
BUENOS AIRES – GAC Meetings
Thursday, June 25, 2015 – 08:30 to 12:30
ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Let's start. We have an agenda item 21 -- 28, sorry, which is led by Portugal, and she will inform us about ongoing discussions about the ICANN meeting strategy and the meeting structure, which will be different from next year on, with a shorter so-called "B" meeting, which is the one around June. So, Ana, the floor is yours.

ANA NEVES: Thank you, and good morning, everyone. So I think that you know that from 2016 we have a different format of our meetings. So we call them meeting A, B, and C.

Meeting A, it's more or less the format that we have nowadays. I think the thing that I would like to underline here is that we are going to have two public forum, so one in the morning, in the first -- in the third day, and the other one is business as usual.

The other thing that we should have on the meeting A is more time for cross-constituency work.

Meeting B, it will be the meeting for us, the community. So it was thought to have, really, work between us as GAC and among the other constituencies.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

So the way I see it is, like, together between us in small groups, discussing several things, and to have other meetings, informal meetings, with the other groups. And when I say "informal," it's a different format from what we have today. Because, for instance, when we meet with the ccNSO, so ccNSO is here, you are there, and we have, like, four or five questions, a presentation, and that's it. And I think that we have much more to discuss. And so when we were thinking about this new structure for the meetings, it was thought that this format of having only four days and really to have work, internal work, within the community would be a good idea.

So meeting B, something that we have to discuss is whether we are going to have a communique or not and whether we are going to have a meeting with the Board or not.

Meeting C is the bigger meeting in the year. So for us, again, it's more or less the same as meeting A. But again, more cross-community interaction should be developed.

Another thing that I think that some of us consider very important is to engage with the local community. And so in this meeting C, we could foresee perhaps some time to have meetings with the officials from the country where we are to discuss Internet and its politic policies.

And now maybe Tracey could present in a better way the structure, how we are thinking about it, and then -- because now we have to see that we have to adopt what we want in Dublin. Because from 2016, we will have a different structure.

TRACEY HIND:

Thank you, Ana.

I'm going to go through these -- first few of these slides fairly quickly because it's essentially what Ana has already shared with you.

The model is changing, and that's because there are so many conflicts because the meetings are so much bigger now than they used to be.

Next slide.

We do have to make the change. I remember somebody saying at the last meeting, "Oh, do we have to change ours?" But we do have to because the ICANN resources that support our meetings, all the lovely interpreters at the back, all of this marvelous equipment won't be available to us for more than the four days at meeting B, so we don't have a choice with that.

Next slide. Thanks.

So by Dublin we need to decide -- Can you just press a couple of times? That one is obviously not showing up.

We need to have a view by Dublin what the meetings are going to look like moving forward whether or not any of those changes actually need to flow into our operating principles work, because there may be things we need to change in the operating principles to support these meetings. Don't know. Ana will take the lead on that. And how we fit in with other SOs and ACs.

This slide that's up there now, that's the proposed -- sorry. Go back one.

That's the proposed structure from ICANN themselves about how they see this working.

Next one.

As Ana said, as she and I have been working on this, meeting A doesn't actually change terribly much. Whether or not ICANN are going to stick with what they've got on this high-level proposal, I'm not sure. Ana will know more, but they have all of these kind of public ceremonies and high-level topics and welcome forums on day three, so a little bit like the Monday now. That's something we could consider having no meetings on. But aside from that, there's not terribly much change to that one, really, is there?

Next slide.

This is the one that's got most of the changes and that you need to have the most conversations about. It's going to be only four days, and the four days ICANN hope will be focused on cross-community discussions. So there's a whole raft of ways that you can do that, and just through brainstorming, this is some of the ideas Ana and I came up with. But they will be, by no means, all of the ideas, and I'm sure you will invite your ideas after I finish this presentation. But things like not meeting with the Board or not doing a communique, saving time in those areas. Perhaps, because it's a shorter meeting, enhanced online remote participation so that more people participate remotely

rather than physically actually being here, potentially. And potentially focusing the work during the course of the day with other constituencies rather than the GAC talking to itself, as it were, in its own meeting room would allow an opening up of dialogue across the community without needing to add too much time to any days because you wouldn't have to actually speak be to the GAC during much of the day. Those were some ideas.

Next slide.

And this is the -- This is the meeting that's gotten bigger, and the focus of this one is on outreach.

This is potentially the one where the HLG, or the high-level government meeting, may reside or you may want to put it on a permanent basis simply because the focus of the rest of ICANN will be on outreach activity and it may be consistent as a theme, but you also may decide against that.

There's a possibility, because you've got extra time, to speak to government officials from the host nation, and to look outward to various constituencies and communities maybe that you don't always engage with, such as business stakeholders or registry groups during this meeting. Again, we're not sure. We just brainstormed it.

Next slide, thanks.

So the proposed next steps, Ana will continue to lead this, I will continue to support her and document material from the secretariat.

And possibly you might want to repurpose a previous GAC Meeting Strategy Working Group to look at this new meeting strategy.

Certainly work with SOs and ACs, which Ana has been involved with. And we need to have -- the most important business, we need to have a position -- or you need to have a position that you're ready to endorse by Dublin, because otherwise 2016 will be right on top of you and we won't be ready.

I think that's about it. That's the end of the presentation, I think, isn't it? Yeah. So back to Ana.

ANA NEVES:

Thank you very much. So as you may remember, everything come up from the Meeting Strategy Working Group. That, from the GAC, was myself, Suzanne from U.S., and Tracy from Trinidad and Tobago. And so now we are working with the other constituencies because everyone is trying to see how to make better use of our time. And everybody agrees that we need more time among ourselves because what we are discussing here, even if we have different objectives maybe, at the end of the day we are discussing the same thing, and it's much better if we know ourselves and our positions even in the GAC, and we need time for that.

So having this presentation made, I would like to know whether you have some questions, some concerns, and feel like to discuss meeting format B.

So....

Olga, Argentina.

ARGENTINA: Can I ask you a question?

ANA NEVES: Yes, sure.

ARGENTINA: Thank you, Ana, and thank you for the presentation, Tracey. By the way, for the record, I requested to be in that working group, and I sent all the papers that were quite complex, and for some reason I was never accepted. It got lost, it seems, in the exchange of emails. Not with you. With those organizing it.

But I have a general question. I think that the intention is that some meetings are smaller so they can fit into countries that cannot hold a meeting today. Is that right?

So if they're not going to limit the registration, how do you achieve a meeting to be smaller? That's kind of a philosophical question I have.

ANA NEVES: Well, this is a larger thing that is not a GAC decision; right? So I think that -- well, but it's not up to me to decide how this is going to be handled, but there will be no registration as we have for the time being for meeting B.

So as far as I understood so far is that we are going to have -- this meeting B is really for the community. So it's not for the -- for the world. So it's for us. It's for the community. So there is no exhibition, there's nothing, except us.

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO: Maybe I could respond to Olga's concern as well as ask a question, or make a suggestion as well. this is Trinidad and Tobago.

The meeting B will also have less rooms requirement. So the number of rooms -- One of the issues ICANN has is the physical number of rooms that are required for meetings. So though there will be people come to be the meeting, still, the hotel or facility doesn't require the same number of rooms. So countries who don't have large conference facilities can host the meetings. Even though the hotels may not be as large, they can still try and shuttle them in, if necessary.

One of the suggestions I have, perhaps, for meeting B, is now that we have working groups that are established in the GAC, perhaps we could utilize meeting B to also do working group type face-to-face sessions and have it more, maybe, cross-community. So similar as you already did with the -- I guess the Geographic Names Working Group, we can have more interaction with the community on those meetings, and maybe less plenary GAC sessions. That might be one way of dealing with the meeting B and achieving the objective.

Thank you.

ANA NEVES: Any other question?

Sorry? U.K.?

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thank you. Good morning. Thank you, Ana, for the presentation and handling this actually quite tricky reorientation of the meeting structure. So it's very important.

First of all, Marrakech, is that an A or C meeting? Is it kicking off -- It's an A, yeah. I just know we have the high-level governmental meeting at that A meeting, so I just make that observation.

For the meeting C, the outreach, I think that's a very important objective of ICANN and the GAC, and maybe one element of that meeting planning could be a GAC open forum that we've had previously. We make this a big opportunity to advance awareness of the GAC and the agenda, and so on.

My other point is I think we should always retain the option of issuing a communique with advice to the Board, whatever type of meeting we're at. I mean, I can't -- I can see situations where we may be pressing on important work and we will want to submit advice to the Board. I would not want to contemplate an extended period before we actually deliver a communique, as such, if that becomes -- if that is still the primary medium for submitting advice to the Board.

So that's my first reaction on that question about meeting B type and the question about communique issue. But willing to hear others on that, of course.

Thank you.

ANA NEVES:

Yes, that's right, Mark. Actually, in the ideal world, meeting B would be direct meeting only for internal work and for us to have meetings among ourselves. But, actually, there might be some pressure issues, and then we will -- that we have to work on. And because meeting A will be in March, in principle, and meeting C at the end of the year, so we have some month in between it that we are not going to -- to deliver any communique. So it's something that we think that we should think about it.

My point is whether we will need that all in meetings B that we will have communique, but it's something that's impossible to know and it's impossible to say that in the operating principles that in meeting B's we are not going to have any communique.

On the other hand, the communique obliges us to have plenary, plenary meetings. So I think that meeting B, we have to be very flexible and to see with the chair and vice chairs what will be the best model, the most appropriate model.

The thing is that we are not having this -- this cross-community work, and we are not having work among us, and we are not having work

with the host nation. So -- And these are several of the things that we thought that they should be surpassed with this new model.

So in meeting B, we'll only have four days, but maybe we'll have time for the communique and to meet in the different settings and informal settings. But maybe here we really have to count on the -- on the chair and vice chairs to decide on this.

I don't know. More comments? More thoughts about this, please?

NAMIBIA:

Thank you very much. I just want to support what the U.K. say. I think it's -- As governments, we have a lot of issues to discuss. We come from different parts of the world, and definitely in terms of the part where I come from, an official outcome of a week's deliberations would be some form of a communique or statement or something.

So I -- And of course when we pile up issues for the A meeting or the C meeting, I think we may be challenged in trying to pack all of them in a communique that has been piled up or that has come a long way for the whole year.

So a communique, in my opinion, would be an important outcome of our week's labor.

The second matter is the -- is just a brief one. I just want to refer to the terms of reference B. Of course, I think generally we will -- all members of GAC will identify, you know, areas for changes in the operating principles for the next, you know, foreseeable time. I just

don't want to have a -- a situation where you have the -- the working group on the meeting strategy, you know, have it as a terms of reference, perhaps, to identify changes to the operating principle where there is a committee for that. So maybe we can rephrase that a bit.

And the third matter is registration. I know it's a -- it's a contentious issue because we want to keep it limited, we want to keep it small, we want to do internal work, but if I understand correctly, there won't be registration for -- not necessarily maybe registration for the meeting. And that will not auger well; because sometimes in government we need to have an invitation to a meeting, so to speak. And, if you don't have an indication or a document that you can, you know, sometimes attest to your request for authorization for the meeting, especially in Africa where I come from, it's difficult to be released.

So it may eventually then lead to a situation where you don't have people attending. And then GAC may run the risk of not getting a quorum for our meetings. Thank you.

ANA NEVES:

Okay. Thank you. Well, very good questions for the debate.

So first point, the mission to operating principles. So we just put here the GAC operating principles. Because some of us should quote things, but it's not in our operating principles so it can't work like that. So this mention is only because, if it means that we have to change something on the operating principles, it can be done. That's it.

Period. So we are not going to discuss nothing about operating principles.

It's only to think that if you have to change them. So it's not because it's not foreseen in the operating principles that we're not going to have a new format of our meetings.

So -- the other point is the invitation to the meeting. Of course, everyone that is delegate to the GAC is going to be invited and have to be in the meeting.

So the point here for the others that are not part of the AC/SOs. So we are not talking here about the people that are part of the advisory committees and supporting organizations. Not at all.

So, of course, there will be invitation. Everything will be formal. When I'm talking about informality, it's more about our -- the kind of meetings that we might have or could have. So nothing about our work. On the work developed and that we have to have some outcome. Well, of course, we -- the communicate is not really a scenario of all the work we developed here, but it's more our advice to the Board. So it has been working like that.

But the point is that we don't really need a communicate to summarize the work or to make an outcome or formal about the work we have done during that -- during those four days.

So, again, there is a formality here. Meeting will be formal. The point is that the meeting will be for inside ICANN, not for outsiders. And,

when I mean outsiders, I mean all the people that are not part of the constituencies.

Iran.

IRAN:

Thank you. Good morning. Thank you very much for the arrangements.

I have little concerns about outside/inside, so on and so forth. One of the main issues in the process is openness, inclusiveness, and so on and so forth. And now we try to distinguish outside and inside and so on and so forth. This is one point.

Second point, at some previous meeting we decided that whatever we do will be open, except for the communique. So I don't understand that we tried to give this impression that we want to exclude some other people by devising a plan saying that these are outsiders, these are insiders, community, so on and so forth. I have some difficulty.

And the second issue is if I appropriately understand about our communique. I don't comment on that because I wait for your clarification. But, in our view, communique is the only important output of the GAC and must remain to be released as it is with the way that we have agreed at least since last year and so on and so forth.

So that is very important. And we don't want any arrangement of A, B, C and we have any impact on the way that we discuss the communique and we release the communique. So please kindly

consider that this outside and inside, or external or internal, it may be something that would not be consistent with the principle of the ICANN process. Thank you.

PORTUGAL:

Thank you. I'd like to react immediately. Sorry. When I'm talking about internal and outsider -- sorry -- it's because of my English. So it's all meetings will be open. Open. Totally open. So the point is that you can go anywhere, and anyone can come here.

So the main point here is that the meeting be -- should not be open to the to the world meaning that, if I'm not a member of GAC, if I became non-member of GAC, I could continue to come here to any meeting, right?

But in principle, in meeting B, the meeting should be really focused on all the people that are part of the advisory committees and supporting organizations.

So it will be the work for us. So there is nothing to do with openness. So openness will be here, of course. So openness is our main issue here. And it's because of openness that we want to have more dialogue with all the other members of the community. Regarding the communique is exactly what you said. So several concerns are raising here. That we must have a communique because it's foreseen and it's the only outcome you have from the GAC meetings. And it doesn't matter whether it has an advice for the board or not or if it is a

summary of our meetings. So okay. So it is exactly what we need to discuss. Thank you.

Spain?

SPAIN:

Thank you. And good morning to everyone.

Meetings A and B are more or less like the ones we know. Meeting B is going to be different. Well, only apparently different because ICANN seems to be fond of scheduling sessions before the meetings starts and after the meeting ends. So we never know if the meeting is going to last only four days. That's a side comment.

I have some concern with the possibility that there won't be interpretation services, transcription, and recording for meeting B and on the scarcity of physical meeting rooms, because that implies that maybe we are trying to attract less people to meeting B. I don't think it is in keeping with the outreach that not only ICANN but also GAC has endeavored to achieve throughout these years.

We want to enlarge GAC membership and GAC participation. If there are is no interpretation, no recording, transcription services and so on, that can be an issue for some countries to come to the meeting.

On top of that, if we don't have proper agenda, during the meeting people will be scattered out in different working groups, and there will only be a GAC gathering in the afternoon. I don't know whether some governments will give permission to their civil servants to come to the

meeting. Because they might see an appropriate agenda and the issues are going to be discussed and also an outcome.

What we have been discussing about the communique is an important point to get authorizations to come.

I'm also concerned that many GAC members are not members of Cross-Community Working Groups. I mean, working groups are from outside the GAC. So they may be a little bit lost. When they come here, they don't know where to go, which group to participate in. And, if meeting B is going to be poorly attended, it's going to be devoted to interactions with other constituencies and so on, it would not be fair to take any substantive decision in these meetings because many of the GAC members could not have participated in the meetings.

It's also proposed that in the afternoon people that are not attending physically the meetings they are in and give an update what has been going on during the day. But you have to take into account different time zones. And, when you are at home, it's very difficult to be all the time connected to the meeting; because you are in your office and you have distractions, you have other things to do. It maybe it's in the middle of the night that you're not going to connect to the GAC session to know what has been going on during the day.

So I have some concerns. On the one hand, as I said, for governments it's important to see an agenda and also to have an outcome. But, on the other hand, I'm worried that if we don't have enough participation, we shouldn't have an outcome. Because many people in the GAC would not have participated in discussions.

On the other hand, this meeting is structured is already approved. And we have to adjust to that.

But the proposal put forward for the meeting B is still not very mature for me. We'll have to think how to combine the need to enhance participation and inclusiveness with flexibility and making the most in that four days. Thank you.

ANA NEVES:

Okay. Thank you, Spain. I have U.S. and Morocco. I don't know -- you. Sorry. Thomas. Thomas. Chair.

Sorry.

Only to react immediately to one thing is that transcription and interpreting we'll have in meeting B for the four days. The thing is that there will not be these services aside these four days. But, during the four days, everything will be formal. When I was talking about informality, it was about to have meetings differently. So -- but everything will be formal. Invitations, meetings, et cetera.

But, if we stick to the plenaries, that's okay. That's what we are discussing here. So we have to mature this idea here.

So, Thomas, please.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. So, first of all, I've sent you a document which gives some information about how the GNSO is discussing this. I don't know

whether you've -- it has been sent around. But I can't remember whether it is only the leadership or all of you.

So something that you should need to know is that the SO/AC chairs have started to engage with each other on trying to exchange their reflections in their constituencies of how to use this as, for instance, it makes sense that there is some coordination. Because, if everybody agrees that there should be some time for community interaction, but they plan it internally so that they foresee different days for community interaction and for, let's say, internal action, then, of course, that won't work. And I think we can also see this meeting strategy as a chance -- in a sense, one thing is that the ICANN meetings may go to countries where otherwise they couldn't.

And I wouldn't talk of insiders and outsiders. I think one of the reflection why they think that the meetings will be smaller is not, for instance, because they expect less governments to come. Maybe on the country that may bring in more governments from that particular region. But you may know that there's a lot of business discussions and transactions prepared or discussed around the ICANN meetings.

So there are a number of people attending at least some ICANN meetings, depending also on the country and so on, that -- actually having business issues that are not, let's say, directly linked to the policy discussed in ICANN. And there's an assumption that these business transactions would concentrate more on the A and C meeting and there would be -- in particular, less people on the business side than on the B meetings. So I think it would not be the expectation at

all that there should be less people from governments in the B meeting, just to make that clear.

And then there are several things that we should think about. One is there are pros and cons for spending time on the communique drafting. I see the point of Iran that this is something we've always done. It's one of the key elements for us to give advice to the Board. So the question is: Can we afford to have only two occasions a year for giving policy advice in the communique to the Board or not?

This is something we may also have to test. And that may also depend on what other channels are for advising the Board. So we can always send letters at any time of the year to the Board. The question is then: How do we prepare -- or let's say to what extent do we need the time to talk to each other physically in a meeting before we can send out advice to the Board or to others? We may need to be a little bit innovative here and maybe just test a few things also in terms of intersessional work. We have now a number of working groups, which is also an opportunity but, at the same time, a challenge. If we are efficient in getting the bridge between the working groups and the GAC right, then that may actually be a relief for the GAC in terms of work, in terms of discussion.

Because things may be prepared in the working groups so that not the whole GAC needs to dive into every issue. But they can be brought to the GAC at a stage where things are already informally agreeable to key stakeholders or key countries in the GAC. If this is not well

coordinated, it may actually even enhance our work and make us less efficient. And I think it's the same here.

One of the elements that we may start to try and do more, which we had not done, but there has been several times that me and others have raised this, we could start doing an annual planning of issues with timelines, for instance, by saying this is something that is very urgent. We should have a GAC consensus over an issue in this or that particular moment while other things are less urgent. So we will not discuss them in one meeting, but we'll actually schedule the discussion on this meet -- on a particular issue on another meeting. So, like, a yearly planning of priority and issues is something that the GAC so far, at least to my recollection, has never done which we may start doing:

And there are a number of issues that may help us, actually, to use this new meeting structure in a way that it offers new opportunities. And I think we shouldn't just see it as we have less time in the B meeting, and this is a problem. And then again the question is: How do we, in consultation with others, think that we can best interact with the others? Maybe we could -- if we agree with all the others, we could do, like, a one-day town hall meeting where everybody, everybody gets together. And, instead of discussing the same issues one hour with the GNSO, one hour with the ccNSO, one hour with the ALAC, we may all sit together and get more things done in a more open, more interactive way. So there are lots of ways to actually try out things. It's -- we won't know before we do things whether we -- whether they work in some areas.

So this is just a little bit of information and food for thought. But the thing is -- and Ana and Tracy is right -- we need to have some of a plan in Dublin for what we would at least try out for the next year. Thank you.

ANA NEVES: Yes. Thank you, Thomas, very much. It's exactly what I tried to convey. So Suzanne, U.S., please.

UNITED STATES: Thank you, Ana. And thank you, Thomas, for providing that overview.

I worked with Tracy and Ana on the cross-community meeting strategy working group. And it was several intense meetings over several days really thrashing out, white boarding different options. But I think Ana has struck this note to try to convey to us -- and I think Thomas, thank you for reminding us -- the real key point was to get the SOs and ACs together. We all complain about this. Many of us who have been coming to meetings, we all operate in silos. And the idea was to remove all of that. So it's a little less formal, perhaps. We have to adjust. I think you're right. We treat it as an experiment.

And we have to work a little harder, perhaps, in advance to identify the issues that are of mutual interest from different perspectives. And it's intended to use those days that we are trying to mesh our respective work plans a little bit differently, better, if I may say, because right now it's a struggle.

And it often falls to the SO/AC chairs themselves, which is an extra burden. So, to me, I see this as you can mobilize the GAC to actually facilitate those interactions. So it's not intended to cut anybody out. But it was intended, I think, to remove the formality of an opening session with very senior officials welcoming us. And it's not intended to deny that opportunity to a host country, just to structure the sessions very, very differently.

So perhaps there will be some educational sessions as we do now. Or maybe less. Because, if there is work that each SO and AC has identified where they wish to get the other SO and AC's perspectives, those are the four days to do that.

So I think you're quite right. Thank you for all the preparation. Perhaps what we might want to do is make sure people go back and read the meeting strategy working group recommendations. Because then I think it will take you through the history of what that group is trying to achieve. Thank you.

ANA NEVES:

Thank you, Suzanne. It's good if you could read, again, all the recommendations and what was really adopted and what the purpose is. Because it seems like we are rediscussing the basics. So -- and we should be here now maturing the idea how to form the meetings from 2016 on.

And now I have Morocco.

MOROCCO:

Thank you very much. Morocco speaking. First of all, I would like to express my appreciation from the point of view of Morocco to Portugal because of the efforts to organize the GAC work and for the positive interaction with the other constituencies. I know that all GAC members are flexible enough and the GAC cannot become a force of reluctance. Because we understand the change is needed, and we are in favor of change. And, as a great philosopher said, nothing is permanent except for change.

I would like to talk about the communique once again. As it was mentioned by the representative of U.K. and Namibia and Iran, I think that the communique is the only document produced by GAC with respect to all the issues relevant for governments. We should bear in mind that we are here representing our governments. And so we must also report to them all the talks and all the topics discussed at GAC. We have to be flexible with respect to the format of the meetings. And we may also express our preference so as to continue producing the communique.

The B meeting should not be seen in isolation. It's a meeting that is part of meetings A and C.

And so we consider that this meeting is a possibility to better interact with other communities. Because we have seen what we talked with the other constituencies and the Board that we only have one hour of discussion. And sometimes is quite frustrating because we would like to continue our discussions and develop our ideas and proposal even further.

So my proposal is that the meeting agenda, with other the constituencies and taking advice to GAC view, be defined beforehand so as to know in advance what we're going to do and our message can be better conveyed to the other constituencies within the framework of this interaction. Thank you very much.

ANA NEVES: Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Madam. I have to leave in 10 minutes to got to the ICG meeting. As a member of that, I should be there.

I think that any actions relating to improve the situation is welcome. Any action which provide more possibility for other host countries with less availability than today is almost welcome.

I think the reflection on that whether we should have a separate meeting with the GNSO, ccNSO, and so on and so forth whatever we should have more or less combine them in one group or two group is also welcome.

But I wish to say that, if at some stage we decide to go to option, perhaps, B, it should be on the provisional basis for some time. In the meantime, within that year, we correct or remedy any deficiency. If at the end of that we come to the point that, no, it is not an improvement, we should come back to the original option A.

So that -- nothing should be permanent. So we should be -- we should have the possibility for coming back to any options which was working. But it is good to try.

One thing is important. About interpretations, I'm not concerned. I don't want to speak any of those languages. I am obliged to speak only one language, and that it is this.

But I think for some people it is important to have the ability to participate in some discussions. And, apart from that, transcription of some of those discussions on delicate point is important for them when they go back to their capital to look at that transcription and to identify or understand what was the comments made by various delegations. So transcription with respect to those issues should not be sacrificed for the -- for the economy and so on and so forth. That is very important. And that is why this captioning and transcription was proposed at the beginning. So we have to look at the transcription to see which area we need transcription. For instance, if you want to talk about the GAC communique, transcription of that is required. Because, during the communique we discuss, people make their comments, and we have to see who has said what that brought us to that conclusion. That is important.

So we have to look at that one. But I take your advice that between now and Dublin we carefully read this and perhaps have a better idea at Dublin meeting. So excuse me. Excuse me if I go out for the ICG in 10 minutes. Thank you.

ANA NEVES: Thank you very much, Iran.

OAS: This is OAS.

Just one observation, just in terms of meeting. I wanted to support what Morocco said in terms of the preparatory work leading up to the meeting is what would be critical. But I think what would be a miss of us as GAC, whether as members or observers, is having participated with a particular mandate for each Cross-Community Working Group, there has to be some space where it's collated and circulated to the entire membership. Because you'd have had different discussions and points being taken to the groups for discussion, and there would have been an outcome coming out of that representation to those Cross-Community Working Groups.

So I think it's essential to decide, based on the structure of meeting B, which I think it's fine, is how would we actually pull it back together if there's no communique? And how would the positions based on those interactions be communicated to all the members who would not have participated in the various working groups?

So I think that's the parts that's missing to actually tie meeting B and meeting C together.

Thank you.

ANA NEVES: Thank you very much.

So I think that if we take, for instance, this example that you and other colleagues from GAC have a meeting with some colleagues from the GNSO on one of the working groups that you are not now discussing on one of the subjects, it's something that you will develop and interact in an informal way. But then you can come back to the GAC, and you can share what the outcome is. But the most important thing is that you discussed with the other colleagues that you know them better and you know better what their ideas and concerns are. So you learn a lot, and you can share that with us. And this can happen with many other colleagues.

So this is the informal part of the formal GAC meeting B. This can be one of the models that we can have in meeting B that we cannot now have.

So I feel very frustrated here when I have the meetings with the GNSO, ccNSO and I don't -- I don't say anything. I'm just listening. And I think that I have a lot to say, or better to understand, but this is not the right setting.

So when we discussed this new format that was adopted, it was really how we can engage with the others that we are not really understanding their concerns. And GAC, for instance, is not well perceived at all. So governments, we have a problem because the others, they don't understand us. So this is the opportunity as well for them to understand what public policies are and that we are concerned with everybody. With businesses, with consumers, with the private sector, academia, the technical community.

So it is a very good opportunity for governments to engage with the others, but not to forget, never, of course, that these meetings are formal and that members and observers of GAC, they have to be in these meetings.

So the point is to engage in a different way and in depth.

Any other questions, concerns? Something that can....

Indonesia.

INDONESIA:

Just want to get a bit of clarification. So when we are talking about several meetings, we have the plenary like this, and we can have the time to go to the other S.O., ACs and whatever. Do we, at that meeting, we also have -- what you call it? The voice for the decision voice or whatever in the SOs and ACs?

I'm asking this because not all countries are represented also in the S.O., A.C., and so on. Like in Indonesia, for example. In many meetings, only the government comes because of the many limitation and the limit of capabilities. Many communities' organization cannot afford to come to the SOs and ACs -- other ACs and SOs meetings. So when we come to that meetings, do we have also the same level of presence and voice and decision in that SO/AC meeting?

Thank you.

ANA NEVES:

Thank you. I'm not sure if I really catch your -- what you said in the -- in the (indiscernible) way, because for instance, Portugal, Portugal, we are like three here in all the advisory committees and supporting organizations, and that is not the issues here. It's not a nationality thing. It's more about the work that we do in each constituency here.

But I think that all these, questions, I think that we have to reflect on them. And I think that as a step forward, we could keep in mind the resolution that was adopted already on the new format of the meetings of ICANN and to pick in each part of the resolution, and then to propose something for the Dublin meeting, because I know that we are all overloaded with all document and many documents, all the work back home. And I think that with some help from the secretariat, I think that we can go to the resolution and pick up the main parts that are important for our new mom and to try to make a proposal to be adopted in Dublin.

Thomas, do you think it's a good approach?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Yeah.

ANA NEVES:

So if -- Singapore.

SINGAPORE:

Thank you, Chair.

If you don't have the GAC plenary meetings for meeting B, which means that compared to now, we'd only have two GAC meetings in a year, and if GAC has to be effective and giving timely advice to the ICANN Board, then we have to think about whether are we functioning effectively by having two GAC meetings in the year going forward compared to the two meetings now?

Now, we don't disagree with this interaction of S.O. and A.C. We can try it out. I think that it's a good initiative. We should try it out. But I think the GAC should keep the flexibility of if it doesn't turn out well, I think we should still make use of meeting B to have a GAC meeting.

We can identify a very limited agenda for meeting B those very urgent and pressing issues where ICANN Board is waiting for GAC's advice, and we should have the flexibility to add into a very limited agenda and make use of the meeting B to discuss, to form position and give advice to ICANN. That is very important, and I really -- I agree a lot of comments made by Spain and -- if it doesn't turn out well, efficiently, interacting with S.O. and A.C., and we should start over thinking whether we can keep the present model of three GAC meetings in the year.

Okay. Thank you very much.

ANA NEVES:

Okay. Thank you very much, Singapore.

Thomas, I think --

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Just quickly. I don't think we have to decide now that we have only two GAC meetings, because if you look at what the GNSO is doing, they have their -- what they call it, in their boxes and matrixes, they have parts that says -- what do they call it? They have an intra part of the work which is GNSO internal, and then -- intercommunity and intracommunity. So there is a part that they stay together and there is a part that they use for exchanges with others.

So we have four days, so we can decide about how many days we actually spend on our own and how many days and which ones or parts of days we spend with the others.

For instance, if we say, okay, we have one or two days where we only discuss together, we have no exchange with the others, ideally these would be the days where the others do the same, and then we can still, if this is wanted, use these days to then produce a communique or any kind of advice during these days.

So it's not a black-and-white thing. So this is up to us to decide what we want.

Thank you.

ANA NEVES: Thank you.

U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thank you very much.

I recall there was an idea that two of the meetings would be in fixed locations. Maybe the hubs. Is that gone? Is that idea gone?

So the meetings will be all rotating around the continents as previously; right. Okay. Thanks.

I thought there was a germ of a good idea there, you know, in terms of predictability, resources, facilities to cater for meetings, and so on.

No. Okay. If it's gone, all right.

Thanks.

ANA NEVES: I think not everybody really agreed with that, so I think that meetings will keep rotating. The thing, the different thing is that meeting B can be hosted by a smaller country.

Thomas.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Just to respond to Mark. That was mainly a political reason that it shouldn't always be in the same places, because -- and now there is -- there is a presentation by ICANN staff, by Nick Tomasso, that actually shows the regions that are planned, when in which region, and A, B, and C meeting -- I'm not sure if this has been distributed to the GAC. In

case not, perhaps we would ask Olof to distribute or redistribute this. But there was a presentation that Nick Tomasso gave, and I've seen it earlier, so that you can see the distribution and some other ideas and arguments. So maybe it would be good to share that with everybody.

ANA NEVES:

Yes, it's very good idea. Nick Tomasso presented there in Singapore. Yeah, right.

So -- So we are going to reflect on what you said. And as I was proposing, I think that we could pick up some of the more important elements from the resolution adopted on the new format of the meetings, and then to have a good document to be adopted by Dublin.

Okay? Thank you very much.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, very much, Ana, for reading this session.

The next item, we decided to switch 29 and 30 to allow people to attend other sessions that they really have to, but because we felt the operating principle discussion, as we have already seen in this meeting, is something that is very dear to many of us, and we will take this very seriously to do this properly and allow for all those who wish to discuss and possibly amount the operating principles to have a chance to raise this.

So let me give the floor to Henri as the lead on the operating principles working group to inform us about their plans.

HENRI KASSEN:

Thank you, Thomas.

Good day, colleagues. I have been asked to, and accepted, to chair and to coordinate the activities concerning a very contentious, hopefully not too much, issue concerning the review of the operating principles. Thank you for the trust and confidence that you have placed in me in coordinating this work.

I am not -- It's actually my first time to -- sort of a maiden presentation. I've been silent, but my apology first also for not circulating the terms of reference earlier. I know there was an email some two, three months ago where we indicated that we will do that, but we needed to do some more work.

Secondly, I asked Tom, I'm not so conversant with the colleagues in meetings where I am. I have name cards so I could see that would be Germany, this would be France, this would be Gabon, this would be Senegal. So I will ask Tom to assist with the floor so that I can at least focus on my iPad and yourself.

The objective, of course, is to present to GAC the working group draft terms of reference as a fourth review. We have had a review three times: in 2005, 2010, and '11 in Dakar. So it is, of course, opportune and necessary now to look at it. A lot has happened since 2011.

The outcome would be an initial consideration by GAC of the draft terms of reference which was circulated on Sunday, 21st of June, earlier this week.

So the paper provides an overview of the review of GAC Operating Principles Working Group. I just looked at the short name, since in ICANN we like to have abbreviations, and I saw it can be called RoP -- ROPWG. And in my vernacular language, a RoP is sometimes referred to as a seal. So that is very, very contentious and very complicated in Namibia, the whole issue of harvesting of seals, so I would rather avoid using the abbreviation.

So the -- Of course the context of the working group is to undertake a comprehensive review of the GAC principles, operating principles, and provide GAC with recommendations for a revised set of principles.

We had a brief run on the minor review process, and we, of course -- I notice how interesting and how contentious the issues may be. But we have received a number of proposals so far already, including colleagues that has indicated their interest to be part of the committee. I've noted -- I've noted the names, of course, we have to get to putting a committee together.

The objectives -- the working group objectives is, of course, the risk consensus on changes. It's very important that we -- very important things have been raised. Changes in the past few months or years, even, has, of course, come up. There is a huge bank of history behind this. My distinguished colleague from the U.S. have reminded that

there has been work done on this some time back before I came on the scene. So possibly this is a fresh input that you will get from me.

And of course the matters is wide ranging. We are going to look at the GAC operating principles from page 1 to page 50 -- or from principle 1 to principle 54.

Where, of course, consensus cannot be reached, we will recommend to the whole GAC with a view to initiate -- Oh, where consensus is reached, of course we will have to go, then, into the formal process in Article XV, principle 53. 52 and -3. The key points for the working group is, of course, now to draft the terms of reference, and it has already been circulated. In the weeks following our meeting now, GAC members are invited to review and comment on the draft terms of reference. And we would, for experience sake, request that it goes to the ACIG email list, either Tracey or Tom or Michelle. And then a revised document will be circulated and presented for final acceptance. And that, on my notes here, is dots. We still need to take advice from you today.

So in terms of the history, we -- we have briefly -- Let's get the next slide, perhaps.

No. No, that's the last one. The next one.

There's a background slide just to indicate, and this is something that I think Tracey sent me this slide, and my iPad played a trick on me and it was playing like this, so I think it's the same. Yeah?

So -- But it's basically just a quick timeline that in the last review was 2011 in Dakar. There was, of course, the Working Methods Working Group that was established that dealt with working methods within GAC, and a good basis, starting point, if you wish, for our working group. So we'll pick up from there.

Then in 2014, then there was the need or calculated GAC five vice chairs that was driving an immediate need for changes to the document. And also this is when the seed for this committee was planted.

So we have started in 2004 about working on initial ideas. Of course, 2005 in Singapore the committee was -- has taken shape. And, of course, we have just approved the changes to the -- to the operating principles to provide for five vice chairs. The electronic voting arrangements will now be part of the terms of reference of the committee.

And today we are presenting the draft terms for your consideration in terms of discussion and -- discussion. And discussion. Because, if there's a miracle, you will be able to say, yes, we adopt these terms of reference. But that's a miracle. It's -- we're not yet -- I do believe in that. So -- so that can happen. There's the slide up. Just a timeline with a background.

And then the next slide would then be an idea of -- the terms of reference in one sentence. The next slide, please. And then the deliverables. What do we want to achieve? Developing a list of

principles where change is proposed or suggested. Develop a process for review, discussion, and reaching consensus that is the action plan.

Review each principle where change is proposed and where it's necessary. And then preparing a briefing papers for GAC to provide updates about the process of the working group.

I know that we have been waiting for putting our shoulder to the wheel. We've been waiting to start work. So my plea is that the approval of the terms of reference as a -- you know, as a person with some legal background. The terms of reference will be the starting point. So, if we start to do some work and then, if someone stands up and say if the terms of reference are approved, then not yet. We are wasting our time. So let's start with the terms of reference approval so that we can get our marching orders.

The next steps then is a murky pool of confusion at this stage because it's full of question marks. The first one would be for GAC to comment, of course, offline or online now after the B meeting, to comment on the terms of reference. And I would like to put a date there. I know that we said the adoption would be at Dublin. So the next step would be to adopt the terms of reference officially so that we have our marching orders. And we were saying in our email around Dublin. And I pray that someone will say no, Dublin is too far. Let's just approve it in the next two weeks.

And then the third is invitation to submit proposals. Of course, it's open already. So we can already start making our views known. And then I have a question mark until when. And that is where the murkier

part comes in. Because we said minor changes is essential for BA so that we can have, when we have elections in Dublin, we are covered. But the holistic review is a longer period, is not that critical. So -- but how long, I think? That's a question that we need to have in mind.

Then, fourthly, to -- of course, we submit progress report in -- to the A, B, and C meetings as what every time when we meet. And then submission of proposed changes to GAC. Eventually, we have, of course, in terms of principle 53, the 60-day period. And 53 actually says -- I don't know this type of English. But it says it must sit for 60 days. I don't know, "sit" is a very inactive activity. So I don't know whether sit means it's just silent and it doesn't say anything and nobody must say anything about it. But 60 days -- and I hope we will change that word to say maybe to not that it sits but that it is reviewed or considered over a period of 60 days.

So there's a lot of question marks in terms of the next steps. We don't have a slide for that. But I would want, in summary, just to plea that we -- you work with -- we work together to get the terms of reference approved as soon as possible. Dublin is a safe time frame. But, if it can be done earlier, it will be welcome. So that is the -- my submission. And I would like to invite comments on that.

Thank you.

Thank you. The United States.

UNITED STATES:

Thank you, Namibia. I appreciate the opportunity to chime in. And thank you for volunteering to take this on. There is, indeed, a long history of attempted revisions to the operating principles. And, if I recall, there was a fairly comprehensive attempt prior to 2011. So in 2011 in Dakar, I think the key change we made was to clarify the basis or the source for the GAC's consensus-based policy development. We did the explicit reference to the U.N. definition of consensus. I don't recall us doing a whole lot more with the text at that time.

So, if the secretariat has any ability to comb through the ancient old archives on the GAC Web site, if, to the extent they exist, there were earlier versions, I think there was a colleague from the EU Commission at the time, Bill Dee, actually did a completely comprehensive post review. And I think we must have been overtaken with other work and other priorities. But it might not be a bad idea to try to find that, if at all possible.

I would like to propose that we shoot for a far earlier timeline than Dublin to approve the terms of reference. I would like to think we can do that within the space of several weeks so that the working group can actually start entertaining edits, proposed edits to the current operating principles. I'm afraid that, if we kick the can too long, it always looks like a daunting task. Whoever drafted the original ones had a lot of time on their hands. Because it's an extremely long document with a lot of sort of duplicative, if I may -- it's not necessarily very polite -- but a lot of repetitive sort of duplicative sort of provisions that I think we can really streamline. My colleague from Austria once

suggested that we could probably cut this down to three pages, if I recall, instead of however many pages it is.

So I do think the sooner we get to work the better. Because, as Australia noted yesterday and I would still like to point out, in the event we need to hold elections, we absolutely need to clarify who has standing to vote in those elections.

So I'm certainly game. I don't know that you've created a working group email list, but I'm more than happy to volunteer. Happy to coordinate with colleagues. And I would urge a very early date to approve the terms of reference and to actually start the work.

And apologies in advance. I believe the CCWG meeting has been moved up to 10:15. So I will also be exiting the room shortly. Thank you.

NAMIBIA:

Thank you, United States, for the -- for your comments. And yes, as you know, as this is sort of having a -- an impact in terms of a legal assignment, but we don't want to make it a legal document, although it is, but not a legal document to litigate on because then it may not be three pages at the end of the day. It may be 300 pages. Because lawyers always have to say every little thing. So I will, by all means, try to avoid that. But thank you for the support that we tried to get the terms of reference approved within the next three to four weeks probably by end of July.

Any other comments? Thank you. Switzerland or the chair?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Just to build on what the U.S. said, I actually do have in my folders of my computer some older versions of 2010 and so on about the work that Bill Dee and others did. So I can see whether they are still functioning in terms of opening and so on. I will send them to Henri, of course, so we have this as a basis.

And then I think, as we always said, it's important that everybody can raise any issues that they will look at every single paragraph of the operating principles. Then we would need to decide on whether there were some issues that we would advance or whether we want to insist that everything needs to be agreed until changes are made. So there are different views probably. Thank you, Henri.

HENRI KASSEN: Thank you, Thomas. Any other comments? I know that we have been -- there's been a strenuous week for us, and we are touching the closure of the meeting. So, colleagues -- but, of course, I think silence or the calmness now is not an indication of what's coming after BA when we get on the planes and we're back in our offices or back at home. Then the floodgates will open. And we will -- which I welcome. And then we will find the ingenious comments and improvement proposals from every one of you. Thank you very much. Any other comment?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much, Henri, for conducting this session in a very nice way.

If there are no more requests for the floor, then I think we start our coffee break and meet again at 10:30 looking at the Web site. Thank you.

[Coffee break]

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Welcome back. Please do sit down. Tom has circulated to you the decision and next steps paper that we were referring to yesterday. And this is something that I would like to raise with you regarding this compiling -- asking for input from GAC members on answers to these questions.

We have started to discuss about the CCWG. And we've heard that -- and you see it in the email of Julia from Denmark that she just sent to the whole GAC.

We have agreed on a deadline on the 14th of July for all GAC members to send answers to us, which we would then forward to the -- to the CCWG as compiled input from all GAC members. But, apparently, the CCWG is, basically, compiling input as well. And Julia urged us that we would make the deadline slightly shorter so that the input from GAC members goes to the CCWG in time so that they can actually put it in their paper that they will produce, like, one or two days before the meeting.

So we propose to you to go to Friday of the week before the face-to-face meeting in Paris, which is the 10th of July. So you also see it already in the decision -- in the list of decisions that we've already provisionally amended it. So, if it's okay for you, the deadline for submitting answers to the questions that you will receive is 10 July. So that would allow us to then feed this list into the CCWG work that they can put it in their compilation.

I hope that this is acceptable. So I see no objections. So take this as accepted.

And this document that -- with the decisions and next action items is something that will be completed with the decisions we take today. So what you have now is -- takes into account all the decisions that were made until yesterday. And what we discuss and decide today will be added once we finished our session. And then a final version of that decision document will be sent out to you after today when we have closed the session. Thank you.

So next on the agenda we have -- as we switched things, we have an update on the GAC Web site and a discussion with a -- hopefully, with a decision on some clarification about the travel support rules.

So let's start with the update on the Web site. And we have lead is Tracy from Trinidad and Tobago. Thank you, Tracy.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

Thank you very much, Thomas. Working with me on the Web site is the ACIG secretariat and the GAC ICANN staff. So they can, I guess, interject at any point in time. Tracey from the ACIG secretariat. So Tracey and Tracy working together on this.

All right. So just so you can see -- next slide, please. The current GAC Web site was created in 2011.

TRACEY HIND:

It's not rendering.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Yeah. Some work has been ongoing on that ever since. But not until 2014 has a decision been taken to do some significant revamping of the site. That's when we bring on the ACIG as a secretariat. As you recall, a survey was sent out to users in 2014. GAC members filled it out and came up with some gaps and some needs that we attempted to fill. And since then we've been working with the ICANN staff to see how best we can treat the issue moving forward with 2015, which is effectively now.

Next slide, please.

So, unfortunately, you're not seeing the graphics.

TRACEY HIND: The slides are not rendering properly.

TRACY HACKSHAW: That's okay. I think we'll move pretty quickly through it. So the -- on the left of the -- unfortunately, you're not seeing the graphics. But on the left-hand side, it's the -- is it left? Left-hand side you're seeing the new project, which is the streams of activity happening there. And in that we're attempting to work alongside the ICANN approach, which is there's a common approach for ACs and SOs in dealing with the content and developing personas and so on. And the ALAC is actually one of the first projects that they're working on today. And their Web site is currently being revamped, and we're using that as a model.

Okay. This slide is gone.

So on the right-hand side -- okay. Excellent. There we go. Okay. Good.

Right. So there we go.

On the right-hand side, which is the green, we are also doing some rework of the current Web site so that there's some particular issues that were identified by ourselves as well as yourselves in terms of addressing the gaps in the current work. And, as you can see there, we are talking about doing some of that work today. And some of that work has already been moving forward in terms of developing a search for the overall GAC Web site which has been missing for some time, removing duplication of content, trying to have better navigation of the existing content, and so on.

The whole point of this is that we try -- we're reliant on ICANN staff, on the one hand, in terms of the revamp of the existing sites as well as the new site to move it forward. And we're looking at the GAC for some guidance on how we can proceed next. If you look at the next slide.

The proposed approach is to almost shadow the existing work of the ALAC site. But the ALAC Web site, as we've discovered in this meeting, is still quite far behind, which means that our intention of having a Web site ready by the end of 2015/2016, seems to be challenged significantly. Because ALAC Web site doesn't seem to be ready in that time frame as well. And we're starting after the ALAC Web site. And we're looking at ICANN staff to address those time frames. But, as you can see on this slide, we don't really have an overall even start date, if you want to call it that, as well as an end date for this project.

So from the chair, vice chairs, and from the GAC -- next slide, please -- we're hoping to get some maybe a trigger for the project to move forward a little faster. And we're asking the GAC to agree to -- we're, of course, continuing to move the project forward with Trinidad and Tobago as the lead, perhaps each creating a task force of some sort within the GAC that we can actually call the GAC staff -- I'm sorry -- the ICANN staff to work with us in a more structured way and perhaps ask the GAC chair and executive to write to ICANN in some form asking them to provide some guidance and time frames.

We also are looking for volunteers from the GAC. I recall in a previous iteration we had Singapore. We had Paraguay volunteering to assist. Any further members we're willing to bring on to this task force. So please do send your names to the secretariat.

And we want to thank Julia and the ICANN support staff for continuing to develop the site and revamp the existing site. And, if there are any concerns you have for the existing site today, please do continue to send them to us so we can address them quickly.

I think that's about it for the wrap-up, unless anyone has any questions or unless Tracey wants to add anything. I think that's about it for me, Thomas.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Tracy.

Any comments or comments on Web site and on the concept and the proposed way ahead as well?

If that is not -- Spain.

SPAIN:

I propose that we prioritize the issues that should be tackled in order to improve the GAC Web site given that we don't have certainty as to when we will receive the ICANN staff support in order to revamp the GAC Web site.

So, if that's -- that is the case, maybe we can start with the things that needs improvement more urgently than others. And that is structured the work if it's feasible.

For instance, the GAC register of advice is really difficult to navigate through. And it's not complete. But this is just an idea. Thank you.

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO:

Yes. And, again, that's the kind of input we're looking for that we can work with the existing site and the existing secretariat staff to see how best we can improve the existing site as well as take that forward for the new sites. I believe there's maybe some approach we can use in terms of doing a requirements document and having that be agreed to by ICANN staff and a timeline being assessed so we can add that to it as well. So sort of a parallel activity.

And we hope that we'll improve the existing site, given that there likely will be a delay in delivering that site by the end of this year and perhaps incorporate that new content into the new work into the plan, the new GAC Web site.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Further comments or questions? If not, then let's try to be clear on the next steps. First of all, I think everybody agrees that Trinidad and Tobago will continue to have the lead. And then, of course, I'm happy to write to ICANN to tell them what we expect and give them an idea of what we would expect and then ask them until when and if -- and, if so, until when and how they can deliver this. So for the temporary -- for the reworking of the existing Web site as an engine, what exactly is the input that you would need still in order to be able to do this? Maybe you can clarify this.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Right now the current Web site is being worked on literally by Julia along with, I think she says, one person from ICANN. It does take some time. But she is working to get that done. The challenge we face is the way the current Web site is configured, some of the things that are required, even what Gema is suggesting, is very hard to deliver. So reformatting the register advice might have technical challenges with the current platform. So we'll do what we can, but we'll take the information and the requirement forward. So that will go into the -- as you're recommending, some sort of letter that will be prioritized the new Web site, perhaps even delivered as a piece of functionality first and so on. But the issue really is that the current Web site, current platform is very hard to work with to deliver the new functionality we're looking for. And we're doing what we can with the content we have.

And I'm advised that the current site, which is a wiki environment, is not supported -- or will not be supported in the future. Yeah. So it's -- it's going away.

It's going away. So it's very difficult to get new functionality deployed.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Okay. Questions? Comments? So I think let's just follow all channels like working on the existing one, to the extent this is feasible and reasonable, and at the same time continue to develop the new one and also to get the clarity from ICANN to what extent and how they can support us. Or, if they couldn't, then we would need to look for alternatives on how to get a Web site out of the ICANN system if we would -- the GAC would think that what ICANN can give us is not sufficient. This would be an ultimate consequence. But I hope that we won't get there. So I hope that we will get a Web site that -- from ICANN in the system that will work for us.

So thank you, Tracy, for following this up. And we look forward to hear more from you and also, of course, from the secretariat on this issue.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

I think just, whenever you, as users of the Web site, have some ideas or things that you realize when using it for free to forwarding ideas -- to

continue to forwarding ideas to Tracy and the secretariat. And they will try to see what is possible.

So thank you very much, Tracy.

We have, actually, a second. This is a split session in the sense that we didn't have enough slots but we have two items that we need to discuss. The second item, as already alluded to and as you see on the item heading in the agenda, is the issue of travel support.

We have some regulation -- maybe I find a better word for this. We have some rules for travel support, who gets travel support, under what conditions, and so on and so forth. And there has been a feeling that these rules were not fully clear or fully coherent, and we've had some previous discussions and also consultations via email by the GAC. And I would like to give the floor to Olof to bring us up-to-date on where we are and how we can -- at least this is the hope, to have a decision on having clarity on the travel support rules.

So, Olof, please, go ahead.

Thank you.

OLOF NORDLING:

Thank you, Chair. And, well, just to give the background.

The previous travel support rules document was actually dating a couple of years back. So it was high time to do an update in various respects, and brush up and put it in some -- to make it consistent with current ICANN constituency travel rules, because those are at the

foundation of all this. And the GAC travel support rules just builds on top of that for the particular GAC aspects we need to have.

So there were a few adaptations and a few clarifications in the first draft that was put to the GAC leadership and won support there, and then I sent it out to the GAC list. I got a few comments back regarding the clarification made regarding the so-called preapproved organizations, IGOs that can enjoy travel support, and a few detailed comments on this, that, and the other that we looked into and took up at least one of those three while explaining why the others were not really appropriate in relation to the ICANN constituency travel rules, which are, as I said, at the basis of all this.

And, also, then what happened. So sent out a new version of the travel support rules last week. Then a few things happened.

First of all, since the selection committee consists of the chair and vice chairs for the selection of supported travelers, well, we had a change from three to up to five vice chairs. That needed to be reflected. And we had some other interesting news as well. That we got an increase - - we requested an increase from 25 to 30 supported travelers plus five for the pre-approved, and that request has been granted. So that needed to be reflected as well, which it is in the most recent version then sent out to you dated the day before yesterday.

So this is the document we have in front of us and which is up for, I would say, adoption by all of you, or at least, in the first instance, for comments or clarifications.

I think that would do as an introduction, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yes. Thank you.

Comments and questions, please?

Yes, Jamaica.

OAS: It's OAS.

We had submitted comments concerning the qualifications as a pre-approved organization, understanding the context that the qualifications would mean not having any members as a part of the OECD and having to be headquartered in LDC.

We would just want to put to the floor any -- request any support concerning OAS's qualifications of being pre-approved from the point of view that we represent 32 member states who do fall under both lists.

We -- The cyber schedule program specifically, in terms of how we participate in these meetings, comes from what we call specific funding, meaning that we're unable to participate regularly unless we have a specific fund to actually treat with this.

We have been doing outreach to our members to become part of the GAC, but until then we believe it is important for us to be here to represent the interests of our members in the interim, if not in a pre-

approved status at least special consideration. If we do apply to attend the meetings, if not all three meetings, at least one meeting per year. And given the new structure of the proposed ICANN meetings, the meetings that would be most important based on the interest of our member states.

So I just want to put that to the GAC members for consideration. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. Maybe for the sake of clarification, and everybody may be in full knowledge of this, Olof, could you quickly explain what a pre-approved organization is and how the system works, what the criteria are for this eligibility? That may be helpful for us all to understand.

OLOF NORDLING:

Most certainly. Thank you, Chair.

It has been codified in the update, but it's actually codifying what was the established practice before then. And, well, just to quote, I read it out. You can read it yourself. To become a pre-approved organization, the organization must be dedicated to the interests of LDCs, SIDSs -- so least developed countries, small island developing states -- have no members from the OECD, and you all know what that stands for, and be based or headquartered in LDC or SIDS.

That's how it runs right now. And, well, I can only say that most certainly so, that among the 32 IGO observers that the GAC has

currently, well, not very many would qualify with those criteria, or do qualify with those criteria. But that's the approach that has been used so far.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: To ask for clarification, when in this -- I cannot find these provisions in the GAC travel support document that you sent around. Where are these provisions in this document? Or are they in a different document?

OLOF NORDLING: Oh, I am reading from the end of the first paragraph, starting with "provision has been made," and so on and so forth. And at the very end, you have the last sentence of the first para, "To become a pre-approved organization," et cetera. Just to identify where in the text we are.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Any other comments on this?

Yes, Trinidad and Tobago.

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO: Yes, having -- This is Trinidad and Tobago. Having worked on this before and with the fellowship program as well, I think the issue is, and I think Niue has raised it, is whether or not -- can the IGO or the observer member obtain not pre-approved status but on a case-by-

case basis. So the issue is whether or not, at any GAC meeting, would the five slots be used up. One of the challenges we had faced before is that the five slots were designed to be allocated to these regions, and there are slots that haven't been taken up yet by, like, for example, the Pacific Islands. The Pacific community has an express interest, so it's entirely possible that the Pacific and other similar region organizations may take up the travel support. So it would be very difficult to assign pre-approved status to other organizations, I would imagine. But perhaps the issue of the case-by-case basis might be considered, I think, during the application and approval status with the proviso that it's not a precedent-setting exercise. That if one gets travel support, does it mean there's a flood of applications from the others saying, well, we also want travel support, and suddenly it creates a problem for who it's meant for if they're looking for support. I think that's the -- one of the things that was trying to be avoided.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Trinidad and Tobago.

First of all, I think one thing is to be a pre-approved organization. If you're not a pre-approved organization, that means you still have a chance to get travel support, to make this clear.

The other thing is I think that was the question that has been raised earlier on the list. We would need to check and see whether those who are currently -- count as pre-approved organizations actually do

fulfill the criteria. If that is the case, fine. If that is not the case, we would have to amend that list. I think that is clear.

Another question, question for understanding. So the criteria that an organization must be dedicated to the interests of the LDCs, SIDSs and have no members from the OECD and be based or headquartered in an LDC/SIDS, this is something that was there before or is this a new proposal?

OLOF NORDLING: It's actually codifying what was established practice. So it puts it out, it spells it out, but it's no change from how it was considered before.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. Thank you for this clarification.

Further comments and questions?

Spain.

SPAIN: This is another part of the travel support. Okay. There is a rule saying that priority consideration can be given to a requester based on the location of the GAC meeting in order to enhance participation from a particular region. It's okay? Because it's not compulsory. It's priority consideration can be given. But it has always struck me that the rule favors participants who are in the region, because flight tickets for

them are cheaper than for the ones that come from regions that are far apart.

So the rule for me could be the other way around, but in any case, it is a flexible rule because it "can be given," it's not "must be given."

So we can assess it on a case-by-case basis and looking at the application that we have received for a particular meeting.

Thank you.

OLOF NORDLING:

Just to make that abundantly clear, this is not a change. This is exactly as it has been since the previous version. So hasn't been introduced, hasn't been modified. It remains the same from the previous version of the travel rules.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. Well, we take note, but I think we can still ask ourselves questions whether the existing rules make sense.

Also, what I've heard is that, something we may reflect, but the question is whether we would actually make this part of the holistic review of the operating principles or do it on a separate track.

If you can support a person for three consecutive meetings and then you need to stop, and then you can continue to support travel from the same country but you need to give it to another person, you can question whether this actually makes sense in terms of building the

capacity of a GAC representative in order to be up to -- up to the development and be informed if every three meetings, that means every year, you need to change the representative and start from scratch.

So there are some things we could actually reconsider, but I don't want to, like, go into a holistic exercise on this now, but maybe we need to think about how we deal with this in the midterm to make the most meaningful value-added out of the travel support that we have.

Was it Canada who was -- No. Okay.

So other questions and comments?

If that is not the case, then what is -- So what are we doing now? What is the next step? Are we adopting this text so that we have some clarity based on the status quo on existing practice that we use for now? And then we think about how to maybe have a review of this as part of the operating principles or maybe as a separate track, because there may be some issues we would like to review, but they may take us a little bit longer.

So can we agree to these clarifications as they are now?

Jamaica.

OAS:

OAS.

Chair, we'll be -- we'll be -- I think what I would want to submit, and all of you could correct me, we could circulate the documents that we had sent to this committee, to the operating committee for consideration, because what we submitted was a case as to why we should be considered, even on a case-by-case basis, as Tracy pointed out, for periodic meetings if not all three meetings per year, where we basically highlighted which countries we represented and why it would be important for us to be at the meetings. And if not for the purposes of this document, at least for future any revision, it could be considered as well.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So I'm not sure whether I fully understood. You're proposing to share the document that you sent once again? Or --

OAS: Yes, we'll share it once again, but I figured that you were trying to close this one. So if not for the purposes of being a part or being considered for amendments to this document, at least for the operating working group.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yeah. So I think that is, of course, acceptable.

So does that mean that we have agreed for the time being on this -- on this version of the text? And we need to continue -- We commit to

continue to look into this and propose a way forward after the meeting.

Olof.

OLOF NORDLING:

Thank you. And I think that we have, at least, reached some clarity that it -- well, while we have this expression "reserved for," there is a possibility to interpret it on a case-by-case basis regarding the pre-approved organization slots.

So -- Well, it would be helpful to have this adopted, which I hope -- think we do, so we can also translate it and post it on the Web site and have this as a basis for the allocation of travel support for the upcoming Dublin meeting so we don't run with something from 2011.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you very much.

So with this, we come to the end of our -- before -- before-last session.

The next one is about the GAC Underserved Regions Working Group where we will be receiving an update. The lead is African Union and Trinidad and Tobago. So, Tracy, since you're sitting here, would you give us an update on this one?

Thank you.

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO: Thank you, Thomas, and I will be very brief.

So we circulated the terms of reference for the Underserved Regions Working Group. I believe at the last meeting in Singapore we made it clear what we're attempting to achieve.

There have been some comments coming in still on the terms of reference, but I believe we are in a finalization phase.

I would like to call the terms of reference process to a close, and perhaps whether -- certainly not now, but on the mailing list have it formally adopted.

We have had already a first meeting of the working group face to face at Buenos Aires, and the work plan project has begun.

So we've begun working, and we would like to ensure that we have an agreed terms of reference to proceed with.

As you would have heard, I believe, earlier in the GAC meeting, the ccTLD survey is already out. The working group is treating with that.

We've had some survey information coming back in from some GAC members, so we would like to ensure that a working group is ready, formally codified and ready to go. And I'm hoping, Chair, that we can have that addressed as quickly as possible. Perhaps if not now, certainly immediately after this meeting via the mailing list.

Once again, I'd like to make a call to all -- it's not only for underserved regions, but all members who are interested in participating to indicate their interest to the secretariat to be added to the mailing list. And we would like to probably formally have a session in Dublin. We had a side meeting, but maybe we could probably make it more formal to have a face to face with everybody who is interested. Certainly we want to do a call in between the meetings to address the work plan issues and have reports on the work at Dublin.

For the time being, I think that's it.

Again, I would like to, if possible, close the terms of reference round and perhaps have that signed off and approved, if possible. If not now, certainly in the mailing list.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. And I do also understand that you will be involved in the preparation of the Marrakech High-Level Governmental Meeting and support Morocco in --

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO: Yes. Morocco has requested that we do provide some support, and we have agreed. Yes.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yes, thank you.

Questions or comments?

If that is not the case, I can just say that it would be very wishful to have a meeting that all GAC members can attend of that working group in Dublin. I would just like to flag, and it goes to everything that we plan for Dublin, we may again need a little bit of time for trying to see where the GAC will stand and to what extent it agrees and what regarding the accountability workstream 1 work of the CCWG.

So whatever we plan for Dublin, we'll need to be a little bit flexible, maybe even more flexible than this time. But let's hope that that won't use all of our time in Dublin so we actually have time for important issues like what you are dealing with in this working group.

So if there are no more questions, I think then let's thank you and move on to the last item for meeting, which is the preparation for Dublin. As we just spoke about Dublin, maybe, I don't know, whether the secretariat can inform us a little bit about the reflection that we've had in the leadership team, in the secretariat, and maybe also shared with others, about how we plan or hope to organize the meeting in Dublin.

So thank you, Tom.

TOM DALE:

Thank you, Thomas.

I think the first point to make in -- as we always do, in looking ahead to the next GAC meeting is that your input as the GAC membership is

particularly important. Not just the issues that have emerged from here but issues that you identify in the lead-up to the next meek in Dublin. And I have to stress that there is an opportunity at all times for GAC members to suggest priorities, specific agenda items, areas for further work at any time.

There will be at least one agenda-setting call in the lead-up to the meeting in Dublin, and as always, you are strongly encouraged -- indeed, urged -- to participate in that call or those calls and to consider what you believe needs to be prioritized. But I appreciate -- It's an ongoing process and things will always get a little bit compressed towards the end of the process, and inevitably things will get a little bit busy in the immediate lead-up to the meeting.

However, the leadership group and the secretariat will try to ensure that there is time for input, reflection, and particularly through those agenda-setting calls.

I think the outcomes from the meeting discussions this week suggest that Dublin is, as Thomas has said, firstly going to require a degree of time to have set aside for a GAC position on the CCWG Accountability work. Remember, GAC is a chartering organization. And just as GAC reached the position here as a chartering organization on the CWG Stewardship proposal, the accountability proposals, as they emerge over the next month or two will also require a significant amount of time on the agenda. I think people understand that. The questions, the initial list of questions for GAC members' input has been sent out, and at the moment that's a significant item for the Dublin agenda.

One very important procedural matter is, of course, that vice chair elections are required to be held in the Dublin meeting. And a reminder again that nominations have been opened.

The high-level governmental meeting in Marrakech, planning and discussion around that will be a significant item for Dublin as well. It's something that has to be decided in Dublin, as does, as we heard today, a GAC view on the new meeting structure. But of course that's not so much a GAC view to someone else. It's a GAC view about what the GAC wants to do, and it's in the hands of the GAC.

So the new meeting structure for -- to be started in 2016 is again something that really does require some decision and planning in the meeting in Dublin.

The GAC working groups which are now significantly advanced in their work following this week, will, I suspect, require some time to present and work through appropriate time slots at the Dublin meeting, and we'll have to work closely with the chairs of the various working groups to ensure that they have the right time and the right format for working with the GAC on, you know, furthering their work.

And finally, there's one particular policy issue that has not been discussed this week but may well emerge as something that the GAC would need to spend some time on discussing both intersessionally and at Dublin, and that is the issue of future registry services and the policy development process around that, which I flagged to you some weeks ago. You'll recall, that's been identified through the new GNSO quick-look mechanism. There will be an issues paper coming out in

the next few weeks on that issue. This is, to put it crudely, what replaces WHOIS in the future.

The GAC has previously identified a lot of significant issues around that. The policy development process will be proposing a whole new range of data: data collection, data retention and data access provisions, and I'm sure quite a number of governments will have some views on that. So that is coming. You have been forewarned about it, but it will become busy. It may well be something we need to find time for as well.

Those are the major items. Thomas, back to you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you for this very useful update on things we may expect to deal with.

Comments, questions on this exposé?

Yes, Spain.

SPAIN:

I come back to an agenda item we saw at the beginning of the week. It's GAC advice effectiveness.

I don't remember right now whether we'll have an assessment by Dublin or not, but that could be something we're going to take up at the Dublin meeting. When we have the results of -- or the evaluation,

we can then think in which areas we have to improve in order to be more effective.

And I also think that by Dublin, some work could have been done on the bylaws consultation procedure that we are asking the Board to initiate regarding GAC advice on new gTLD safeguards. So we'll have to devote some time to it as well.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Spain, for these remarks. If you look at the decision paper that you have received this morning, it's actually the first item on that list is the decision to support the initiation of the review and the -- as a next step, we noted that ACIG will undertake the analysis and will report to us in Dublin. So that will, of course, be on the table somehow in Dublin.

And, with regard to the safeguards, yes, we will see how the Board reacts to this. But I think the expectation from our side is quite clear that we should have the Board engaging with us on the issues that they either have not implemented or decided to implement the advice or where we think they have not implemented it properly. So thank you for this.

Other comments or questions? If this is not the case, then we will not unnecessarily prolong the meeting here and give you the opportunity to also go to other meetings that are currently ongoing, which are of importance as well.

That means that I will end by thanking everybody, starting with the interpreters, the secretariat, staff, you all, the organizers of the meeting, all those people who have served us wine and drinks at receptions, and so on and so forth. Thank you very much.

And maybe since he's leaving, let's also thank Peter sitting over there hiding on the right hand for his very constructive work. We will miss you. And yeah. Enjoy your next steps in your new career and your issues that you're dealing with and hope to see you again some time somewhere.

So thank you very much to everybody, and enjoy the rest of the meeting and have safe travels home. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]