

---

DUBLIN – GAC Wednesday Morning Sessions  
Wednesday, October 21, 2015 – 10:00 to 12:30 IST  
ICANN54 | Dublin, Ireland

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Colleagues, I would like to continue so I would ask you to take your seats. Thank you very much.

Thank you all. You received as of yesterday a compilation not of nice rock songs but of your input to the issue of stress test 18 by Tom Dale. So I would quickly like to give the floor to Tom to have a word on the document that he put together. Thank you, Tom.

TOM DALE: Thank you, Thomas. Good morning, everybody. I realize that some of you in checking your emails, you may have an eye-glazing reaction to yet another email from me, but, as Thomas said, at the GAC's request, I circulated an email at 9:57 P.M. last night. A single document which consolidated the actual specific drafting or text proposals submitted by GAC members over the last couple of days with regard to stress test 18. And at Thomas' request, we'll just go through the document now so you have an overview of what is on the table, if you wanted it to stay on the table and then I'll hand back to the chair.

---

*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 document you see on the screen and perhaps in front of you, as your email attachment listed firstly the proposal from Sweden from Anders Hektor which was circulated a couple of days ago that indicates, just reading quickly, that an alternative is to change operating principle 53 to stipulate any change of operating principle 47, which is the one dealing with consensus decisions in the GAC, should be done by consensus. That is any change to the operating principle should be done by consensus instead of by simple majority voting. Just to clarify at the moment.

The operating principles can be changed by simple majority voting, not by consensus, a simple majority. So the proposal is to change that system to have changes to that operating principle done by consensus rather than voting.

Just scrolling down, please, if you could, Julian. The next one was circulated by Sweden, but it was from Steve DelBianco who is the chair of the CCWG stress test working party. This is a recent suggestion concerning the amendment to the bylaws that Steve had circulated. It reads, the board should not be placed in a position to arbitrate among divergent views within an advisory committee. In the event that the board determines to take an action that is not consistent with the advisory committee advice, the board shall have no obligation to try and find a mutually acceptable solution where the advisory committee advice was

---

not supported by consensus among committee members. So that proposal is directed not at GAC advice per se, but at the board treatment of advice of all advisory committees within the ICANN structure.

Just scroll down a little bit further, please. And a proposal was circulated by New Zealand and just going straight to the actual text a little further down indicates the text in the bylaws at the moment in italics. It's proposing to include an additional provision within that part of the bylaw which is involved at the bottom of the screen there which reads, to avoid placing the ICANN board in a position where it would be obliged to arbitrate between divergent views or in interest of sovereign governments, the obligation for the GAC and the ICANN board to try and find a mutually acceptable solution only applies where GAC advice is supported by consensus among GAC members. So that's a specific drafting proposal.

Moving down again, there was a proposal circulated yesterday by Spain. And just moving straight down to the actual drafting, just a little bit further down where it says J. That's J, again this is wording from the proposed bylaw change. J refers to the relevant reference for the ICANN bylaw. And that reads, the advice of the GAC on public policy matters shall be duly taken into account, both in the formulation and adoption of policies. In the event the ICANN board determines to take an action that

---

is not consistent with the GAC advice, it shall so inform the committee, state the reasons why it decided not to follow that advice, that's the existing text.

Then I think there's new text that follows, which is a GAC advice approved by consensus as defined in GAC operating principles, that's a footnote, would require a vote of at least 2/3 of the board to be rejected or any to be rejected. The governmental advisory committee and the ICANN board will then try in good faith in a timely and efficient manner to find a mutually acceptable principle. That's a drafting proposal.

The next proposal circulated was from the Netherlands again yesterday afternoon. And it's framed in terms of two specific concerns. The first two sets of proposals, which I think are phrased as options. I'm not sure if they're exclusive options, but we can clarify that a little bit. The options proposed in the Netherlands, text is that, one, GAC should operating principles to ensure that change in this working method that is consensus rules will require a consensus itself, will require consensus making it a fundamental rule.

Secondly, that ICANN's bylaws should be amended to require that only consensus advice as defined by the GAC operating principles will trigger a reconciliation procedure. There's a second part to the proposal from the Netherlands concerning

---

GAC operating principles. It suggests that GAC operating principles should be amended to define consensus advice in such a way that minority blocking is prevented. That's the terminology from the proposal from the Netherlands.

Then there was a proposal circulated again by email yesterday by Iran that focuses on a slightly different approach to the issue concerning GAC participation in the community empowerment model, however that may be framed. The suggestions from Iraq here concern firstly that GAC decides to remain and acts in an advisory capacity in any new structure.

Secondly, GAC may consider it may exercise any of those relevant powers, except that is in the community mechanism, except removal of individual board members.

And thirdly, it suggests in that case the following course of action may be taken. Firstly, that GAC discuss the need or otherwise of participating to exercise that power. The conclusion on this should be reached with consensus as defined in the GAC operating principles number 47.

Secondly, that that one such consensus to participate, this is participation in the community mechanism, is reached, then the stance of the issue should be discussed in order to provide a decision on pronouncing to be in favor or against that issue.

---

Such decision should also be made with consensus as noted above.

The conclusion from Iran is that in this case there would be no need to amend GAC advice and, thus, no need to have stress test 18.

The final specific proposal was circulated by the European Commission.

You see that on the screen there. It proposes some new text there in the second part concerning amendment of the bylaws again. The additional text reads, where the ICANN board is obliged to pay due deference to advice from advisory committees and where that advice, if not followed, requires finding mutually agreed solutions for implementation of that advice, the advisory committee will ensure that the advice provided is clear and unequivocally reflecting the consensus view of the committee. So that's additional text for the bylaws.

We've included, just scrolling down for the sake of completeness, comments that were submitted to the GAC list by, firstly, the Russian Federation and also by Namibia. I did not understand those proposals to have specific drafting in them, but they were included because think came up in the context of yesterday's discussions on stress test 18. That's the document that was circulated.

---

Back to you, Thomas.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. And thanks to all of those who contributed text and ideas in the attempt to find a way to somehow reach common ground on this. I think this is key to, along with what the colleague from Iran has said, with the meeting with the board, we still have some time to try and get together on a common ground. So I would very much like to thank all those who have taken efforts to help in that sense.

I think there are some interesting elements in this proposal, so I would like to give the floor to you to make comments on these proposals on elements that you consider may help us. I have Japan first. Thank you.

JAPAN:

Thank you, Chairman. We like to clarify why do we look at this text which are not proposing any other thing at this stage. So as stated during the previous sessions, we should -- we (indiscernible) to conclude (indiscernible). Please don't waste time by discussing (inaudible) stating text. So we should concerted ways that conclude a text. Thank you.

---

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. There was some problems with the audio. I think you urge us to concentrate on concrete text and not to repeat positions that have already been stated, if I got you right. Thank you very much for this. We will take that into account.

So comments on the elements, on any of the elements proposed in this compilation as presented by secretariat?

Switzerland?

SWITZERLAND: Thank you very much, Chair. And good morning to everyone. I would like to join the thanks to all the colleagues which have been trying to come up with new language which might help in these efforts, which is an ongoing process.

Just to highlight some elements which I find interesting. For instance, the option of applying the operating principles to insert flexibility and also more clarity on the decision-making procedure. The idea that we should avoid both the tyranny of majority, of simple majority and, at the same time, we should avoid the possibility that our decisions and our contribution to the multistakeholder mix is captured by a single country or by a very small minority.

Also, that there is probably a legitimate concern that simple majority decisions could be kind of problem for the board to



---

react to simple majority decisions taken by advisory committees.

And finally, I think the extension or the general reading of some of the proposals that's tried to establish a general rule for advisory committees in general without singling out our committee is also a way forward which could be explored more. And in this regard, I would like to kindly ask the European Commission whether they could explain a little bit more the rationale for their proposal and how it would fit with the proposal which is on the second draft report of the CCWG, whether that proposal would be taken out and replaced entirely by this one or how they would envision that. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Switzerland. Since we have a question to the European Commission, would you react?

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Yes, with pleasure. Well, thank you. I think it's perhaps useful. The idea here is, of course, the text is not set in stone. It's an idea. But the idea was to bring this issue to a higher level, to a more generic proposal which has implications for the ICANN board. We don't want the ICANN board to be in a position where it has to negotiate or discuss with two opposing camps.

---

Let's say theoretically, theoretically, in an advisory group you had two different positions on advice. It's theoretical. We don't want the ICANN board to then start negotiating with the two halves and find a mutually agreeable solution. We want the advisory committees to find their own solutions. So that's the first point.

The second is that the advisory committees for the moment have different rules. The GAC is the only one for whom advice of the advisory committees has to be taken on board and certain provisions apply. But we don't know what the ICANN structure will be in the future. We don't know if there will believe no SOs or ACs.

So the idea was to put it in a more generic position, again, so the ICANN board is not obliged to take on this negotiating role. And there's one thing I wanted to add particularly. This would mean that the existing version of stress test 18 would disappear. That change that's between K and J or K and L, whatever the numbers are, the letters, rather, would disappear and would be replaced instead to this change to the bylaws.

And there was another point I wanted to mention, which of course I've forgotten, despite my coffee. It will come to me in a minute. Oh, yes. The other point I wanted to raise was relating to one of the proposals which uses a similar approach, but says

---

that the ICANN board shouldn't have to look at different positions. And I think that's not absolutely correct, because in the GAC operating principles as they are now, we say consensus, but we also require inclusion of any dissenting views. I think that's a really important aspect to keep. So, this point a part of the wording which says clear and unequivocally consensus review, I don't know where that came from. I think that may have been added by someone else. The consensus view is the consensus view. The board also has to taken into consideration any minority opinions or anything that the advisory committee proposes. So that's the idea in general. I hope that's sufficient.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, European Commission. I had a request from the floor from the back. Please.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: My name is NKiru from Nigeria. I apologize ahead because this is my first involvement in GAC. The question I might be raising might have been answered, but I just need some clarification. When you say consensus, what does it really mean for GAC?

What percentage of the population really meets qualify for the general agreement?

Is there a percentage?

---

Is it a number of people present at the meeting or the total population of the GAC?

What's really is consensus for GAC?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. This is a very good question actually because we need to take into account that we have 155 members, but not everybody is present at every meeting. So if I take this right, consensus has normally been when the people present, including the ones -- there are sometimes are some that are participating remotely -- agree on an issue. But it doesn't require the consent of those who are not participating. I hope this clarifies your question. Thank you.

NIGERIA: So, sorry. In the meeting if there are just about 20 people, does that form a consensus?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: That's a question of whether or not we have a quorum actually that we would -- yes, Olof, please clarify this for us.

---

OLOF NORDLING: Out of memory from the GAC operating principles, there's a requirement for quorum that there be a presence of one third of the full members. Principle 40. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Olof and Spain for clarifying this. Yes, Denmark.

DENMARK: Thank you, Chairman. First of all, thank you to all those people who have put in suggestions. I think actually there's many, many good suggestions here. From our point of view, we did not have any problem with stress test 18. We could see that the formulation was perhaps not proper, but it was our firm view that the ICANN board should not be in a position to try to find a mutual acceptable solution where you as chairman was not able to find it between governments.

There's two principles which we think is important here. If we can avoid it, we would hesitate to change our operating procedures. It would take a lot of time and we have in one way or another to react to the CCWG.

So we would prefer that it will not interfere with the GAC operating principles.

---

The second thing is then to try to see what can be in the bylaws. We will have more attraction to a solution which are not aiming at GAC but are more horizontal and a couple of solutions here from the European Commission, which I thank for the proposal. So we think we should look at these things. Thank you very much.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Denmark.

Netherlands.

NETHERLANDS: Thank you, Chair. Just wanted to make a couple of remarks. First of all, I think we are doing a very good job in trying to help and to have a, let's say, break out to a new way of looking at it and have solutions.

I think we are not -- to my extent, I think the CCWG should not wait for a consensus proposal from the GAC, because that's not the way the CW works. I think the CCWG should take this very, very seriously into account and try to come up with a proposal which meets certain aspects which we have given in our comments, in our proposal.

---

So maybe that's what I -- Referring to Japan, I think we are not -- the aim is not realistic that we come up with an end solution here in the GAC. I think that's not -- not realistic.

The second thing I want to say is that there are some -- as Netherlands, we are pretty neutral. We don't see any benefit from the stress test 18, but we don't also see no harm of it. So I think we are pretty neutral in this case.

What I think is that we should -- we have seen several proposals. We see some major ways of coming out of this thing.

Basically I see two things. One thing is what I see from the Steve DelBianco and also New Zealand and European Commission, is that there is a generic way of making solution which prevents capture or putting the Board in a very -- in a position which they are not -- let's say it's not reasonable to ask the Board certain actions, which is the generic way. I think the other way is having our operating principles enshrine the concept of consensus. I think they are the two main streams. And probably both of them will not require a bylaw change, then. So that's the end goal, is that on the Governmental Advisory Committee section, bylaw would not be needed.

Thank you.

---

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Netherlands.

Well, actually, at least my personal feeling is that there are elements in these proposals that may actually help us to find something that we could all live with. So if this doesn't work, then we recognize that it didn't, but I think there is a chance that we may agree on elements and put something together that we can all say that this is acceptable to everybody, and then the question would be how to feed it into the CCWG. But I think we have some time left, so let's give us this time.

Yes, United Kingdom and then Germany. And Spain.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thanks, Chair. And my thanks also to the contributions of ideas and proposals. It's extremely helpful.

I just wanted to pick up on the point about changing the operating principles, which Denmark focused on.

There's always the possibility, of course, that if we were to reach agreement to change the operating principles, we would commit to do that. We would agree and then make clear to the community, including the CCWG, that we were committing to amend the operating principles. And then the process would follow for us to do that in synchronization with implementation of the proposal. So I'm not so sure there is a real difficulty there



---

as long as we are able to agree and then make that commitment.

So I just have that thought to contribute in terms of process for advancing some of these solutions.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, U.K.  
Germany.

GERMANY: Yes, thank you, Chairman. Good morning, everybody.

From our point, I think we would first of all like to thank everybody who has participated in this exercise during the last days, forwarding proposals. I think that's very helpful and brings together all relevant points for consideration now.

To clarify also our German position in this respect, we are in a similar situation as Netherland has described. We actually do not see a real need for having stress test 18. On the other hand, we don't see harm in this, and insofar we are pretty neutral on this question.

---

Regarding your proposal or your idea, I think it depends whether we really -- if we have a chance to come to a compromise, I'm not sure. Since we are neutral, it's difficult to evaluate whether it's possible to come to consensus within the GAC. If it was possible, then I think it would be a good idea if we can forward this to the CCWG. If it was not possible, I think at least we should seek some common ground to the CCWG. And that was your proposal as far as I understood. And sending it to the CCWG that they can consider this common ground for their further proposal.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Germany. And that goes to Netherland as well. So if you're neutral, help us to identify the elements that we can all share.

I have Iran and Argentina.

Sorry, Spain was first. I'm sorry, I forgot the once I -- shall sorry. Gema. Please, Spain first.

SPAIN:

Thank you, Thomas.

---

I'd like colleagues to reflect also on including in the possible compromise solutions the request to include in bylaws the requirement that the Board has to reach a threshold of two-thirds majority to not to follow GAC advice.

In the CCWG, there are several proposals to change the bylaws. This is the right moment to make proposals. If we let this train go, it will be difficult -- more difficult in the future to achieve this.

I want to repeat again the reasons I gave a moment ago for the value of this proposal. I would only stress that I think the scenario has changed from when it was put on hold last year. Now -- well, the scenario may change if the GAC finally agrees to work stably on consensus.

So I could propose colleagues to take this into consideration and include that in the packet of proposals that can be put forward to the CCWG.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Spain.

Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Chairman.

---

We are perhaps concentrating only on our own exchange of views, but if we look into the email reflector of the CCWG, there is a lot of things directly and indirectly about the issue.

There are three point that colleagues want to tackle. One is what Spain said. The threshold to reject the advice of the GAC, currently simple majority. It was put two-third GAC agreed, Board agreed, put it in a public comment. Public comment disagreed with that. They said that, no, we want that simple majority, (indiscernible) majority.

If we want to try it again, it should go to the public comment, no doubt.

Second, changing the principles that the GAC changing operating principle currently simple majority, should go to the consensus, this is second issue.

And third issue is deal with the stress test 18.

So we are tackling three different things at the same time. I don't know to what extent we could be successful.

Some of the issue we could raise at any point, perhaps. I would like to concentrate on the following.

Imagine that there was no transition at all on the table, and imagine there was no accountability. Did we have with this

---

stress test 18 subject on our table? No. Last year was not on our table. Why it come to our table? Because of the community empowerment. And because of the fear that GAC, due to the exercising that power, may -- let us put us in inverted comma, "capture" the community. The people think that there are two groups that if they put their power together, they may "capture" the community, in inverted comma: ccNSO and GAC. Two. So they want to avoid that.

So the issue is not lying with how the Board treat our advice. The issue is the community empowerment. Perhaps we should tackle from that point, how we avoid that. How we avoid or how meet the concerns of the people that express some anxiety that in future, empowering the GAC to participate in exercising the empowerment may influence the process. But not going to stress test 18.

If you address that point, you address the situations.

So let us concentrate on that issue, how you could avoid that.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much, Iran.

I think Argentina this next.

ARGENTINA:

Thank you, Chair, and thanks to colleagues that send the text. When I expressed my concern about drafting more text, I was never in the intention of not trying to solve things out. It's that we already tried this in the GAC, and I chaired a small drafting team, and we didn't get any -- any -- only one vision for this.

So as we had gone through that process, and we have shared with the whole GAC the outcomes, we thought that that was done.

And at the same time I would like to express that among these possibilities, it should be noted that there's another possibility; that the stress test 18 doesn't exist, which is the position of several countries.

So we are discussing about text that mainly says, in our opinion, the same things that the stress tests say now. And what I think is really remarkable is that we are being flexible in our own -- we are trying to change our thinking about trying to change our own operating principles to flexiblize ourselves when we never got a flexible change in that original proposal, even though we had done comments in writing in the two rounds of comments and several comments in the conference calls, many countries and many other members of the community.

---

So I think that I find it a little bit weird that we need to be flexible. When you try to negotiate, you need flexibility from both sides.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Argentina.

Well, just a quick comment. I think there is flexibility from both sides. Also in the CCWG, as our colleague from Iran said, there is a discussion on this, and we are not yet at the last word.

So whatever is proposed into the CCWG as possible alternatives, if you wish, will be looked at. Let's put it that way.

So I think it's -- Yeah, the process is not over yet, neither in the GAC nor in the CCWG, and there is a chance that if something were -- an alternative proposal would come up, that this will not only be considered but that that may have more traction. So, yeah. Also there, the process is not closed yet.

Thank you.

I have Viet Nam; right?

Thank you.

---

VIET NAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We have heard just now from ICANN Board that they confirm that the process of making decision is GAC's, it's not anyone else, and the ICANN Board always respect advice from the GAC, and they always try to work in the very careful way. So in my opinion, is more than enough.

And with GAC, we have been working on well with the principle consensus base.

So I would like to share the view of some colleague here that we -- there is no need to change -- to have stress test 18. And I would like to share the view from our colleague from (saying name) that as a part of ICANN workstreams, there should have possibility to equal participant in policy development process and decisions and discussion on matter of public policy. And the improvement of the accountability of ICANN should not lead to limitations of the existing GAC mandate.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Namibia?



---

NAMIBIA:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would want to -- again to just highlight some issue. I try to confine myself to procedural issues because that is what is factual, sort of.

I understand and my colleague from Argentina has highlighted a number of times that the -- this proposal or this initiative started from a subcommittee or working party one of the CCWG. I also heard that distinguished colleagues of Germany say we may probably reply or give an answer to CCW. But firstly my question is does this emanate from the full CCW or is it just a subcommittee that has discussed it and not gone through the CCW as a main committee to be able from them then to send a proposal to the GAC? That's one.

The second one is I also like the suggestion from -- from my distinguished colleague from Spain that it is about our way of making decisions.

We have, in fact, I think, generally had an amended or a different version of stress test 18 already in ATRT2; the recommendation that we want a, perhaps, the Board to give -- to formalize the way in which they deal with GAC advice. And I think the proposal was a two-third majority decision when they want to reject. That is something that is also hanging. And say no, we were informed no. There is too much divergent view, so leave it.

---

I think we are at the same point with stress test 18. There's a lot of divergent views. Leave it. Refer it to the operating principles working group and it can be dealt with there later.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Namibia.

Canada.

CANADA: Thank you, Chair, and thank you, colleagues, for all your helpful suggestions. I think there is a way forward in seeing some common ground here.

I think in terms of the rationale for the stress tests, I would really like to draw attention to the suggestion from my colleague from New Zealand, and I think this really does pinpoint and does put in a very clear way the reason why the stress test was put forward. And if you look at the wording suggested, it says: To avoid placing the ICANN Board in a position where it would be obliged to arbitrate between divergent views or interests of sovereign governments. The obligation for the GAC and ICANN Board to try to find a mutually acceptable solution only applies when GAC advice is supported by consensus.

---

I think this really nails the rationale. It isn't about telling the GAC how to make decisions. It isn't about in any way trying to impose. It's simply to say that the ICANN Board does not want to be in a place to arbitrate between governments. We don't want them to do that. They don't want to do it. So I do find this a very, very helpful suggestion. It clarifies to us, it clarifies to the community the rationale for the stress test. And it makes it, I think, quite straightforward as to why they put this stress test forward.

So in terms of a way forward, I think this could possibly be something we could all agree on, because I think we all agree that ICANN should not be arbitrating between us and sovereign governments.

So I would put that forward for consideration as a possibility for common agreement, and I think that in terms of the overall agreement in the room, I think we do all agree on the power of the GAC consensus advice approach.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Canada.

Next is Egypt.

EGYPT:

Thank you, Chair, and thanks to all colleagues who have provided actually very constructive proposals for a way forward.

I see that we already have many proposals, and they are not mutually exclusive. So maybe if we can go through the different proposals and see the aspects that have consensus, and we can come up with an overall agreed way forward.

I also very much like the principles you laid out by Netherland. I think that we also should look into those two principles and check that we have common agreement on those, and then work out on the different threads we have. I mean, Spain's proposal for having, too, supermajority to reject the GAC advice, but also having consensus to change any operating principles of the GAC, and other generic proposals that -- along the lines of what New Zealand, European Commission, and others have proposed.

So, actually, I think we don't have mutually exclusive proposal. So I think we can move forward faster, I guess.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Egypt, for this constructive proposal.

---

So since Spain is on the list, I'd quickly like to give the floor to Spain, and then I propose that we, if you agree, do what Egypt suggest. That we go through every of these proposals and see what elements could be supported so that we get a sense of where common ground may lie, if that is okay.

So, Spain, please.

SPAIN:

Thank you. I'm going to speak in Spanish this time.

I would like to answer to it Andreea Todoran from Canada, her comment about the New Zealand proposal.

Manal Ismail from Egypt said the proposals on the table are not mutually excluded, but I think that this is not a good starting point.

If the GAC or if any other advisory committee issues a recommendation based on consensus, a recommendation that is highly supported, it is easier for the Board, of course, to try and deal with that recommendation, address it, and try to find ways to take some action upon it. But working on a consensus basis means that perhaps some decisions are not reached, and this is one of the examples, the one that we have before us. This has happened before in the GAC and will continue happening.

---

The Board has to make decisions, and it has to make the decisions taking into account the public interest of all Internet users around the world.

Our operating principle number 47 foresees these possibilities that we may not reach an agreement. In that case, we should communicate to the Board various views stated at the GAC.

This is then because the Board should take this into account.

I don't know whether that would be arbitrating among government opinions or not, but the Board should take all this into account so as to weight the public opinion.

So I will not discourage the Board with a proposal in that sense so as to take into account all that has been said by the governments. I think that on the contrary, one of the responsibilities of the Board and one of the duties of the Board is to take into account all the elements on the table before making a decision. This is why I think that this proposal is not appropriate.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Are you fine with the proposal by Egypt to go through the document and see what elements would be more -- or what

---

ideas behind the elements, even if the formulation is not there yet, but what gets traction?

So let's look at the first. Let's go through it in the order that they are in the document, I suggest. So let's start with Sweden, with a proposal from Sweden and see.

So if you could get the screen -- yes -- to the Swedish -- the first proposal, and solicit comments on that one which are elements which you think may be used for something.

Is there nothing in this proposal that you would like it retain as possibly going in a direction of acceptability by all?

Spain.

SPAIN:

Spain speaking, and once again in Spanish.

As it has been said by our colleagues before me, I'm certainly reluctant to propose or that the GAC may make a proposal saying that we can meet ourselves to amend our operating principles in a certain respect. I think these are our rules of procedure and it is us who have to decide upon them.

So if a proposal implies an amendment to a specific section or article, it's that we would be yielding ourselves out. And I think that's the way ahead.

---

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Changing the operating principles. There is some reluctant, at least, from some countries to go down that road. So let's -- Yes, The Netherlands.

NETHERLANDS: Well, I think there are two elements which maybe are the difficulty. One element is probably more a procedural one, is that there is the perception that we are forced to do something. Okay; be it, I think, for the reason of compromising and getting decision done, I think it's obvious that parties should move from both sides.

Of so I think the procedural point is the GAC is obliged to do something, doesn't -- is something which is in the game. Let's say it that way.

Second point is of course we are free to choose as an organization, as a committee to choose our own working methods, but I think specifically in the remit of a multistakeholder corporation and not the ITU or the U.N., I think we should take in care -- take into account that we are, let's say, working in this environment, meaning that with all the other communities, consensus is the way forward, is the way in which these kind of processes work.



---

So I would not say that -- for me, for example, the option of going to having a voting mechanism is something which is probably not acceptable for us. So I think the way in which we should function is consensus. I think that's the -- that's the reason we are here in this kind of setting.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Sweden.

SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair. And thank you, colleagues.

Something that I find important here is -- not with this particular proposal but in general, is to consider whether we are meeting the concerns of all involved. Not just our own concerns but the concerns in other groups as well.

With this proposal, the change would be in our hands. Perhaps there are some that would say nobody should tell us that we need to do that now. Maybe, perhaps, that would be a bitter pill we would need to accept. It will still be us, the GAC, that would take this decision.

---

If in ten years or whatever there is the general feeling in the GAC that for some practical purpose we would need to change this to voting with some sort of majority, then we can do that at that time. It will be more difficult to make that change in the bylaws further down the road. So this will give us the role of making the change.

And also concerning the timing, that it takes 60 days and two meetings, like U.K. said, that will be an issue for implementing. And there will be other issues with implementing different changes as well. So I don't think that should be a deal breaker, so to speak.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. So what you're saying is that it's about giving a signal to the community that would be like the -- the core of their proposal.

Iran.

IRAN:

Thank you, Chairman. I appreciate your efforts. You want to mix up all these proposals to see whether you can have -- I think

---

some colleagues, they say they are not mutually exclusive, they are not mutually inclusive. That doesn't solve the problem.

You should look into the stress test 18. First question, retention of that or not? If you want to retain that in acceptable manner, the proposal of Sweden contribute to one part of that, and that part is saying that GAC may decide in future to modify its operating principles going from consensus to the over -- to the majority, and so on. That was very good proposal. But the proposal of Sweden does not address the issue of a stress test 18 that some colleague do not agree with that in saying that the advice -- sorry, the obligation of the Board to get into the discussions and negotiation with GAC is only for those cases on which consensus is reached. The proposal of Sweden does not address that point. However, it addresses the second part of the stress test 18. That would help. If that part remains in future, the change of the principle will be based on consensus would give more assurance to the GAC they shouldn't be worried about the second part of that. But the first part still has not been addressed. So we want to address that.

So I suggest that you continue this discussion, but I don't think that you could reach any firm conclusion on such a big group to see and going to one by one. All of the proposal has good elements, but to see which element of these proposal contribute to the removal of the problems in stress test 18 in order to retain

---

that. If they cannot, then we have to delete that. So that is the situations. From that aspect, we have to look at that work.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Kavouss, but actually I think many of us are convinced through identifying elements, that may help us.

I have Switzerland and then Egypt and Sweden. Thank you.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Chair. Just very, very quickly. I want to support what other colleagues have said, that while we perhaps today or yesterday, I guess, were unable to come up with a full set the of elements where we agree, I think this is an open discussion. Our colleagues and other interested parties who participate in the CCWG are listening to this discussion, and it's will a benefit to highlight the elements where more broad agreement is in the room, because they he can then take account of it and feed it into their working in the CCWG.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Egypt.

---

EGYPT: Thank you, Chair. And just to clarify my intention by saying not mutually exclusive, I meant exactly what my colleague from Iran said that each one has elements, good elements that could be taken into consideration. So all I meant was that we don't have to pick and choose just one. We can work something along the lines of the good elements of each and every one and put ourself in a position to reject, then, stress test 18 if we do it our own way here.

So thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. And this is also how I see in negotiations that you take elements from all side on which you agree and you try to put this into something that is coherent that hopefully everybody is able to say yes, or at least not no to in the end.

Sweden, briefly.

SWEDEN: Thank you. Just briefly to reply to what Iran said.

The proposal would cater to the concerns that was expressed in stress test 18 that there might be a risk in the future that the GAC would, with a majority vote, go into majority voting.

---

This would take away that risk. So there wouldn't be -- so that way it -- it solves the problem of the first part of stress test 18 anyway. So there wouldn't need to be a change in the applause as well.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. Let us quickly go through the other ones to not discuss it in detail but give it like we don't have the green and red cards. I want to see the temperature on each of the proposals, maybe some elements. The next one which is coming from Steve DelBianco from the stress test working party. Quick comments on that one. Were there other elements in it that you would see positive?

Iran?

IRAN:

Certainly there are elements in all of them are positive but I don't think that's the duty of the CCWG to protect the board saying the board should not -- this is not our duty. CCWG is logistic everybody, the board everybody. Never does anybody make the effort to protect the body. It is not the duty. I think even there is some positive element is coherent with the proposals. Thank you.

---

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Let's try and only focus on things that you would like would be valuable to retain or to investigate further. Let's not focus on what you don't agree. Only take the floor if you find something worth retaining. I hope that makes it quicker.

Yes, New Zealand.

NEW ZEALAND: Thank you. So this is similar the text that we were looking at from Steve DelBianco, similar to the text that New Zealand proposed. I think there are elements we can work with. It's not necessarily a road block but something I would flag that proposals for other advisory committees or look at 2/3 of the voting requirement early. Just bear in mind that the colleagues from Brazil this morning that if we do propose these, perhaps we could reach out to the other communities affected and just give them a heads up or see how this would impact them. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. So the merit of this would be that it doesn't look specifically at the GAC, but it looks at it from a broader perspective and also the 2/3 majority would be looked into from a broader perspective. Is that what I retain?

---

Any other comments on this proposal?

Switzerland.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you. I would also agree that general or horizontal approach is quite meaningful. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I see some traction for that element. New Zealand proposal, any comments?

What would you think out of that proposal would be something that we should retain as a valuable idea?

Iran?

IRAN: I think New Zealand comment on the first proposal that DelBianco mentioned, the proposal are the same. Similar, the same. Same people, same person, same group. So I don't think we should further discuss the decision -- the discussion was already carried out, so let's go to the next one.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Iran. Yes, Paraguay. But don't tell us what you don't like. Tell us if you like something.



---

PARAGUAY: No, no, no. No worries. I'll speak Spanish for more clarity my thoughts.

I think that it's incredible that we've been discussing this for three days and certain countries are not willing to discuss this. Because we're saying where we're going to go to the electric chair or not, so where are we going to form a committee to say whether we like to go to the electric chair or not?

So I don't want to be there. I don't want to be placed in that chair. I think we're forcing a discussion to discuss things that certainly there's no consensus. This is one issue.

The other one is that we may maintain a status quo if there's no consensus. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I won't comment on that comparison because we don't have electric chairs in my country so I don't know what that is really, fortunately.

I think we owe it to our commitment to the CCWG in the end to not give up yet. I take the statement about trust that Brazil has made this morning and leave it at that.

---

So if nobody wants to retain anything from that New Zealand proposal which would be new compared to what we have already, I would like to move to the Spanish proposal very quickly.

Canada and U.K.

CANADA: Yes, hello chair. I previously spoke to this so I wasn't going to respeak. The rationale for the stress test.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Please try not to repeat your positions but try to identify you think the other side would be able to accept, too. This is I think what we should go for. Thank you, Canada. U.K.?

UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, yes. The text about avoiding placing the ICANN board in a position where it would be obliged to arbitrate, that's good text for us. We should retain that. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Switzerland.

---

SWITZERLAND: I think that the thought that there could be simple majorities in supporting GAC advice and that could place the board in a difficult position, that could be something to be retained.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Switzerland. Sweden?

SWEDEN: Thank you. Under the values with this proposal that I appreciate very much, is that many feel that others want something from us and that we're not getting anything in return.

As I say, the compromise proposal, we're actually asking for something in return, which would be to have a two-thirds majority in the board taken in, which is discussed earlier, agreed by us and so forth.

Someone said earlier this would be the time to bring this up again. It also besides that, it has a value that there are I believe a wider group of countries that sees positively on this. I don't know their positions, but I believe it has a fairly broad support. The issue of the defining consensus could be a deal breaker. It could be defined in different ways. It could be defined as proposed here, defined by GAC operating principles or there could be text that said defined by the United Nations or there could be no text. Just consensus.

---

Then we could consider that in the proposal in the stress test 18 as they propose to put in the word "Consensus" there, it is not defined. That could possibly fly. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Sweden. Netherlands.

NETHERLANDS: Yes, I would like to concur with Sweden in the sense that the Netherlands were also in favor of the two-thirds in the beginning I think one or two years ago. And especially in the case now that we are working with 150 plus countries. If, let's say, all of these countries are in consensus about public policy requirements or advice, at least with no major objection, then I think it's kind of a strong signal for the board to act upon this. Then the two-thirds I think is appropriate. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Your interventions are noted. Switzerland.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Chair. I think two-thirds corresponds with horizontal approach also to this question because it likens us to other committees. It has already been agreed by this committee in the past.

---

As to the definition of consensus, I would abstain from trying to do that or to enter in that exercise. But the elements to take perhaps into account on the one side to have very large support for such a consensus and, on the other side, not being exposed to capture by a single or negligible minority of countries. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Switzerland. Looking at time, we should move to the next element which is coming from Spain. Something that inspires you positively in that proposal that you think may fly. Have Iran and then Sweden.

IRAN: Yes. There are some positive points on that. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Please name them so we know them. Sweden.

SWEDEN: I thought we just spoke about the Spanish proposal and the next one would be Netherlands.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Sorry. Yeah, okay. Egypt?

---

EGYPT: It's okay. Again, it was about the proposal from Spain which I was going to remind us that as far as the GAC is concerned, we've already agreed to this previously. So thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yes, sorry. I switched. So let's move to the Netherlands proposal.

EGYPT: Sorry. I meant even before this discussion. I mean I would concur.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. So then can we move to the Netherlands proposal?  
Sweden?

SWEDEN: One thing I like is that it mentions the Swedish proposal, but that's not what I'm going to say. I think it's interesting. I've been grouping these proposals and I can see we have four groups of proposals.

One is to change the operating principle 53. One is to change in the bylaws different variations of what was proposed in stress

---

test 18. The third is to define consensus to avoid minority blocking which is one of the Netherlands proposals. Then Iran's proposals is about the exercise of community par by the GAC. These are four different groups.

The one I would like to say something about in the Netherlands proposal is to about defining consensus, which I find interesting but probably extremely challenging for us to do. I don't think Thomas provided text there. If he would have text, it would be interesting to take part of it. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. U.K.?

UNITED KINGDOM: Thanks. I'm going to go straight to consent, too, because I've already made my position clear on one support that the Swedish proposal Sweden has just indicated is the same thing really. And also our opposition is to support stress test 18. That's one and two under concern one.

Under two, concern two I mean, I think this is interesting to explore because I think we are all mindful of the risk of consensus being blocked by one or two members, for whatever reason, and we should explore ways of avoiding that. I mean, we have in past experience come close to that situation, if not

---

actually in that situation and abstention has been one way to register objection. But defining that or characterizing that as an abstention avoids blocking consensus. So there are ways we can actually follow up on one under concern two whereby we amend our operating principles to define consensus in such a way that minority blocking is avoided but actually, also, that small number of governments do have some way of expressing their objection but not in a way -- not in such a way as to block the consensus.

So I think this is very helpful. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, U.K. Iran?

IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. On the Netherlands proposal, certainly there are positive elements on that. In the concerns one, perhaps need some amendment to indicate that other advice of the GAC are or the advice of the GAC other than those reached by consensus as treated is primarily close to the bylaw. But I have some concerns about these concerns, too.

I had difficulty to go see what is a consensus and so on and so forth. Perhaps Netherlands didn't want to at this late of stage to define consensus. But the first element of the proposal concerns



---

one has several positive elements that could be taken into account. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Egypt?

EGYPT: Actually, again, there is no specific drafting here, but I think both concerns are an overarching principles and they nail down the problem from both sides very well. So I think both concerns are well put down and well received and we should at least make sure we agree to balance our decision and take into consideration both sides. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Netherlands.

NETHERLANDS: Yes. Thank you, Chair. First, my credit to Sweden first. But all interventions are always a combination of good things. One point which I want to make is I tried in the rationale of my proposal go really back to the core of the stress test. Stress is about capture. Stress is about trying to avoid minority or majority imposition. So I think given the concerns we also had

---

earlier, I think the concern, too, is something which is part of the capture risk. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Netherlands. Switzerland.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Chair. Just to support Manal, she nailed it for me. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Should we move on to the next?

Which if I'm not jumping wrong in the document from Iran. Elements that you would consider could be retained as acceptable to everybody in that proposal. Yes, Sweden.

SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair. I think it's a very interesting proposal. It's somewhat different from the other ones, but it really speaks to the concerns or the background to stress test 18 or it proposed to speak to the background or the reasons for stress test 18.

I'm in no position to assess whether it really meets the requirements of the CCWG or of the stress test team and of the other communities or MTIA.

---

I think it's country critical in this group to assess the merits and quality of this proposal. I believe we would need some feedback from the CCWG for them to describe to us if and how this would actually meet the requirements. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. U.K.?

UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. This intersects with what I was saying yesterday about the need for the GAC to become well cited on the proposals for decision taking. I think we are jumping the gun. Mind you, I'm sympathetic to Iran if they are saying basically we do need to understand that we have to decide are we going to act solely in an advisory capacity throughout the empowerment mechanism processes?

On what particular powers we may need to vary our role, which I understand is what I read in number two about the exercise of individual -- removal of individual board members. Whereas actually on that, I've said for the U.K. position that the community should be involved in any decision to remove an individual board member under the empowerment mechanisms related to that. So we haven't discussed this. We haven't agreed on a common approach. Indeed, we haven't, as a committee,

---

fully examined the decision-making processes, pre-call, community forum and then that leading to a decision. Whatever modality is adopted for making that decision, voting or whatever, we haven't actually gone through all of that. I've suggested, I don't know, Thomas, if you saw my email, that there's a advice for table which I sent you which we were able to pick out. I immediately couldn't find it yesterday when I was speaking. The table that set out the escalation process for decision taking where the GAC has to decide, you know, how it contributes and fulfills its mandate in the public interest.

So I'm sorry, but I think this is unfortunately jumping the gun because the GAC is not well placed at the moment to be able to consider the merits of the one, two and three here. But I do appreciate Iran putting this before us at this time. That's very helpful to do so. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. Yes, I have received that email. I can't remember if you sent it to me but the whole GAC. Don't hesitate to forward it to the whole GAC because it's -- yeah, it's helpful for visualizing how this mechanism is supposed to work. Iran?

---

IRAN: Thank you, Thomas. I'm not defending the proposal. I have some misunderstanding by U.K.

What in this proposal said that we would be empowered to exercise all of those power, except initiating the removal of the board director?

Because we are not designating. That is that.

However, if any other SO and AC initiated the removal of a single board member, no doubt we would participate if we decide to act that exercise. But we're not initiating a body because we don't have any director. The designator model is this.UK misunderstood me, misunderstood our proposals.

But now coming to his proposal that the community is already more or less agreed by the CCWG that the community will be consulted, but would not be voting on that. It would be consulted and views will be asked and then will be taken into account.

So this point you made is already taken by the CCWG in one way or another. But my suggestion was not that we exclude the GAC to participate in the process, but we are not initiating the removal of director because we're not designating any director. Thank you.

---

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Iran. Any other comments on the text proposed by Iran?

Spain.

SPAIN: Thank you. Thank you for this proposal. But I must confess, I cannot see the link between stress test 18 and GAC participation and community enforcement mechanisms. It's very hard for me to understand the link that you make. So I have really no view on your proposal. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yes, Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Thomas. I explain this morning, I'll re-explain that. If there was no transition and no accountability, there was no proposal for the stress test 18. It came because of the transitions and because of exercising the power. So exercising the power by GAC is the source of the stress test 18.

If you address that, you don't need the stress test 18. So you have to understand it from that angle.

Last year, we didn't have anything about the advice of the GAC, how the board should treat that. It was clear, it came this year

---

because the people says that if you empower GAC to participate in any decision-making, they may influence the community and capture the community. So let us put the stress test 18 in order to avoid that in their views. That's the original exercise. You have to go to the source of the problem, the source of the problem is the transitions and is empowering GAC to participate in decision-making. If you can solve the point from that, we don't need stress test 18. I hope I have clearly mentioned. Thank you.

SPAIN:

How can the source of the problem meet a mechanism that is implemented after the board take the decisions?

And if there has been a GAC advice after the board has considered GAC advice?

Stress test 18 is placed on this phase one in the decision-making by the board, whereas the community empowers mechanisms are in phase two, after board has made decisions.

As far as I remember, stress test 18 was included in the first draft of the CCWG. It doesn't -- I don't think it has come later, but of course you know much more than me in this respect.

So my concluding that I don't think this is clear for the GAC and nothing is going to be of much help.

---

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I think we should try to focus on elements that you think should be maintained that would help us. I think New Zealand was asking for the floor.

NEW ZEALAND: Yes, thank you, Chair. My apologies, it wasn't a comment on the proposal. It was just a note we seem to have different ideas of the origin of stress test 18. And perhaps that's part of why I, like others, am not certain if this proposal will meet the needs that have been requested by the CCWG.

I just note that there is a conversation going on in ccNSO at the moment about stress test 18, and I can see through Twitter that they are saying that stress test 18 is for times when GAC doesn't have consensus advice, and says something A, something B. So perhaps this something over the break, if we engage with the CCWG or people we know, just to be clear on the rationale of what they're seeking.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I think one of the problems is there is no agreement on the rationale. So we'll have to live with that but try to find



---

elements that help us overcome that problem that is not singular to the GAC. Others may have also other differing views on this.

If there are no more comments on the Iranian text, then I would like to move to the next one, which is European Commission. Your comments on the text from the European Commission.

We've already heard a few comments. Is there something that you would like to retain that you think may actually be an element that would be helpful?

United Kingdom.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Thanks, Chair. Yes, I agree, it's valuable for us to retain the sort of horizontal approach for advisory committees that this tries to set into -- into text. I think I would support retention of it. Sorry, I don't have any further argument in favor, but it seems very valuable to extend this issue, perhaps, across the advisory committees in their entirety.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

I have Switzerland, Sweden, and Iran, and the European Commission.

---

SWITZERLAND: Thank you. I'll put it the other way round. It has a value because it doesn't single out the GAC. That's good in itself. And due to its general nature, it also has some flexibility built in.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Sweden.

SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair. In addition to what has just been said, which I support, by U.K. and Switzerland, I also like the element that says the advice provided is clear and unequivocally reflecting the consensus view.

The part with the clear, the advice should be clear, adds something new that I don't think we have in the other ones, so it speaks to the quality of the advice that we give, that it should be perhaps actionable or -- Well, clear.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

---

Iran.

IRAN:

Thank you.

I think in the EU proposal or European Commission proposal, the new proposal is a good proposal because it soften the proposal of working party one or stress test working party, that very strictly talking that only on those area. It put it in a more neutral and a more softer manner. That could help.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you.

European Commission.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION:

Thanks. Just a clarification so the room knows what this applies to. It applies to all advisory committees with respect to advice, but there's a very special provision relating to GAC advice, which if it's not followed has to then go to the mutually agreed.

So for the moment, the GAC is the only advisory committee that does this. So I just want to clarify that that second part doesn't apply to anyone but the GAC, but of course that's not what it

---

says here. It's a principle that would apply in future, as we said, to avoid the ICANN Board being put in difficult conditions.

And the other thing that might help some of the others in the room is to change the word to say "the advice provided is clear and reflects," rather than "unequivocally reflecting." I think that's perhaps a bit -- we were perhaps a bit enthusiastic in that. So that might help to make it easier.

But I also want to say I also think the Spanish proposal is a very good one, the New Zealand proposal.

So what we're trying to do here is find something that works for everyone, so we don't insist on any particular position.

Thanks.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. And I think it's already been said before that this would not exclude combination, as we say, with other elements of what we have here.

Egypt.

EGYPT: Thank you, Chair. In fact, concurring with previous views in support of the European Commission proposal.

---

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. Further comments on this proposal?

If that is not the case, is that the last one that has a substantive text proposal; right?

So I personally think that was helpful. That allowed us -- Yes, please.

SENEGAL:

Good morning. I will speak in French. I am Mr. Lee from Senegal.

I really appreciate the discussion we have had and the spirit prevailing, because it has been a positive spirit so as to reach a text that satisfies us all.

It would be advisable to be able to define a proposal, a consensus proposal. I think that it would be great for us so as not to go back to this issue. It will be great if we together may arrive to a definition of consensus once and for all.

We know that there is an operating text that is applicable, and perhaps we may add in the final text what we understand as a consensus; something that is validated by us all.

---

Then talking about two-thirds may be an excellent idea because it happens in large organizations. Two-thirds is something that reflects what most people think. But once we have defined what consensus means, we may then move forward.

Thank you very much for all the countries that participated and that have drafted their proposals.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much, Senegal.

Iran.

IRAN: Once you finished the consideration of all proposal, I have a suggestion.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: I think we are there.

Thank you.

IRAN: Yes. Thank you, everybody. I think there are positive elements in all proposal. Thanks to everybody.

---

What I suggest, that we take as a basis the stress test 18 as is available today, after all amendment in CCWG, and we try to take relevant elements of all these proposals where applicable to modify that stress test 18 with a view to make it acceptable to the people by adding some elements to that.

This stress test 18 is applicable to the transitions and to the accountability. It does not have retroactive on the previous activities, previous thread -- strings in the Board under discussions to remove all of the anxiety of those people that this stress test 18 may be used differently. So we have to add some element, but the most important is take the stress test 18 as it is and try to modify that, base on some of the element of these proposals such as Spain or European Commission or New Zealand or whatever they have proposed. And that would be a way that it may try to have something that is acceptable as far as GAC concerns. And perhaps that could may be later on submitted in the appropriate way by single people or whoever wants to the CCWG.

So that would be still we work on the stress test 18 text and to see how we could modify that in order to make it acceptable.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Iran. That was actually more or less what I was going to propose as a way forward. So thank you for doing that job. Of

---

course, if others agree. But along these lines, we have identified some elements that we could see that -- maybe not today, but in the near future, we may be able to come up with something and somehow feed things into the CCWG that would be acceptable for all. I know. I just wanted to make that point.

Sweden wanted to tell us something.

No? Are you fine with that way proposed forward by Iran and the Chair?

Sweden.

SWEDEN:

Well, I am. And in principle, I don't have anything against that. I can see that it will take quite a lot of effort and it will take quite a lot of time. And the question is what we will end up with.

Eventually, we will have something consolidated, a singular text, and then maybe we will have a consensus call for that. I don't know.

We haven't heard from all countries during these discussions today, so we doesn't know the positions of all; particularly you that have been very negatively vocal haven't reacted to these proposals.

So it may be in vain to do that.



---

What I was really going to ask is now we have had a fruitful discussion. It's on the transcripts. It's available for everybody to read, to take part in this discussion. I think that's very useful.

The question is could we somehow append also the document that was put together by Tom and ACIG and somehow forward this to those that we feel should take part of the different proposals? I don't know how, whether it would be an appendix to the communique or just informally handed over, or if somebody in the GAC would have an issue with that.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Sweden.

With regard to your first comment, it may take time, but I think we most probably do have some time because the chances are quite high that there will be a third proposal with another public comment period, maybe a short one, but we do have some time left.

I think what I retain for the time being and Wednesday, 12:00, is that we are still engaging in a way to get closer to each other on the issue and that we have made some development. And I think that could be one of the message that we could convey in addition to some positive signals about the escalation, stairs

---

model. That could be something we convey to the rest of the community and say we continue to work within the GAC but also as members and participants in the CCWG.

So we don't have to give the final answer today. Whether or not we share this working document at this stage, I think let's hear other views on whether to do this now or maybe wait until we have something that identifies these elements and share the elements out of these proposals that we -- that we think may get traction. Maybe that would be more clear and less confusing, and not single out ones that we're making proposal.

But I think we may consider collecting the elements in the near future and distributing or communicating elements that we think there would be merit of retaining them.

Iran.

IRAN:

Thank you, Chairman. I hope I did not understood -- understand that -- I don't think we should put anything as a compilation of this text attached to the communique. This is internal discussions. And I don't think that CCWG now requires that we give, "Yes, we agree with that, and we disagree with that."

We could say there was discussions. There were not agreement to the existing text, and the GAC is in the process of attempting

---

to modify the stress test 18 to make it acceptable after different process within the GAC, and so on and so forth. That may be a sufficient signal.

In the meantime, we do our best. Perhaps we should have some conclusion? Why not. We said we have another one and a half days. We can go to that. Or two days? Why not? We try always. I don't think we should exclude that effort. We should put that effort, and we are ready to contribute to that.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Argentina.

ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. I concur with my distinguished colleague from Iran. I don't think -- I am not of the idea of attaching documents which are internal to the GAC, and we should send a message that we are debating.

Could you clarify what you meant by "near future"? Because I have a doubt about that.

---

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thursday, 15 o'clock, of course, we will have a solution. No, I mean, the near future is as quickly as possible but it will take some time and not in half a year or so but in the next few weeks and months, ideally in line with the rest of the public comment, whatever periods that will come; i.e., around the end of the year, if I get the timelines right, they're circling around -- before or after the end of the year, the whole thing would need to be concluded. That would give us one to two months.

But I think we need to stop here. I think we take the -- the proposal by Iran to give a positive signal, say that we are in the process of elaborating further; that we made some progress in terms of understanding each other, understanding the issues, and so on.

And just one thing. We are not obliged to put this into the communique. We could also issue this in a separate document. But since we have one afternoon and we are working on the communique, I think it may make sense to convey that message to the whole community as part of the communique because everybody will read it. It just makes it simpler for us to work on one document this afternoon and not have to switch between several documents. That would be my proposal for this afternoon, because otherwise I think it gets slightly more complicated and we have a higher chance to have evening sessions, and so on and so forth.

---

Iran.

IRAN:

Chairman, if you want to put it in the whole process because of the question raised by Spain, some people they have not followed the CCWG and may have misunderstanding. So I withdraw my proposals, Iranian proposal. Take it out and put everything you want.

I don't want that my proposal put into the whole process because people who are not following the proposal, CCWG, they don't know what we're talking about. They raise the same question that Spain raised that what is the link between this and that. So take mine out, but I am in favor of the group.

Thank you.

By the way, in terms how the timing is concerned, CCWG now foresee that by 16th to 18th of November, they might to have some final proposal or one month after. So we should link it to the final timeline of CCWG, not beyond that.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. That was the intention.

I think there was feeling in the room that this document not be shared; that this is an internal document. So we will not share

---

this now, but we may elaborate on elements that we may share in the near future, meaning as quickly as possible.

Okay? Is that okay?

Netherlands and U.K., briefly.

Thank you.

NETHERLANDS:

Yes, two remarks. First, I think it would also benefit if, for example, the chair or vice chairs together could also convey the views or at least explain or give reactions in the CCWG instead of only sole members. So that's something to consider.

And, secondly, I think if we're talking about sharing, I agree it's not something for the community because it's not completely worked out. On the other hand, it should be -- at least the ideas in document should be given to the CCWG participants.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. Of course we are in your hands. If you wish us to pass a message to the CCWG, and if you trust us that we'll get that message right, we are happy to do this, I think.

---

If we have something -- Assuming that we have something along the lines of a positive note in describing where we are as part of the communique that will be circulated tonight, ideally, in the best-ever case, between 5:00 and 6:00 or so, they would already have that message for tonight's CCWG meeting and for tomorrow. So maybe we can -- we can discuss also this once we see where we are with the communique.

Argentina and Iran.

Or Iran was first.

And Hungary.

Sorry, actually, U.K. was first. Sorry. U.K., Iran, Argentina, and Hungary.

UNITED KINGDOM:

The community decision-making paper, I mean, I note Iran is withdrawing that part of the text we had in the composition document. But I wasn't quite sure if you had thought about how the GAC actually start reviewing this in full committee. I know we're running out of time in this particular meeting. Of that decision-making paper, there's the community forum. I think it would be really good for the committee to start formulating its expectations for the forum and how it would engage in that forum, the status of its advice to that forum. There's a lot of

---

important questions and we can't just keep pushing it back. Sorry, to repeat my anxiety about that. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. As we don't know the timeline yet of the CCWG, it's difficult to get a final answer today. Hopefully we know it by tomorrow. I think there's a chance because they will need to some extent come out with a timeline. From what I'm hearing, it looks as if there will be a third, there will be a new report out around the 15 to 20 November with then another public comment period with 30 or 21 or whatever days.

So my initial suggestion, this is based on if this timeline is ending up like this, is we would continue to work electronically in the coming weeks and then use the public comment period to try and issue as consensus oriented public comment or reaction that we can, IE, that would be something like the second half of November, early part of December. Then by then we will know exactly how the model that is still in the making would look like because we're still the edges of that model are a little bit shaky. But we can of course continue and we should continue already now to build on the elements that we think are going in the right direction.

But we do have some time, if this timeline is as it is. And there's the discussion as you've heard about an intersessional meeting.



---

The question is, would that happen before or after new year, whatever?

But we would then need to consider whether it's useful or necessary for us to participate or whether we can, if we are closed, whether we can reach an agreement on a phone call GAC conference call during the public comment period.

I think we don't have enough clear information to really fix the timeline. I think the next step is to agree that we try to send a positive note, to put a positive note about where we are and what we think of the proposal in the communique by tonight and then continue to work on our own, continue to contribute to the work of the CCWG and define our concrete timeline based on the timeline of the CCWG.

Does that help?

U.K.?

UNITED KINGDOM:

Well, thank you, yes. I see your steer to the committee that we should continue to work on this. I just think -- I'm worried that we might be having to start from scratch much further down the track in determining how do we respond to the proposal on the decision-making process in particular.

---

So if we could work with the members, the GAC members of the CCWG to try and sort of get some committee-wide input, I think that would be valuable if we could approach it in that way, rather than okay, we have another public comment period, individual governments, usually the same ones will comment and react. But the committee as a whole becomes rather sort of distant from the process. That's my worry. Thanks.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Yes. That is of course legitimate that worry. But I think we are now aware that we're entering in the decisive and last phase of this and that we should somehow live with the fact that we will devote all of us some of our time in the next few weeks and months on this.

So I think if we agree that we will continue to work, we'll work out the details about how to work electronically. Of course I think using the members and maybe also the participants in the group is a helpful thing because for communicating in both directions.

But yeah, so my answer would be yes to your what you said.

I think I had some more requests from the floor. Let's try and conclude. Iran, yes, thank you.

---

IRAN: Yes. The reason I withdraw my proposal because you said you want to compile this document to CCWG. I've already sent mine to CCWG two days ago. There's no reason to put it in your compilation. That's the reason I take it out. I leave it to the way you want. I have communicated by activity in that group and this afternoon I participate from 5:00 to 8:00 in the CCWG and we know what the situation is. But the timeline will be decided tonight perhaps more or less. Need the other public comment will be decided tonight more or less. Of therefore you have a clear situation. I leave it to you.

But my proposal, I follow the CCWG directly. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Argentina and Sweden.

ARGENTINA: Very briefly. We're okay with sending a message that we are working on it. We're not okay with sending an abstract or a summary of the text that are being discussed because I think this will make a confusing message to the community. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Sweden?

---

SWEDEN: I think it was Hungary, actually.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Sorry. Yes, you're right. Peter. Sorry.

HUNGARY: Thank you, Thomas. It's a simple question. Is this an open meeting or a private meeting?

In case it's opened, probably all the documents we have been discussing are out.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: It is open, but that doesn't mean all the documents are maybe some pictures. For example, our GAC mailing list is confidential, unless somebody sent something out to somebody else. The question is, do you actively send something out and somebody takes it, fine. I think the feeling is we shouldn't actively share this document because it's an internal step and it's not mature. It would rather lead to confusion than help. We may work on this and build and the elements -- Anders, he's categorization of what may help us single out the elements and of course the discussion. Let's not spend time discussing about what to do

---

with this document. I think we'll use it internally and that's it. Netherlands?

NETHERLANDS: I'm a little confused. We have spoken here and invested time. What is now the concrete proposal to convey what we have spoken here and the ideas to the CCWG?

What's now on the table, please?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: The proposal is to put in a communique that we are working on it, that we have had good interactions and we have had a better -- we now have a better understanding of each other's positions and concerns to send a positive signal and to say that we continue to work on this in the GAC but also with the CCWG and then to do it, what we say. That would be the proposal.

Yes, Germany.

GERMANY: Excuse my request for clarification. Will this then all we're saying regarding the CCWG proposal as of now?

---

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: As of today, yes, I think as including the positive note on the model and so on and so forth.

I think I will see with Tom and make a proposal for the communique so you have something concrete, otherwise we're fishing in the dark. Let us have a chance to put something in the communique text and then you see what we have proposed for today. But that is only the state of today. Tomorrow we'll already know more and the work is continue.

Can we move to the next agenda item which is a fundamentally important one? It's modified in the sense that it's not a reserved slot anymore, but we agreed to spend some moments on the issue of our secretariat, which at least I've learned to highly estimate.

I sent out to you a message two, three days ago with an attachment that contains some elements about the scope of the work and the substance of the work of our secretariat informing you that I think it's time now and we've already highlighted this at the last meeting in Buenos Aires. It's time to make an initial assessment to what extent if the GAC thinks that the work of our independent secretariat provided by ACIG has helped us improve our work, has helped us in being more efficient in particular, also what it has helped smaller delegations that have

---

less resources to quicker and easily understand the issues and so on and so forth.

It would be good to have a first preliminary assessment and the feeling of GAC members about the added value of this secretariat, which would be useful. If that would turn out to be positive, it is positive from the leadership team that's already alluded to in the mail that I sent. If that assessment is positive and there was a feeling that we would like to sustainably continue to benefit from that secretariat support, then we would need to discuss the issue on how to secure the funding in a sustainable way. We've already alluded to this, and I just wanted to flag that we had had so far three donor countries that graciously have allowed for starting this, and they signaled already in Buenos Aires that they are willing to continue under the condition that the GAC secretariat is estimated as something positive, something we don't want to lose again. And clearly if other GAC members or observers, if there are any, would join them in sharing the burden of funding the secretariat.

This is a condition, it's a willingness to continue with the condition that others join in and share the burden. So the message is quite clear.

So this is the situation as it is presented to us now, and so I think it may make sense to get a quick sense from the room on what

---

do you think is the value added of how you estimate the secretariat's work and that way we can then use this estimate to maybe talk about who would be willing to join the funding team. Thank you. Iran?

IRAN:

Thank you, Chairman. You have today's two issues. The first is effectiveness and usefulness of the secretariat. From the very beginning, we were one of the supporters of having a supporting secretariat for the GAC. We have found that the work is very, very valuable. They have helped us enormously in many areas, whenever from the documentation, from the compilation of many things. So we think their services are very useful to be continued.

Now your second question is contributions and so on and so forth. That's another issue, I'll leave it to you. But for the first one, I think that everybody agree with this, the effectiveness, the usefulness and the good support they have given, unless somebody gives view on the contrary. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Iran. Sweden and then Peru and Egypt.



---

SWEDEN:

Thank you. I second what Kavouss just said. For Sweden, it's been of great value, the work that Tom and colleagues have been doing. We certainly would like to see it continue. We realized that we're obviously part of committing to making sure that it continues.

I would ask, I haven't spoken with the donor countries about this, but being a civil servant, I see before me the difficulties in maneuvering these waters and engaging, having a decision with money being fund on particular year's budget and so forth.

So it would be useful to know on a sheet of paper how donations can be done, what sort of the terms are for it, what contract would we be engaging in, how would it be followed up, where would the money be paid. Do we need to engage for several years or could we, if we have a benign minister, do we aid a year and not the next year and so forth?

If stomach useful, practical help would be very good. Thank you so much.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. If you allow me to continue with the speaking or to give a little bit of that information, that may be helpful.

When this -- when the secretariat was hired, there was a contract set up with ICANN, so that was done under the previous chair of

---

the GAC. A contract was set up with ICANN so ACIG has a contract with ICANN that can be renewed every year. That was for an initial period, but it can be renewed every year.

And then the donors have agreed to -- so ICANN is paying ACIG. This is the current model. That may change. We may think about simplifying the structure that we currently have, but this is what we currently have. And the donors have agreed to create an association, a simple association in Switzerland that has a bank account. That is the purpose of that association, to have a bank account where they can pay in money, which has been felt at the moment to be the easiest and feasible way.

Then the donors get a request or the association gets a request from ICANN to pay -- reimburse ICANN for its paying the invoices of ACIG. It's simpler than it sounds. But the money is coming from the donor countries, they pay it to the association of which the donor countries, plus Switzerland were the facilitators to make sure there is a bank account that the donors can give the money to which goes on.

The membership of the association is open to any GAC member, whether you're a donor or not a donor, but you need -- the Swiss law is the easiest in the world, at least to my knowledge, where you can create an association for a bank account. You need three members and that's it but you can have 155 members. So

---

the money goes to the bank account of that association. The association pays ICANN. Of ICANN pays ACIG. This is how the money flows.

Anybody can just agree to commit to giving money, but it's for one year or five years. Also the amount, there are no rules about -- we don't have units. It doesn't have to be the same amount like the donors currently pay. They may not exactly pay the same amount. The more money we get, the more services we get. The less money we will have, the less services we will have. It's not a yes or no. Different levels of course.

Yes, Sweden.

SWEDEN: Thank you, that's very clarifying. So there is no -- as a donor, you don't engage in a contract either with ICANN or ACIG.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: This is right, yes.

SWEDEN: So I should ask my minister to put up money in a Swiss bank account with no contract. I don't really see that happening (laughing).

---

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: The association can make a contract with you. The three current donors were just looking for a way to transfer the money, so that was the solution found at that time. But this is not carved in stone.

In the end, I think whenever somebody is willing to contribute to the funding, we will find a solution that this works. So tell us in case you have a special requirement, there may be different ways. Also with the IGF, you have the trust fund, a separate trust fund so we may open up different tracks if different modalities are needed. That is clear. So far this is what was needed for the three donors. Maybe one of the donors can explain why that was. Let's try and be brief. Sorry for jumping the queue but I think it would make sense in Netherlands and Norway explain this.

NETHERLANDS: Just to clarify, the association has statutes and the statutes make sure that everything which every transaction is being, let's say, co-writed by the members of the association. So there's a kind of financial due diligence let's say.

But I think it makes very much sense to put something on a paper to be sent to, for example, GAC members or even their ministers if they want so, to have an official goal which we also

---

put down the mythology of it. Maybe Norway can address or Brazil can add to this. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Norway.

NORWAY: Thank you, Thomas. Just to explain to the GAC, the model for this foundation in Switzerland was based on the experiences they had with the financing of the EuroDIG. They took the model and the structure they used for having a finance model to be able to model for the EuroDIG. That's why this simple lightweight model was chosen. It's a model used in other areas as well.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Has that been taken over by the IGF trust fund. It's something different if you're a intergovernmental institution, you may membership fees. We don't have this. It's a voluntary payment. The contract is between ICANN and ACIG. It's the GAC chair who validates, who receives the request from ICANN to validate, to look at the invoice of ACIG and validates the invoice. ICANN will not give the money to ACIG without validation from the GAC chair. There are several elements of, let's say, oversight and

---

control in the different steps of this. But we can provide you with the details.

Yes, Norway.

NORWAY:

Just following to say that numbers and what is being used is of course being shown every year. We have accountants looking through this. This is very tidy, very easy, very easy to understand and it's a simple lightweight structure. It's created on the basis of early experience but also to make it able for people to easily contribute, easy to contribute with the amount they can contribute with.

So there's nothing -- well, regarding your comment, it is a very good structure that's been used in Internet governance structures earlier. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. Let me go back to the speaker. I think I have Peru and the European Commission. Thank you, Peru.

PERU:

Most of my questions have been answered. I wanted to congratulate the team because I noticed they really make a

---

difference. Their work has been getting better and better. For me they have been of great help, absolutely. That's one thing.

The other is undoubtedly the system that's been created in Switzerland to deposit this volunteer contributions, I don't think it will suit the system of budget of a country, like mine.

But I can try to find donations from other institutions linked to Internet in Peru and I will do my best to do so.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you for this commitment. Egypt?

EGYPT: Thank you, Chair. Just to echo what's been said by other colleagues. The work of the secretariat has been enormously helpful and very valuable, and we would like it to continue, definitely. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Egypt.  
European Commission?

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Yes. Thank you very much. Just to underline what's been said by a number of other colleagues. The European Commission

---

and I know the other European member states as well have been very supportive and insistent on the importance of secretariat for GAC and we think this is a particularly important aspect and the work of course we appreciate very much.

I will be as brief as possible and use an expression that we use in English, which is you put your money where your mouth is, which is to say that we in the European Commission have proposed a contribution next year in our budget and to have a continuous budgetary contribution to the secretariat over the next five years.

It's not yet confirmed, but we have made this proposal so we're hoping that in the next budgetary proposal and procedures this will go through. Thanks.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, European Commission. This is a very positive thing to hear of course. Brazil?

BRAZIL: Thank you, Chair. Just as one of the donor countries together with the Netherlands and Norway, I would just like to say we believe the system devised to collect the contributions and to make the payments to the company, that they are very efficient. The beauty of it is that this money doesn't have to be transferred



---

directly to the company, but to an association in Switzerland. Let me say that we are very happy with the service provide so far and we would like to continue with the support of other countries in the GAC. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Just so there are no misconceptions. The association in Switzerland, the members are us. The done hers, plus Switzerland, we facilitate, account for the revision and everything is fine. There's no third party. The association is us, the ones that want to make sure that the money is going to the services.

Morocco and then Norway.

MOROCCO:

Thank you very much. I would like to support what has been said by Egypt and Peru. I would like to underline the allegiance of the GAC secretariat. We're very satisfied with the services that have been provided. I myself have realize we're preparing the high level governmental meeting, the significance and importance of this professional attitude in their work. Morocco would like to express the satisfaction of the work of the secretariat. Thank you very much.

---

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: GAC highly values the work of the secretariat and that the whole GAC considers this is a substantial improvement of our effectiveness and of our working methods. Because if we put that on the record, if you agree to this, this is one element we can also go into further refined analysis of what they do.

Because there's one element that we note that also demands for secretariat support is rising in particular with working groups that have increasing requests for support. So it depends on the amount of funding that we receive, as I said before. The more funding we receive, the more secretariat services we will get.

But it's highly likely that given the curve of demands for secretariat support, that we will have to prioritize to some extent also where to put the resources. So far, the ACIG has also been very flexible in terms of not looking at every hour they spend here or there, which is something that adds also to the quality, which is really the flexibility of this team. No matter at what hour of the day a request is coming, it always is delivered in time, rather quickly and in good quality. But just to signal to you that we may look into also prioritizing or clarifying what we want the resources to be spent on because probably the requests for support will increase.

So can I take it that basically there is strong appreciation of the GAC of that work, and that we all urge to ourselves to go home

---

and check whether we can -- each of us is able to contribute to the funding of this, no matter with what particular amount, in what particular year?

It would be important, given the fact that this is now the time to go to those in our governments that are responsible for budgeting plans for the next years that this is done now, as the European Commission has done, so that we get clear signals from GAC members in the -- in the near future, from other GAC members than the European Commission, in the near future that they will join the team, because this allows the current owners to continue contributing to the funding.

So we shouldn't wait forever with positive further commitments because they mutually need each other.

Again, we're all sitting in the same boat together here. So we need to have consensus on contributing to the funding as a joint exercise.

I think I stop here. And whoever is interested in becoming a donor but needs a special piece of information or a special procedure, don't hesitate to come to us. We'll always find solutions.

Norway.

---

NORWAY: Yes, thank you, Thomas. Just to quickly address some of the comments made by Sweden.

The current contract between ICANN and ACIG is based on the public tender, with the tender that was agreed on by the whole of the GAC. So that defines the work items and what the secretariat is supposed to do. And there is a current budget cap based on the contract there. And also as Thomas elaborated on, if there are more funding coming in, there is also possible to task -- to have an amendment of the contract to task the secretariat to do more work, et cetera. So that's based on what is sort of depending on the funding and what the GAC wants and decides as a GAC for secretarial services.

So thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

If there are more questions, you can also ask the donors or the secretariat or the leadership team.

I think we have to end here because there is, in this room, the meeting of the working group on human rights and international law is going to take place in this room at 12:45, and the whole GAC will resume at 2:00 in the afternoon.

---

So thank you very much. See you later.

[ Lunch break ]