

Adobe Connect Chat – GNSO Review WG – 27 April 2017

Nathalie Peregrine: Dear all, welcome to the GNSO Review WG Meeting on Thursday, 27 April 2017

Nathalie Peregrine: Wiki meeting page: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_o7bRAw&d=DwlCaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=PDD_FX3f4MVgkEli9GHvVoUhbecsvLhgsvXrxgtbL10DTBs0i1jYiBM_uTSDzggG&m=uNkxhYeeLNW1Wxu6NQNeD0gLFDx4mZqplcXNkyl1N30&s=3gvv4brbGPafWhC_JsMWvGv6tkpRoct4D2Z0YYaYCis&e=

Lori: I am having trouble dialing in. Could someone please dial out at +1-202-704-0408. Thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Yes of course.

Lori: I can hear you but my internet connection is in and out so phone is better for audio.

Lori: I am on the call!

Lori: Mike muted.

Lori: I put messages out to IPC. So far, no questions.

Nathalie Peregrine: Welcome Raifk

Nathalie Peregrine: and Donna!

Nathalie Peregrine: Welcome Jen!

Marika Konings: a new review is also being planned on the conflicts with local law procedure as requested by the GNSO Council.

avri doria: I am unclear on the degree of periodicity that is being requested. Monthly, quarterly, yearly, every n years??

avri doria: right, staff is requesting periodicity, what sort?

Lori: Continual reviews could be a waste a resources

Amr Elsadr: Periodic reviews are already requirements in the PDP Manual.

Sara Bockey: I think I just lost audio...

avri doria: even ongoing is periodic. just daily or weekly.

Sara Bockey: there you are :)

Nathalie Peregrine: @ Sara, I see your mic is muted, could you unmute please?

avri doria: reviewing them as they are done is ongoing without periodicity.

Nathalie Peregrine: We can also dial out to you

Berry Cobb: @Lori. The ERRP Review is now in the data collection phase. We're starting with complaint data from Compliance related to expiration of names. Data collection may also include a survey of sorts from Registrars/Registrants (TBD). A report will be compiled from Staff and once complete will be delivered to the GNSO Council for their review. Should the Council determine that additional policy work is required, the Council will then instruct staff to create an Issues Report for a possible PDP.

Sara Bockey: I can hear now. not sure what happened

Lori: @Berry, thank you. That is my concern, that there is some substantive community review.

Marika Konings: regarding periodicity - there may not need to be a one size fits all, there may be different triggering mechanisms. For example, the original policy recommendations may have included a specific timeframe by which recommendations need to be reviewed (I believe

IRTP is an example of that), there may be data that indicate that there is an issue that would trigger a review, or maybe if neither of those have happened in x years, an automatic review is kicked off (and remember, a review could say, everything is working as intended, no need to change anything)

Lori: Recommendation 8 is one of our consensus calls

Lori:The IRT has a lifecycle too, correct?

Lori:This sort of goes to Avri's point about intervals between reviews

Lori:Yes, this was an abundance of information. It appears that there is community oversight and flexibility.

Nathalie Peregrine>Welcome Pascal

Marika Konings:The CG considered this question but as no single member can speak for the GAC apart from the chair, there was no support for appointing a formal liaison. However, individual members are being encouraged to participate and additional mechanisms were put in place to facilitate GAC early engagement in GNSO policy development.

Marika Konings:so maybe that meets the objective of what a liaison role was trying to achieve?

Marika Konings:also noting that the key dependency here is a blocking factor as the GAC is not willing to assign formal liaisons

Amr Elsadr:I wonder if it would make a difference to the GAC that the liaison would be a non-binding, non-voting liaison?

Marika Konings:@Amr - from what I understood it is a principle issue, no one but the GAC Chair can represent the GAC, no matter in what capacity

Donna Austin:Correct Marika, and a longstanding principle issue.

Lori:I agree with Avri's point. This needs more thought and discussion.

Amr Elsadr:Yes, they've made that abundantly clear. :-)

avri doria:i still then there is a need for a formal liaison

Amr Elsadr:Agree Avri. The need is present and real. The mechanism to work that out is difficult.

Marika Konings:compared to a few years ago, we have seen increased participation by GAC members and there are definitely more mechanisms in place that make it difficult for the GAC to ignore the policy work that is going on, but it indeed it may not be enough, but if there is no willingness from the GAC to appoint a liaison, I'm not sure what the way around that is?

Amr Elsadr:Perhaps the Working Group can look into alternative mechanisms to keep the GAC updated on ongoing policy work that don't involve a formal liaison?

Rafik:liaison and individual gac members participation are complementing each other

Marika Konings:The WG may want to review the GAC-GNSO CG recommendations as this was exactly the focus of their work (which was recently completed with the recommendations adopted by both the GAC and the GNSO)

Marika Konings:and note that those recommendations contain within themselves mechanisms to review the recommendations should it turn out that there is still a lack of communication / engagement

avri doria:i.e we could have a liaison by another name? POC?

Pascal Bekono:in project/recommendation section, is it possible to mention in bracket the " two work streams "

Donna Austin: maybe Point of Contact would work, but it is a long shot

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: PoC looks better?

Amr Elsadr: GAC/GNSO CG Final Status Report and
Recommendations: <http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gac-gnsocg/attachments/20161011/0a179c42/GAC-GNSOCGFinalStatusReport-10October2016-0001.pdf>

Lori: Thanks for doing all of this great prep work

Lori: ciao!

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks all and bye

Amr Elsadr: Thanks all. Bye.

Sara Bockey: thanks all

avri doria: bye