like to respond to Jim's question

01:18:52   Heather Forrest: No problem, ust don't forget me

01:18:55   Jim Prendergast: I had you in mind with "GNSO Council Experts"

01:19:05   Heather Forrest: I'm singing Simple Minds now, Jeff ;)

01:19:25   Heather Forrest: Thanks, Jim - a dubious title, for sure, but I'll take it ;)

01:20:56   Justine Chew: Am I correct in understanding that if an applicant raises an issue that goes through ICANN Org?

01:21:54   Anne Aikman-Scalese:I'm sure Heather will address the possible application of the Guidance and Input Mechanisms.   Possible conflict because those mechanisms take priority and so Council may want to invoke Guidance or Input if one Councilor raises it. Whatever we adopt should be consistent. One issue is how it is raised. The other issue is whether or not it goes to SPIRT or to one of the Annex processes.

01:22:47   Justine Chew: Including chairs of wound up PDP WGs?

01:23:13   Kathy Kleiman: But aren't we asking Council to *initiate* here?

01:23:19   Elaine Pruis: Since whatever the SPIRIT does is non-binding, it would be ok to make the hurdles to raise issues for consideration small

01:23:31   Jim Prendergast: What does GGP mean?

01:23:57   Steve Chan: GNSO Guidance Process

01:24:11   Jim Prendergast: thanks

01:24:20   Heather Forrest: True, Steve - there is the GIP, but that was designed for GNSO input on non-PDP-related matters

01:24:26   Heather Forrest: more ad-hoc stuff
01:24:56   Heather Forrest: Let's not be hamstrung by our Ops Procedures, is all I'm saying. We need to improve communications in the GNSO by reducing barriers rather than creating them
01:25:14   Kathy Kleiman: Tx Steve and Jim -- could we put the full words into the document for other readers (GNSO Guidance Process)?
01:25:50   Kathy Kleiman: Tx!
01:26:20   Elaine Pruis: It won't be effective if issues never make it to SPIRT for consideration
01:27:32   Heather Forrest: @Anne makes a good point about ensuring that Council maintains its connection and relevance to the SPIRIT team through open channels of communication.
01:28:24   Kathy Kleiman: +1 Anne and Heather
01:29:01   Justine Chew: Just repeating for confirmation -- Am I correct in understanding that if an applicant raises an issue, that goes through ICANN Org?
01:29:35   Anne Aikman-Scalese:Some members may want to bring the issue to the SPIRT team. Others may want an EPDP. When the issue is first raised by a Councilor, there will be discussions on these options.
01:29:47   Heather Forrest: Just to clarify, though - I didn't mean 'informally' in the sense that it's not documented and recorded. What I meant is that I always hesitate to create new processes as one-off exercises. If the GNSO Council wants to communicate with the SPIRT team and vice versa, that should be able to happen without a 'formal' process.
01:34:05   Anne Aikman-Scalese:@ Steve and Jeff - I would say "forward an issue to the SPIRT"
01:34:28   Justine Chew: I find it amusing that we are now attempting to stipulate how GNSO Council should "act", not that I'm against the attempt
01:35:33   Heather Forrest: Given that we're making recommendations, I tend to think that if we have a sense for what the mechanics should be, we should specify that in the recommendations
01:35:36   avri doria: why wouldn't that be a process issue for the GNSO Council to figure out based on its current state of process development?
01:35:54   Heather Forrest: We got burned in "round 1" for very high-level recommendations in some instances that, during implementation, took on a different flavour.
01:36:16   Anne Aikman-Scalese:@ Steve -- Jeff just used the word "forward" and that is the correct expression here (not "raise")
01:36:16   Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks @Heather   Perhaps our recommendation does not need to be *too* specific in design of Council Process but does require such a process allows for agility, timlyness, transparency accountability etc.,
01:36:32   Heather Forrest: @Avri - Council won't necessarily have control of it. Council will approve (or not) the PDP Final Report recommendations, and that largely ends things from a Council perspective.
01:36:51   Heather Forrest: I agree @Cheryl - we need to thread the needle here between too imprecise and too specific

01:39:14   Steve Chan: To Cheryl's point (and perhaps Heather), maybe it's more important to capture the expectations that are sought rather than trying to prescribe how the Council should operate.

01:41:32   Justine Chew: @Jeff, can we precede the bullets with a remark along the lines of "With expediency being the paramount parameter:"

01:41:42   Justine Chew: Under point 5

01:43:39   Anne Aikman-Scalese: I agree

01:47:04   Anne Aikman-Scalese: /Question - How can we provide incentives to the SPIRT to work quickly?

01:47:07   Justine Chew: Hand up

01:50:08   Justine Chew: Problem with mic.

01:51:02   Justine Chew: I didn't want to break your momentum. Wanted to go back to Point 5 and insert a remark before the bullets with respect to timing being of the essence

01:51:18   Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Time check we need to also fit on the AOB item

01:52:53   Heather Forrest: @Jeff quick response?

01:54:02   Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Plan is for regular touch base calls Yes @Jeff

01:54:02   Justine Chew: @Steve, I had inserted some comments on the other googledoc. Should I transfer them onto this discussion paper googledoc?

01:54:21   Cheryl Langdon-Orr: to facilitate any planning or coordination assistance that might be required

01:54:52   Heather Forrest: On composition - @Jeff, you often raise the value of consulting with past PDP leaders. I certainly agree that 'SPIRT should at a minimum include at least one participant from the original PDP WG and IRT'. Given that we're dealing with interpretation, and the size of this PDP, I would think that you and Cheryl would be excellent spokespeople, and also have the trust of the community to faithfully interpret any of the PDP recommendations.

01:55:03   Cheryl Langdon-Orr: so as much Council and Board co-ord as WG with those 2 parties

01:55:14   avri doria: and keep the number of surprises as low as possible,

01:55:16   Heather Forrest: What I mean is that I think we might want to mention here the expertise of PDP leadership in the composition of the SPIRT

01:55:27   Steve Chan: @Justine, without having seen them, not sure. I'd say if they're duplicative and/or more applicable to this document, then yes?

01:55:39   Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Noted Heather (and thanks ;-)

01:56:28   Jim Prendergast: yes - so no issues were discussed on this one but may be on future calls?

01:56:52   Cheryl Langdon-Orr: This was a starter call

01:57:06   Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Avri you comments here are welcome...

01:57:08   karen.lentz: No others set up at this point

01:57:47   Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Karen

01:58:53   Anne Aikman-Scalese: I think "at least one" is pretty limiting in terms of composition of the SPIRT team having PDP and IRT background. I think the recommendation should say "should include participants from the original PDP WG and IRT who can provide insight...." etc etc etc

01:59:06   Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks @Avri
01:59:28   Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Task Force
01:59:36   Justine Chew: GAC Focus Group on SubPro
01:59:50   Justine Chew: ?
01:59:52   Steve Chan: @Anne, not to argue the point, but simply to note that the language is lifted from the IRT Guidelines.
01:59:56   Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry yes Justine is correct
02:01:20   Justine Chew: I thought we're doing No 8 at the next call? ;)
02:01:26   Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Next Call is … … ….
02:01:35   Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes we are @Justine
02:01:46   Anne Aikman-Scalese:Ok thank you.
02:01:52   Steve Chan: 20:00 UTC
02:02:10   Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye for now talk more at end of week…
02:02:11   karen.lentz: thank you
02:02:12   avri doria: bye, thanks