DUBLIN – GAC Tuesday Afternoon Sessions
Tuesday, October 20, 2015 – 14:00 to 18:00 IST
ICANN54 | Dublin, Ireland

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Welcome back to the Tuesday afternoon session of the GAC. The next item on our agenda is item 20 which is focusing on future gTLD rounds, and we have some important ICANN staff members with us in that regard who will give us an update of what they have been and are planning to do with regard to, I guess, reviewing the first round and then feeding this into working out the rules for a potential future round.

So the floor is yours.

KAREN LENTZ: Thank you, Thomas. And thank you, GAC, for the opportunity to address you.

I will try to go through the material fairly quickly as there's a lot of material that the GAC members wish to discuss.

Are the slides available?

So at the last couple of ICANN meetings we've done some fairly large update sessions that talk about both studies and analysis that the staff is doing with regard to reviewing the 2012 round of

the new gTLD program as well as activities that are occurring in the supporting organizations and advisory committees within ICANN. And that's -- we're grateful that that's included some updates from some of the GAC's working groups who are looking at particular areas such as geographic names and underserved regions, for example.

So I will try to go through these slides fairly quickly. The slides will be available and have more detail. I think you also have a short briefing paper that was provided before the meeting that described this. So my focus will be to describe the work that is under way and planned with regard to program reviews.

Next slide.

Okay. Next slide.

So one of the key activities that's driving a lot of the work is the review of competition, consumer trust and consumer choice. We abbreviate that as CCT. That's a review that is specified in Section 9.3 of the Affirmation of Commitments; that there would be a review team once the new gTLDs have been operational for some time who would look at the extent to which new gTLDs have promoted competition, consumer trust and consumer trust. They're also asked to look at the effectiveness of the application and evaluation processes as well as the safeguards

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

that were built into the program to mitigate some of the risks that were discussed during development of the program.

So that review process has kind of just begun with the publication of the call for volunteers earlier this month, and that's a review team that will be staffed by volunteer stakeholders from the community.

Next slide.

This is -- This timeline is what's included in the RFP as far as estimated time frame for the review team once it gets -- once it gets started. As you can see, there's a process in terms of collect thing applications, going through the selection process. So we estimate that the review team will be convened and will start meeting about beginning of 2016.

Next slide.

And so though the review process itself is just starting, there's been work under way for some time to prepare for it and to gather information and data for that review team to have to form some of its considerations. And this -- a lot of this originated from the community, from the, particularly, GNSO and ALAC who recommended a number of metrics that would help assess competition choice and trust, and so I won't go through all of these, but a key recommendation there was to do

a consumer survey, and that asked questions about trust and awareness. And two of those reports have been published, one for consumers in general and one for just domain name registrants, to look at both of those user groups.

Next slide.

There was also recommendation for some economic analysis, and that has been recently published as well. That looks at pricing and nonpricing factors when looking at competition. For both of those exercises, the consumer survey and this economic study, they both are occurring in two parts. The first is to provide a baseline, and both of those studies will be repeated in a year's time and provide a set of companion data.

Next slide.

So beyond those two studies, there are also a number of individual metrics that relate to things like IDNs, dispute resolution complaints. And so all of those that were recommended are in the process of being compiled by a staff, and the page where those are published is at the bottom of the screen there at that slide.

Next slide.

This area that we call program implementation is quite a substantive area. There are -- if you recall the slide on the

Affirmation of Commitments review, it did ask the review team to look at the effectiveness of the application and evaluation processes. And so to prepare for that, staff has compiled a great deal of quantitative data, statistical data about different phases of the process, such as predelegation testing, the objection process, the application system. There's a lot of detail and a lot of feedback that are available in that report.

We have that posted for public comment now, and we expect that that will be revised and updated. And then that can be used as a basis for the review team's discussion, one basis, in that area.

Next slide.

And lastly, the affirmation is also asking the CCT review team to look at effectiveness of measures built into the program which would mitigate certain risks that were foreseen. One of those was a set of rights protection mechanisms that were built into the program. We've also done a similar exercise there, starting earlier this year, where we collected a lot of data about the use of these RPMs, and also the user feedback that we've received to date looking to identify what the key areas of interest are in terms of considering and doing additional work in the areas of rights protection.

So this report was posted for comment. We just published the updated version which incorporates the feedback received. And this will also be a key input to the CCT review team.

Next slide.

So I'm leaving the -- We'll return in a moment to the CCT review process and where that fits in. This is a separate effort that I'm turning to now which is the independent review of the trademark clearinghouse. This actually originates from GAC advice in 2011, that there would be a logical point, once the clearinghouse had been in operation for some period of time, to complete an independent review of that.

The trademark clearinghouse was established, along with the new gTLD program, as a global repository of trademark data from users from all over the world, and that is intended to support the new TLD startup processes. And so we are in the process of engaging a study provider to do that independent review.

Next slide.

There's also a review getting under way that concerns looking at the more technical aspects of the program, particularly assessing what the impact of adding many more TLDs to the root server system has been. And we've also gone through a

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

process to engage a provider for that. And we are -- actually just had a session this afternoon where the study team presented their methodology, which we expect will also be published for comment. So that study is just getting started.

Next slide.

I also wanted to mention the GNSO policy activities that are related to these topics. There is, as you are probably aware, in the GNSO, an issue report that is open for comment now that describes a number of topics that could be considered in relation to policy advice for subsequent rounds, and that issue report is open for comment now.

There's also a more recently posted issue report focusing on rights protection mechanisms. And that topic is not necessarily limited to new gTLDs, although it's included in it. That would look at also, for example, the UDRP and rights protection as a whole in terms of ICANN processes.

So the graphic there is from the GNSO page that, at a high level, shows how the policy development process worked -- works, and the current status is where you see that circle, where the preliminary issue report is open for comment.

Next slide.

This is the timeline, kind of encapsulating what I've described for all of these reviews. The orange bar that says competition, consumer choice and trust review, many of the other items are intended to be part of that, to be fed into that as inputs and data. And obviously we don't know exactly how long that work will take. That estimate that's there is based on generally how long other review teams have taken. And so we think that once the review team is convened and has come up with their work plan and schedule, we'll be able to be more precise about the expected timeline for that.

What's also not on here is the GNSO policy work that I mentioned, primarily because there hasn't formally been a policy development process initiated at this time. Should that occur, that will also be very helpful for us to coordinate in terms of timing and understand the scope and the work plan for that -- for that group.

Next slide.

So I think that covers it, and I'm happy to answer any questions.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much, Karen, for this overview. So we've already heard from several sides now about the quite large number of

reviews that are taking place or are about to take place. So the floor is open to comments and questions from the GAC.

European Commission.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Yes, thank you, Thomas.

Thank you very much for the presentation. It's very interesting, and I expect that this is going to be part of our later discussion that during these reviews, and you mentioned one particular case where GAC advice had been taken into consideration, it was at the base of the review, that you're looking also in the context of previous GAC advice on a number of these issues and what the implications are and how this has been looked at.

But if I'm not mistaken, in the presentation that you made -- I'm not sure if it was you personally, but someone made yesterday on the review of new gTLD program, there were a number of slides on consumer trust and consumer choice that resulted, I think, from the analysis group study. And I think those were rather interesting, that showed that trust and confidence in the new gTLDs hadn't been as high as we might have expected. At least that's my understanding.

And I'm not suggesting that you now go into that long presentation, but perhaps it would be useful to make that

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

available to the GAC members, because we've been discussing a whole series of issues -- safeguards, for example, along with others -- and those are issues of interest to public-policy makers and will help to not only provide input to your review but also feedback to us.

Thanks.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Would you want to respond or should I go to the next question?

KAREN LENTZ: Thank you, yes. We'll be happy to make both of those available. I think there were two things that were substantively related to the competition, choice and trust aspects that were presented. One was the consumer survey that was undertaken by Nielsen, and it did ask respondents questions about their awareness of certain TLDs, their perceptions of the industry, their perceptions of the registration process. So there's a lot of information from that survey.

The second piece was -- was the analysis group study that was looking at registry and registrar pricing data and analyzing that

as well as other nonprice factors, like services and products, to come up with a baseline analysis of competition at this point.

So I'll be happy to make both of those reports available to you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Other questions or comments on these reviews?

United Kingdom.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. And thank you, Karen, for running through these processes and related timelines, and so on.

A question I have is with regard to community-based top-level domain applications. And as you may be aware, we had a discussion about that where we invited the ombudsman to give an account of his consideration of the various complaints and concerns that have been expressed about the prioritization, evaluation processes and so on. So his report is out, and the GAC has provided advice and expressed concerns over several meetings, quite a long period.

At what point do you think we as the advisory committee should articulate some recommendations into all or one particular of these processes? It would be useful, actually, just to know so

that we have some sense of a timeline where we can, you know, reflect on the problems that have been experienced in this round as we look at the next round. And so a kind of signal where must we actually be most active in contributing to these reviews on that particular issue would be very helpful.

Thank you.

KAREN LENTZ: Thank you. I think there are a couple of points that you might consider here. One is, as you're aware, that the GNSO has listed a number of topics, and the community-based structure in the program and definitions and procedures that related to community originated from policy advice. And I think that's reflected in what the GNSO has come up with; that that's an area where they have -- that they think would bear more discussion.

That was also actually noted by staff in its input to the GNSO process, that that is an area that would perhaps be useful to take up from a policy standpoint.

So I think there's currently quite good coordination from -- with the GAC in the GNSO process. And so that's one -- one avenue for that.

Also, in terms of the -- you know, the GAC's advice process, the -- there's existing advice in the form of the GAC principles on new

ICANN | 54
Dublin

gTLDs from 2007, I want to say, or earlier. But -- and I don't know, in terms of the GAC's processes, whether that's being looked at as a whole or whether working groups are sort of independently looking at their areas and perhaps coming up with recommendations as to a topic that they think should be -- should be considered or discussed or could raise to the level of advice.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Other questions and comments?

Yes, Red Cross, please.

IRC-RC: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Stefan Hankins International Committee of the Red Cross on behalf of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent movement, for the record.

We wanted in this context of this session to underline the importance, as conversations and preparations come under way for future gTLD rounds, to comment on the importance that past Board policy determinations be reaffirmed and carried over as

far as possible into the next rounds, thus at least unless there are paramount or new policy considerations to do otherwise.

I wanted to refer here maybe as an illustration to the protections and reservations accorded, albeit temporarily, to the designations and names of the Red Cross and Red Crescent at the top and second levels. These are protections, which as has been underlined and -- by the GAC in past advice, are clearly grounded in global public-policy interest. They're grounded also in universally approved norms of international law. And, indeed, as the Board and ICANN staff move into implementation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent protections, I think it will be important that the -- the existing reservation be made permanent and reaffirmed in the next round.

We remain, of course, available within the Red Cross/Red Crescent also to take part in the processes and deliberations in this regard.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Red Cross.

Other comments? United Kingdom.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes. Thank you, Chair. Just on that point, we would very much support the Red Cross and Red Crescent movement in terms of ensuring that there isn't a total reconsideration of protections that have been implemented in the first round when it comes to the next round. So I think that's an important position that we, from the U.K., would want to underline; that they carry over, in effect, to the next round.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much, United Kingdom.

Other questions and comments?

If that is not the case, I think we should use the rest of the remaining 30 minutes in this session on discussing maybe on how the GAC plans to organize itself in -- with a view to contributing to these various activities from the GNSO and also from ICANN staff.

So you are free to stay with us if you like to listen, because this is a public meeting anyway, or if you have other urgencies, of course we would excuse you. But I think we should use these 30 minutes to have an exchange and see how do we organize ourselves. Also given these timelines that we've heard, which are quite ambitious for us given the rest of the work, but

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

assuming that this is very important, I think we should -- we should really be clear now on how our different deliberations we have undertaken so far, including the working groups that we've had and how this is going to be organized in the next few months, I think, in order to feed in.

I see that Russia would like to take the floor.

Yes, Russia.

RUSSIA: I will speak in Russian. Sorry.

I just would like to ask the participant from GNSO to stop, because I need to ask the question. Sorry for the -- GNSO, please.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: You mean you would like them to stay?

RUSSIA: Yes, because I need to ask the question.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So if you have one more minute?

ICANN | 54
Dublin

RUSSIA: Yes, just one minute.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: It's not representative of the GNSO. It's ICANN staff, actually, but you may still ask the question.

RUSSIA: I would like to draw your attention to the fact that one thing we do need is to give more thought to sanctions in unity here. The point being is that we need to think about applicable measures to avoid similar mistakes in the future. The point of the fact is that GNSO is participating in very important work in the development of their policies. And we do matter, as GAC members, too, when these decisions are met, when we are talking about contractual obligations between registries and ICANN and users correspondingly.

First of all, recently applied sanctions clearly demonstrated that there is a problem there that ICANN still remains within the U.S. jurisdiction in the separating under the U.S. law. All their registrars are also subject to the U.S. law. These contracts are also governed by the U.S. law.

Correspondingly, in the event of sanctions, they must obey the American law. And they cannot proceed with their contracts.

Simultaneously, there is a consensus in the world community that this is a situation where sanctions undermine human rights, undermine the customer rights. All these things have been discussed before. Accordingly, the issue of sanctions in unity, if we completely ignore this important issue, this may can lead to very important problems in the future. In principle, this is fraught with fermentation in the future and becoming even worse if a similar situation occurs in the future. I just wanted everyone to give it a little bit of thought. Thank you.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: I think this is noted. Do you want to reply to this maybe?

KAREN LENTZ: Thank you. Thank you. We appreciate the comment. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. Thank you.

So if there are no more questions directly to the attention of our colleagues from ICANN staff, then we will continue with the discussion on how the GAC should organize itself and what are elements that are of key importance for us and how should we

organize ourselves in delivering input, giving advice or other input into these processes that we've made aware of.

So the floor is yours.

Maybe we can start with one element that was also part of this presentation, which is the competition, consumer choice and trust, I think, something like that. It's called review, that you've heard that there was a call for interested people to nominate themselves as potential members of that review team.

The deadline is early November --

OLOF NORDLING: 30th of October.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: 30th of October.

So anybody who thinks would be fulfilling the criteria that are set out in this call for -- for people can, of course, apply for himself or herself. And then as you have seen on the slide -- Maybe we can go back to that slide because it's still on. I think it was slide two or three, something rather early in the stage, where there was a timeline -- Even before that. If you go further back.

This is the timeline that we received, although I think there must be a mistake in it. Because, if the applicants will be published on 2nd of November, the SO/ACs will not be able to endorse it on the same day. So probably there is a mistake in that 2nd of November date. But that's a detail, and I guess that will be corrected. Yes. End of the month. So the 2nd of November should read 30 of November.

And then, according to the AoC where this review comes from, it is the CEO of ICANN plus the chair of the GAC who will then look at these applications and then decide about the review team and announce the members in December. And then the rest of the timeline you see there. So I think of particular importance is one that you spread the information, if you haven't already done so, that there is this call for volunteers that anybody can apply.

And, then again, there is a possibility, not an obligation, for SOs and ACs, also for the GAC, once the applicants have been published and their names have been published, to endorse and make recommendations to those who take the decision about applicants that would have the support of the GAC. We can do this. We don't have to. So this is something that we may consider.

As these deadlines are rather short, so the end of the application period is at the end of this month. So in 10 days. And then we

would need to be rather quick in looking at these and communicating views, if we have any. So maybe comments or questions from you to what we should do or should not do with regard to this particular review would be very welcome. African Union Commission.

AFRICAN UNION COMMISSION: Thank you, Chair. As I mentioned this morning, the Public Safety Working Group had this issue discussed yesterday during our face-to-face private meeting. And we're of the opinion that we have the subject matter and the interest. And it's important to have a member from that working group participating in this review. So I propose that is something to be considered by yourself and colleagues. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Other comments or questions? Olof.

OLOF NORDLING: Thank you. Olof Nordling, ICANN staff. There is another little aspect that's worth considering perhaps right now. Because as the Affirmation of Commitment goes, it's foreseen that both the CEO and the GAC chair will be members of the AoC review teams. But that has, in practice, not happened. There is an option there for the GAC chair as well as the for CEO to appoint a designated

appointee -- and that's outside of this application circuit -- to take their place in the review team. Just to refresh our collective members for those who have been around for some time, one of the more recent -- well, a number of years ago it was a review on WHOIS. And then the designated appointee was Peter Nettlefold of Australia, just to keep that in mind as well. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Maybe we should try to give a little more information to the GAC about the numbering and composition of these groups. From what I understand, this review team in the end will comprise around 15-20 members. Is that more or less correct?

OLOF NORDLING: Well, of that order. But it's, actually, something that is designated -- well, the selectors usually decide. So that -- but it's been in that order of magnitude. And there also is a possibility of appointing additional ones. Because there is some kind of balance between the SOs and ACs from the extraction of the members. But also independent experts can be appointed in addition to that.

I'm looking at Margie, but I don't think there have been any final decision on the exact composition in numbers of the review

ICANN | 54
Dublin

team on this. Or is there a suggestion perhaps? Sorry for putting you on the spot, but that's quite interesting.

MARGIE MILAN: Hello. Margie Milam. Yes, Olof is correct. There's no number specified. It's up to you and Fadi to determine what the number is. And, as Olof mentioned, there can be independent experts in addition to ones that are designated among the SOs and ACs. There's no fixed allocation among the SOs or ACs. It's really up to you guys to decide how to do that. In the past it's been about 16 members is the number that has been. And that's just a guideline.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Since you're here, just another quick question. I heard that some SO and/or ACs, basically, endorse a particular group of people and then have something like an expectation that those will be on the group. But there is no existing, let's say, attribution of seats for each SO or AC. So there is no regulation at all. This is really, in the end, a question of what are the candidates and what are the -- what is the number?

And how, based on previous practices, how did then the chair of the GAC together with the CEO, how did they take that selection? What did they do? What is the value or the weight, if I may ask,

for an endorsement of the GAC? For instance, if the GAC says we would like to have these people, what is the impact of such a statement? Maybe that helps also for GAC members.

MARGIE MILAM: There is no requirement to have an endorsement. We just did that because there is the notion that you're going to represent an SO or an AC, how do you determine that? So it's certainly not a requirement.   In the past the endorsements haven't been followed. I believe in the last review team, ATRT2, there were individuals that were endorsed by the GNSO, for example, that were not selected. So there's really no rules in that regard.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So this is a sign of support that is an indicator, but there's no obligation in any way to follow these. Okay. I think that --

MARGIE MILAM: Correct.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thailand.

THAILAND: Just to clarify, there is volunteer members and independent experts. When you talk about the volunteer member, you have to name the supporting organization or advisory committee.

So in this case is the applicant in the GAC list? I think it's really not an issue to put as volunteer members, right? What about the country have expert and they want to propose or invite them to come? So they have to be independent expert? Is that correct understanding? Because all these GAC members are going back to their own country and maybe bring the resource person. So we have to be clear where what they did.

OLOF NORDLING: Well, I can give a preliminary answer that sort of way back I used to support the reviews. But they may have changed. But, as a matter of fact -- well, yes, you indicated -- well, those interested indicated some kind of affiliation. But that doesn't imply that, for example, would be representatives or GAC representatives or alternate representatives or anything like that in the GAC case. But, rather, that they come from government circles.

When it comes to experts, well, there are many shades of gray in that. That's -- perhaps Margie had more recent experience. And I may have forgotten things as well.

ICANN | 54
Dublin

MARGIE MILAM: I think the independence is -- you're not trying to represent an SO or AC is how I personally read it. There's nothing strict about that. And, again, it's really you and Fadi would determine that. So, theoretically, you could -- if you have the expertise in some of the areas we're looking for such as consumer protection or IP rights, anything like that, you could try to put yourself out as an independent expert, list your criteria. And then that's something that would be considered. The independence, I think, is there to a point that you're not trying to represent an SO or an AC.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much. I think that clarifies it. And I just want to repeat the first deadline, which is the 30th of October. So in case you consider reaching out to people that you think would be good candidates, use the next days to do that. Because, otherwise, it will be too late.

Looking at the time, I think we should -- I think we see a little clearer on this particular review. Let's try to focus on the other ones.

One aspect is the GNSO -- sorry, U.K. I forgot you. Thanks for reraising your finger. Thanks.

UNITED KINGDOM:	Sorry. I don't want to delay progress. But it's a very tight deadline, and I'm quite willing to consult on the consumer protection policy experts in London. Forgive me, if I missed it, if it's in the call, but is there a sense of the workloading. This is a year-long project. So is there advice on how much time needs to be committed by the individual? Was that available? Sorry if I missed it earlier. Thank you.
CHAIR SCHNEIDER:	That's a good question. I think it's three and a half hours a day on Monday, Wednesday, and Tuesday. No.
OLOF NORDLING:	Sorry to say that you're absolutely right, Thomas. No, it's substantial. Let's put it like that. Most certainly going to be weekly calls, I would expect. There would be face-to-face meetings. And there is a timeline which stretches one year, which -- well, it may seem a lot. But it turns out that -- it usually becomes very compressed at the very end.
	Margie is nodding her head. So I guess I'm still just about on the right track.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: It's not for somebody who plans to go on a round-the-world trip in November/December 2016. That is clear. But there is information on the workload. There's some indications in the call, I guess.

OLOF NORDLING: Very few have gone fishing at the same time, so to speak.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. Now, with regard to the other ones, I think we've already discussed, when we exchanged with the GNSO, that we would try and use the GNSO -- GAC/GNSO consultation group or, in particular, the GAC members on the GAC side of that consultation group to try and play the interface, use them as interface with regards to the GNSO's work. But it may be that GAC part of that group would need to be strengthened by additional members. So I would suggest that those of you who have a particular interest in these reviews or in particular aspects of the reviews, we've heard a number of issues that we care about that is coming out of also of the working groups on geo names, underserved regions, communities, number of discussions that we've had, safeguards, PICs, so on and so forth, that you consider at least in some way linking to the members of this group, the GAC members or adding yourself to them so that

we are sure that we do not miss an important opportunity to feed into the GNSO.

And, with regard to the ICANN driven reviews, as you've heard, there are normally public comment periods where we can actually, as a GAC, make -- or also as individual countries, you may make comments on these. So it would -- maybe we can use our Secretariat staff and support that these deadlines and so on are highlighted and so that we get all the information. That we don't miss to give input. In case we would want to give input as a GAC, we would need to, of course, somehow work on a consensus input. Sorry. On this. So let me ask you, let me give you -- or maybe Tom and Secretariat, you can start and see how you would plan to or think without having given you much time to think about it, but how you may think to support us. And then, of course, GAC members, please share views on how we should do this.

Okay. Thank you.

TOM DALE: Thank you, Thomas.

The Secretariat, in conjunction with ICANN staff, could prepare a -- excuse me -- a roadmap type of document fairly shortly if the GAC would find that helpful, covering the opportunities and

timelines and deadlines in particular for GAC engagement in both the ICANN review processes and in the GNSO PDP processes. That would help me. I don't know about you. But that sort of guide is one thing. And that could be done fairly quickly. And, certainly, ICANN staff have done a lot of that already. But I think the other part of it that I would put to you to consider is, building on the discussions that the GAC had a couple of days ago with the GNSO, there were some ideas discussed there and indeed ones that I had circulated to you as ideas that I discussed with Mason Cole, who is the GNSO liaison to the GAC concerning greater support for GAC participants in GNSO PDPs offering training building on what ICANN offers at the moment, which is extremely good Secretariat support and general assistance to GAC members who -- or GAC nominees, for that matter, experts you may wish to engage on the major PDPs in the GNSO.

So there are ideas about, as I say, greater capacity building to assist GAC members who have not participated in those PDP processes before. So that would go with a document about deadlines and maps and so on. That's important, of course, for yourself and briefing from us as well.

But I think we're suggesting it's equally important to look at ideas to provide you with not just incentives but the actual capacity to participate. We can't do anything without your

diaries or your time. That's up to you. But there are some ideas which I have circulated a few days ago concerning capacity building and support for the GAC, particularly in the PDP process. And I hope you can think about that and consider whether that will be useful to you. Thank you, Thomas.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much, Tom. I see the U.S. has raised her hand.

UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. And thank you, Tom, for that offer. Just a small observation. I know we have grappled with this before -- and Manal can correct me -- of course, in the GAC/GNSO consultation group.

What we are going to try to do, I believe -- and that's our objective all the time -- is to try to share GAC perspectives with the colleagues in the GNSO and our counterparts. The challenge for us is, of course, that there are very fixed deadlines. They follow quite a fixed pattern, as they should, as they must in the processes. So, depending on which PDPs we as a GAC elect to participate in, we would have to modify our own collaboration procedures accordingly, so that we are actually providing a GAC perspective.   Because, obviously, the alternative, which is always an option, is for individual members to participate with

their own international perspective. Of course, that's always welcome. The GNSO has stressed that many times. I think we all need to be mindful of that distinction, however. And we need to remind the GNSO.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Actually, I've thought of the same thing. We should be clear for those who participate themselves, for us, but also for the GNSO. If, in case that GAC members somehow feed in and participate in these processes, do they do this in their capacity as national representatives giving them one view or interest and so on of a particular country? Or are they speaking on behalf of the whole GAC? So this is, of course, a little bit of a difference.

And there may be -- as Suzanne as said, I guess, the first one is always possible. Everybody can contribute and feed in. But, of course, it would have a different weight if GAC -- consolidated GAC positions or requests or whatever would be conveyed. But that needs more work. That means we have to organize ourselves with the support, I would say, of the GNSO -- GAC/GNSO consultation group members. But not only, of course, the Secretariat, I guess, is also willing to help. Of course, I'm willing to help. But that would need to be organized very

efficiently in order to allow for such positions to actually be produced in the time that is very tight. Egypt. Thank you.

EGYPT: Thank you, Thomas. And thank you, Suzanne. Yes, I agree with everything you and Suzanne have said. But also to highlight that the GNSO from their side also noted that we can request an extension or more time if needed. So they just need to be kept informed. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. This is useful. So, whenever we think something is really important and we can't make it in deadlines, they're flexible in terms of giving us time. That is, I think, a good -- something important for us to know.

Other comments or questions with regard to the GNSO part? If not, we have, I think, we have five minutes left to maybe concentrate a little bit also on the ICANN work that is -- has started or will start. And the public comment period. I think that's, basically, the same thing. We have always -- every GAC member has the possibility to comment individually in a public comment period. But we may also think about whether we have agreement on some key elements that we would prefer to have a

consolidated GAC advice, communication, whatever we call it, to ICANN staff on a particular issue and a particular report.

So -- but that would then also need to be organized. And we don't really have a -- let's say, a fixed structure for this apart from somebody raises something, we consult. And, if the GAC agrees, then we work out a draft. Somebody is presenting a draft communication.

So I see Germany has an idea or a question.

GERMANY: Yes, just rather an observation. I think there are still some of the most controversial gTLDs that are pending where we do not have a decision. And then it's difficult to evaluate what happened and what will happen.

And the second one is I think it might be useful to feed in information and discussion positions we already have. I think, for example, on the safeguard issue and the question that needs to be reflected and could probably be a contribution for discussion papers from other sides. Because, as I said, some of the issues are not solved and we do not -- we are not in a position to give a firm position.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Germany. This just brought me to the idea that, since we have had a look at the GAC advice since 2012 or in a more systematic way by our Secretariat, we could actually ask them to put all the advices for different pieces of advice that we've given in the last few years in relation to new gTLDs in a first round to put them together in a document and maybe quickly recirculated to the GAC to see whether this advice is still valid in our view. And then, actually, as a first input, hand that over to ICANN just as a reminder that these are elements of advice that we consider should be taken into account in the review, to what extent this advice has been requested or the ideas that have been formulated have been met, but also with a view of looking into this in the second round. Would that be something as a first step that you would consider useful? I see people nodding. And I see no objection. So we'll add another piece of work on the shoulders of our Secretariat. These shoulders are growing remarkably.

We'll discuss the financial aspect of this tomorrow, by the way, because somebody needs to pay for the Secretariat, as you know. Just a side remark.

Any further comments or views? I think we may collect, maybe also in parallel to that, and see what are the issues that we would want to look into and feed into these -- I guess we can do this in parallel with collecting the previous advices. What are the

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

elements that we should continue to give advice or communicate with ICANN or the GNSO in the next few months and try to organize ourselves accordingly. Any more questions or comments on this agenda item?

If that is not the case, we should thank the colleagues from ICANN staff for being here with us and sharing information and announcing questions. And thank you for the discussion. And we would end here with this item and move onto the next one, which is slot 21 and actually 22 plus a coffee break in the middle, which we can spend on the issue of accountability. So that means we have twice 30 minutes plus a coffee break.

You'll remember that we've been somewhat unclear on how we are supposed to communicate to the CCWG on whatever we will agree or not agree on during this meeting. And so Tracey has contacted, in the meantime, the CCWG co-chairs and asked them this question. So now we've got -- we just received the answer. This is why we had a quick bilateral trilateral chat here. And I think it may be useful if we just give the floor quickly to Tracey so that she can report to us what answer she has received from the co-chairs of the CCWG.

TRACEY HIND: Thank you, Thomas.

ICANN | 54
Dublin

Yes, I just, while you were starting to discuss gTLDs in the last session, I ran down and had a conversation with the chairs of the CCWG accountability about this and asked them, aside from the content, what were they hoping to get out of or how were they hoping to hear from the GAC by the end of the week.

They're looking for a communication from us in a written form, one form or another, either a letter or an email or something like that. But, ideally, in the communique, if you feel that you have reached a consensus text for the communique, they're looking for a text or they would be delighted with a text that indicates that the GAC has broad support for the process, the consultative multistakeholder process that the CCWG have undertaken and that the GAC feel that they've had the opportunity to contribute as an effective stakeholder to that process.

They would like to see some wording about consensus as an ideal outcome, if possible and to offer an alternative for stress test 18, if that's something that the GAC can't reach consensus on.

Because they would like to use all of those imports as -- for preparation of their final report. As I said, ideally, they'd like to see that kind of material in the communique, if you feel you can come to agreement on text in that. Otherwise, just some kind of formal communication, a letter, an email from the chair that

expresses a GAC position on how they feel about the process of working with the CCWG and how they feel comfortable that your voice has been heard in that process.

Is that clear?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Just to make it clear, this is not -- the GAC is free in deciding what and how it communicates. These are just ideas that we asked the CCWG co-chairs to give us on how they would expect or hope that something would come from us. We decide. So don't -- you don't have to go into who are they to tell us what to do. Because these are just -- we asked them for their expectation, for their ideas. And they've given us this.

So it is clear that this is absolutely up to us if and how what form, what substance we answer them, so that we don't misunderstand each other on. This was an attempt from us to get an idea on what they would hope to get from us. Yes, Iran.

IRAN: I don't understand this issue at all. Who has given that mission to the Secretariat to contact the chair of the CCWG to ask them for their views? This should be discussed at GAC. And GAC would decide. And the meeting given to you the chairman of the GAC. But who have decided that? We have not given such a

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

delegation of authority to somebody to give -- what did you expect from us? I don't understand the process at all. So I don't agree with that at all. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. In fact, we have decided that we would seek clarification. The GAC has decided -- I don't know was it Saturday or Sunday? -- but the GAC has decided it's not really clear for us what is expected from us. And then we have tasked our secretariat that they would go and seek the views of the CCWG. But, again, this is the view of the co-chairs of the CCWG who have very spontaneously answered a question. And it's not the idea that we don't have to discuss their expectation. Again, this is just an input that should help us knowing what they would expect. But we don't have to discuss their expectation. We can I think -- and I would suggest -- continue with discussing our views. This is -- was just as an input to -- for us to have a better idea on how we could shape our input.

So I hope that this is clear with this.

So the question is: We have twice 30 minutes. How should we organize this twice 30 minutes? Do you want to continue on stress test 18? Or do you want to start with something else, with the other aspects? Stress test 18? I have Sweden. Yes.

ICANN|54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

SWEDEN: This would just be a proposal. There may be other proposals. But there are a few strands of conversations going. And I was hoping we could use the coffee break, perhaps, to finalize those discussions. But at least continue them. But others may have other ideas. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So would your proposal be that we have the coffee break now and to allow for some discussions and then follow-up? Or should we have the coffee break in the middle. Iran?

IRAN: Thank you, Thomas. There has been extensive email exchange seeking to find workable solutions to the origin of stress test 18 from the Congress to the NTIA, from NTIA to the working party dealing with a stress test, to CCWG to GAC.

And I don't know whether Anders wants to take care of that or just dealing with some few limited people that he has in his group in some corner of somewhere, but not taking account of both these extensive exchange of emails. If the second is available, yes. Otherwise, he may continue his personal discussion with you people and excluding others. And we don't agree with that. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Sweden.

SWEDEN: I can always do with coffee.

                         [Laughter]

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: European Commission.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Yes, thank you. It's European Commission, for the record.

                         Well, I was just going to suggest a slightly different approach.
                         And that is to address some of the other issues relating to the
                         CCWG accountability, which we still haven't really addressed in
                         any detail. Then have a break so that Anders and anyone else
                         who is interested in talking about stress test 18 informally could
                         continue. And then we could come back and address stress test
                         18.   Would that help to at least advance a bit some of the
                         discussion?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: That's a proposal. Please, I'm in your hands. Tell me what you
                         would want to start with. Yes, Paraguay.

ICANN | 54
Dublin

PARAGUAY: Yes Mr. Chair. I suggest having some coffee and going ahead with the conversations. I, myself, have an alternative to stress test 18. And I would say that the alternative, in my humble point of view, would be status quo. But, again, that would create problems for some other people. So I suggest we drink some coffee and talk about it. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So we have two -- we don't vote, but we have two positions for coffee. Any more positions for coffee. Three, four, five? To be serious, I think let's -- I suggest let's use a coffee break to discuss how we move this forward. Otherwise, we spend the first half discussing how we move this forward. So, if that's okay for you, coffee break. All right? And then there will be no more coffee break until the end, but that's life. Okay?

[Coffee break]

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you for your attention. Given the fact that some key people are still involved in exercises trying to work out something, I think let's wait a few minutes more before they have come back and then resume. I know that we are already over the coffee break, but I think we should give them a few more minutes.

Thank you.

All right. So I think we should sit down and, first of all, agree what we will deal with next, whether it's continue the discussion and trying to find a solution on stress test 18 or whether we should try and continue discussion that we had Sunday on the three other elements.

So please, please express your views on what we best use our remaining time this afternoon on.

So the floor is yours.

And before that, the secretariat has some nice administrative issues that they want to share with us. That gives you time to think.

TOM DALE: Yeah. Yeah, thank you, Thomas.

Two matters if I can draw to the GAC's attention, please. First is if you're staying at the Westin hotel in Dublin, you may not have your room key. You may have lost it. We have one here. So if you do have a room key and you're staying at the Westin where your travel budget is obviously better than mine, please, we have your key here if you have lost it.

The second announcement concerns the social event, the reception between the GAC and the ICANN Board. Instead of 6:30, which was the original time this evening, that event with the Board has now been rescheduled to 7:15 this evening. That's 7:15 this evening with the ICANN Board on level 5 of this building, in this building.

Thank you, Thomas.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

So the person that is in the Westin can also secretly get that key back so in order for not to be recognized.

All right. Back to our favorite issue of accountability.

I have a request from the floor. Let me try and see what -- Jamaica; is that right? Ah, my table is correct. Excellent.

Jamaica, the floor is yours.

JAMAICA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

We have heard the comments of our colleagues in the GAC, and we would recommend that we look at the other issues in relation to accountability, and then if we have the time, we go back to stress test 18.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Do you agree that we look on the other issues and not stress test 18? Yes?

DOMINICA: Yeah, Dominica here.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Dominica, yes.

DOMINICA: Mr. Chairman, I fully endorse, but I even want to go further. I think we are basically wasting our time on stress test 18 which seems not to be an issue. I have seen a number of emails going back and forth and even members of the CCWG have indicated that this is not an issue among themselves. So I don't see why we are wasting our time on stress test 18.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Dominica.

So should we go to the other issues instead of discussing stress test 18?

Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Chairman.

I agree 95% to what the two colleagues says, but not categorizing stress test 18 as nothing or not being an issue. Maybe not being an issue for us or for some most of us, but it is a issue; we have to resolve that. But we could, this time maybe you agree, sleep on that, think it over, further consult, further exchange views through the email and come back to that. And today use the time on that. Still, there are some discussions, but I am not categorizing as a zero, because we have seen the emails in the CCWG. You may not be on that list, that the people says stress test 18 may be cause of failure of total transitions.

So is not nothing.

We have to find a resolution for that.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Iran.

So that means that we will not discuss stress test 18 now, but we agree that it is an issue.

I guess -- see people nodding.

That means we will not be able to run away from this.

Excuse me, Brazil?

So if that means that we go to -- Argentina.

ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair.

I would like to concur with our colleague from Iran about extensive exchange of emails in the Cross-Community Working Group list. And some of them put in the stress test 18 the core issue for success or not of the transition. I am not saying that I agree or not with that. I am saying that for some members of the Cross-Community Working Group this is of the highest relevance for a successful or not transition. So in that sense, I think that perhaps some space for debate would be given at the first stage of this session.

I would also like to bring to this discussion some email sent to the Cross-Community Working Group list. Some of them have been shared in the GAC list. This is an issue not about only governments that think in a different way. There are members of other interest groups of the ccNSO, the GNSO that also have different perspectives about the stress test 18. So it's not about -- only about the GAC. It's about other members in the -- in the ICANN community.

So my suggestion would be that we may -- we may give some priority to stress test 18 instead of other things.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

So we cannot discuss both things in parallel. So we need to agree on what we start with. Well, we have half an hour left.

If we discuss the other issues which has been the majority of those taking -- taking that view, how should we do this?

The other -- Yeah. There's a request for clarification what are the other issues. The other issues were the ones we had on the screens. We had four points on the screen the last time. Trying to recall them. One is potential GAC role -- an estimation or an

assessment of this community -- empowered community mechanism with these escalation stairs and whether this is something that we think is going in the right direction, plus the discussion of the GAC's role in it. And the two other ones were the notion of ICANN's mission and commitments and core values and possible -- and its narrowness and the possible impacts on public-policy issues. And the last one of the three others was the question regarding the formulation of private sector leadership versus using the term multistakeholder in that.

So which should we -- should we start with trying to get an assessment of the model, of this community empowerment -- developing community empowerment model and the GAC's role in this? I would suggest to start with this, because this is still the key, let's say, of the whole accountability proposal is this model that is emerging now.

So we had -- already had 50 minutes of exchange on this.

Yes. The floor is yours.

Yes, Iran.

IRAN: Chairman, I don't understand. You want to go to the community empowerment as a subject or community empowerment as

topic by topic on each six or seven powers? Or you want to talk about the models, and so on and so forth.

If you clarify the situation, we may be in a position to contribute, but currently, your question is very, very general.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you for this question.

Actually, that would bring us -- I think we can go through this step -- step by step, but I don't think we are able or mean also it's not our role to go into such detail.

So the proposal would be to continue the discussion of Sunday on giving some kind of feedback at this stage from the GAC on the way this model is developing and on the role that the GAC is taking in general.

Yes, Iran.

IRAN: If you allow me, I would wish to refresh the views of our distinguished colleagues from what -- from where we are today.

One week ago, we were in the middle of nowhere. Today we are somewhere, somewhere which is promising.

The CCWG navigate through various approaches: voluntary model, single-designator model, multiple-membership model, sole-membership model, and now sole-designator model. Some people, they call them single designator, but it should be sole designator according to the views of the legal counsel.

Now, we are doing sole-designator model which has at least some positive latitude of the ICANN Board that they can go with that with some views. So it is a way that promising to us that when we leave Dublin, we would have something to work on that, preparing the final version of that, removing all deficiencies that express by people, and putting in the final proposal of the CCWG either with public comment or without public comment.

The last one we will discuss later, whether we should have a public comment or not. But now the situation is that it seems to me that there is a way forward. And that way forward is sole designator, provided that we remove deficiencies. One of the most important one is deficiencies currently exist in the separation of PTI.

You all remember that. There was many comments in the second proposal that currently PTI is an affiliate of ICANN. It may not work. Then there should be a separation process.

This separation process has been properly mentioned in annex L of the CWG. I don't want to take your time to go to that.

But with this sole-designator model, we can process that. We can ask that the process of the separation be enforced. But the decision, if ICANN does not want to separate that, is not currently enforceable.

So if the Board decide that, no, I don't want the separation, currently we have no alternative but to recall the entire Board, which is a very tough discussions and decisions.

What we are seeking now, and I send an email to the chair of the CCWG to ask the legal advisor to find a language to put into the bylaw that for this specific case we would have a possibility of reinforcement of the decision of community before going to the recall of the entire board. And the chair of the CCWG has agreed with that and is being sent to the legal counsel of the CCWG.

They said that comprehensive. I replied that, no, don't go to comprehensive. We don't want pages. We want one paragraph how it should be enforced.

If that issue is resolved, the remaining issue, in my humble knowledge of the CCWG, is positively reaching some sort of good conclusions. Then we have to look for other issues that there are in the details of that.

So the generality of the issue that we would not have a document with two reference model will be removed. It would

have a document with one single reference model which is called sole designator, if it resolve the issues, plus many other issues that people raised and discussed yesterday in the CCWG. The issue of separation tomorrow will be discussed in CWG. Jonathan, chairman of the CWG, yesterday mentioned that in his view, there is no problem, but I told him that this is his views. It must be confirmed by the CWG as a whole group, and then it should not be confirmed by other chartering organizations that there would be no problems of separations if we go to the separation which has direct relation with translations.

Having a conclusion on that tomorrow, we'll discuss on the tomorrow afternoon. Perhaps maybe legal counsel will provide a language for that.

In my view, perhaps we could go ahead with that sole-designator model and work on that and refine that, finalize that, and then decide whether or not we have to go to the public comment.

Just not to ask for the floor again, in my personal view we need to go to the public comment, because we are departing from the initial sole membership. We go to the sole designator with some thing. So it should have public comment in order to be diplomat- -- to be, yes, democratic, sorry, democratic, transparent, so on and so forth.

However, the duration of public comment could be reduced from 40 days, either to 30 days or 21 days. Once again, I told to CWG -- CCWG yesterday, I am not in favor of the things vite fait mal fait. We have to do it carefully. I leave it to you, and if you want further clarification, I leave it to people to provide further clarification.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Kavouss. I think this has been very useful, and also highlighting the remaining issues to be solved under the condition that you think this model may actually solve the purpose.

Let me ask the rest of the room, do you agree with Kavouss's -- Iran's proposal to send a positive note on the development with regard to the model and the community powers along what he has outlined? That would be one of the elements that we would then try to convey to the CCWG ideally by tomorrow night. Not necessarily in the communique, but maybe in an email or in a letter, but in a formal communication.

So if -- Are there any objections that we should take this as one element of a communication?

I don't see any objection. So we'll note for the time being that this is something that we would try to convey, that would need

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

to be formulated. So we hope that will not take too much time. But -- U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you. Yes, I broadly agree with that approach.

What I wanted to focus on in particular is the decision-making model. This -- Which I referred to in previous comments, actually, where work has been going on, I think it's in working party one of the CCWG, to determine the sort of steps leading up possibly, not inevitably, to a decision.

So this is the submission of a petition by at least two SOs, I think, that would then be considered by a pre-call to determine if it should go forward then with support from more of the SOs and ACs. I forget the exact ratio now. Two -- two SOs and one AC, I think. Forgive me. I was looking for it just now. I couldn't quite find the precise details.

But then -- So then there's agreement that this should then go to the community forum. And again, the GAC has a role there potentially, I think in most cases if we're talking about these empowerment mechanisms as being substantial evolving crisis situations which could be headed off at the community forum. The GAC may advise on public interest grounds not to take a particular course, whatever. But the GAC then has a role. And

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

subsequently, it will go possibly to a decision if they're subject to what comes out of the community forum discussions.

It may lead to a decision to -- to enact one of the empowerment mechanisms, to remove a board member, to reverse a decision on the budget or strategic plan, or the nuclear one, removal of the board.

So can -- If colleagues here are sufficiently au fait with this proposal of an escalating process, escalating in the sense that the further along you go, the thresholds start to be adjusted as to whether a decision would be taken, whether that model of decision-making is one that we can support, bearing in mind the GAC will be participating at all stages, I expect.

I've been engaged in some of the working party consultations on this. I've been impressed by the position and the thought that's gone into it and the openness of views and so on, but I'm not sure all GAC colleagues are sufficiently au fait with the proposal. But it's a key element. It envisages the GAC, as I say, fulfilling a role. So we need to take a view on it, I would propose.

So I offer that as a step to be taken at this meeting.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I think you raise an important aspect. So one is do we think that the model is going into a direction that is basically a good one. And the second question is if so -- should and if so, how the GAC participate in this.

And to try and draw on our consensus input to the CCWG of September, I think that the GAC -- or let me try and maybe help the discussion. The GAC is willing to participate in this model, in these steps, but maybe not in the final step where voting maybe necessary or -- but I assume that on the lower steps we would be willing to provide input. Maybe not call it advice for the reason of not confusing this with the advice to the Board, but we would somehow have a role in this. And then the question is in the end, if it came to a vote at the very, very end, whether we would signal that we would intend to participate or intend to not participate or intend to decide at a later stage whether we would participate. I think this is something that would be good to signal.

Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Sorry to asking for the floor again.

I think I, in general, agree with the U.K. but let us tackle the matter from different angles. A sent a few minutes ago a

message to the co-chair of CCWG and to the rapporteur group, and as a capacity of personal. I'm not representing GAC. And the message is as follows: GAC need to decide to remain and act in an advisory capacity. So you have to consider that. That has impact on decision-making. If you remain advisory, most of the difficulty will be resolved.

Second, GAC consider that it may exercise any of those powers that foreseen in the single-designator or sole-designator, either lump sum or case by case. We may say that we participate in those -- in exercising those powers case by case. Because in some case, we may not be involved, and we would not bother to that. Or you may say that you want to participate all of these things. Is second question.

That question, should you decide to participate to exercising of any of those power, there are two course of action you have to take. First, decision on participation. This decision will be discussed in GAC and conclusion on decisions to participate, to exercise or not, maybe you conclude that should be based on the consensus as defined in operating principle 47.

Once you decide to participate based on the consensus, then you discuss the substance, what is the issue, removal of the entire board. Then decision on that should also be based on the consensus as currently defined in operating principle.

What is the result? You remain advisory capacity, you decide on participation or not based on the consensus. You decide on the substance of the issue based on the consensus.

Then it seems to me that there would be no major concerns of those people who express that GAC may capture the entire community by its participations.

It would leave us to go ahead with what we have done in the past, major decision making by consensus. We remain within the principles of all government's decision making. And consensus is a good way that we have already -- this is what I have said to the co-chairs and so on.

If we address that issue, Chairman, some of the other issues will be automatically removed from the table. So decision for yourself and your committee is that we remain an advisory capacity, one.

Two: If you want to decide to participate in exercising any of those powers for participation we discuss and decision remains by consensus. And then we go to the substance of the issue. Removal of the board. Entire board. Then that decision, negative or positive, in order to be considered in that whole SO and AC will also be made based on the consensus operating principle 47. And, in the column of the decision making yesterday, if some of you were in the CCWG, I mentioned that

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

you could put -- first of all, every decision in the CCWG is based on the consensus. I pushed more than necessary that we avoid voting. But, providing those consensus, there might be some people in favor or against that in favor of against. Also I suggest that put it in the absence of objections or advise on the consensus basis. So everything growing grows a model in all direction based on the consensus. So the removal of anxiety of some of the people here and outside here and in the upper places and the lower houses, upper houses may be removed. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Before I give the floor to Sweden, I'm not sure whether we -- all at least I as -- well fully understood your contribution with regard to what has been raised by the U.K. In my understanding, it is possible for the GAC to participate on the lower steps where no vote is needed. Whereas, at the last step a vote may be needed. And, if you say remaining in an advisory capacity, that would imply that we may participate in the steps where no vote is needed but not in the last one. Do I get this right or not?

IRAN: No, Chairman.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. Help me.

IRAN: You participate in the first, which is your internal, with any SO or AC in a petition steps, according to your procedures. You go to the forum after the call, according to your procedure. You participate in the forum with all other SO and AC to analyze the situation. When comes to the last step decision making, your participation will be either case by case -- and if that decision would be in the form of advice and the advice would be in the form of the consensus. You do not lose any power. But in the form of advice and in the form of consensus. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Sweden.

SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair.   This is not in response to the U.K. intervention. It's actually more on the stress test 18. But, since we're running out of time, I thought maybe I should say a few words about that, if that's okay.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: I think that's okay.

SWEDEN: Thank you. And it also relates to what Iran just said. And I'm sure Iran later can explain to everybody how he sees that this also connects to stress test 18.

I should report back from the conversations that have taken place. And, as I see it, there has been a very fruitful and interesting discussions with many different parties. I don't see that there is any singular proposal that would solve the problem. But there are a few interesting ideas. We've also been discussing how we could convey to CCWG a message or some guidance. Perhaps -- I don't want to preempt the discussions that we may have tomorrow. But perhaps we won't be able to agree on something.

But one way of conveying a message is to have a discussion on record, which they can take part of.

So my proposal to those with an interest in this issue would be to put forward their proposals that they have and that we have a discussion in this room on the record and that this would be something that could be read and understood by others. Perhaps we'll even reach an agreement. I don't know. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you for this information and for that proposal. Just to make sure that we fully understand, so you are soliciting concrete text inputs on stress test 18 in whatever way? And then would these be collected and discussed? And, if that is right, when would this be collected? Would this be discussed in the next slot that we have on accountability, which is, I think, our last one, actually, tomorrow? Or would that be informally tonight or wherever somewhere outside the GAC's schedule?

SWEDEN: No. I would --

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: If you could clarify, thank you.

SWEDEN: I'm sorry if I'm unclear. I would say that those that have proposals that they feel are fairly well placed in the group not just supported by themselves, but a larger group, should put forward in this group in the GAC room. Okay?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. Yes. So the first part is clear. Everybody who has a proposal, a text proposal, should share it with the GAC. That's it.

ICANN | 54
Dublin

And then my question is: When should -- you propose that we discuss this, then, in the whole GAC and then in the next session, which would be tomorrow from 11:00 to 12:00? Do I get this right? Or would you propose that people continue to discuss this informally first? Actually, it's not an exclusion. We can continue in formal discussions and come together tomorrow.

SWEDEN: For sure. Definitely continue discussing them informally as well.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. So, if that's okay with everybody, we take Anders' proposal to invite all of us who may have ideas that they think they could get some traction to share it on the GAC list. Then we see what we get by later today. And then we discuss this tomorrow at 11:00. CTU.

CTU: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just trying to understand. So, certainly, I've seen on the list proposals already made on the GAC list. Does that constitute having been brought to the GAC? Or does something else have to be done? I'm not quite certain what Sweden is requiring.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:	No. From what I understand, there are new proposals that have been developed or started to be developed in smaller groups and that these would now -- things that we haven't seen, if I get this right. That these would be circulated and we would try to figure out whether they are of any use for our discussion for tomorrow.

Yes, European Commission.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION:	Yes, thanks. Perhaps another way is just collect all the comments so the Secretariat could then make them available to everyone. You don't have to -- you could see different alternatives.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:	Okay. I see that as a complement. So whatever comes in, maybe let's give us a deadline. Whatever comes in by today at 6:00 or so would then be put together by the Secretariat in one document. Would this make the thing more clear? Or Spain? And then Iran.

SPAIN:	Thank you. I prefer to speak in Spanish this time.

So I have a proposal to make. May I explain it right now? Or shall I send it in writing to the distribution list?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: We don't really have time. But, if you are able to -- so you would be one of the persons that would have a proposal that you would like to share.

Since we have the ALAC in three minutes and we have three more requests for the floor, I suggest that we follow Anders' proposal that you send it to the list and explain it maybe in the message, if that's okay. Because I think we don't have the time to -- but, of course, every proposal is seriously welcome because we need to find a way out.

So next I have Iran and then the Netherlands. Thank you.

IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. The origin of stress test 18 was to touch two birds with one bullet. I did the same philosophy. The text that I sent to the CCWG chair I copied to all GAC members. Now you have it. And I want to kill the two birds with one bullet. Stress test 18, no change. But address the issue because of the community power capturing by GAC. So that is the text that you have.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So we would add your proposal to the list of other proposals as well. Is that what you -- yeah.

IRAN: It is in the GAC distribution list before. You can take it and put it.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yeah. So it's already there. Thank you. The Netherlands.

NETHERLANDS: Yes. Thank you, Chair. I presume I think you said comments. But you want concrete proposals, which are -- I mean, we have heard all the arguments from many, many countries. So you only want concrete proposals. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: This is how I understood the proposal from Sweden that we would collect concrete pieces of texts in the hope that this would help to either get to consensus or at least to a formulation of the different views that we have. Yes. U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes. Thank you, Chair. Sorry. I'm going to what I was proposing earlier as we are about to run out of time. Can I suggest that you invite the co-chairs to provide an update on the decision making model in writing so that then we can all see it tomorrow? And then we can have a look at it with precision, more precision than I was able to recall earlier.

And then am I right in thinking there's no space on Thursday for accountability discussion? Is that right? There's a session tomorrow, one session, one hour. And that's it. And is that really it? Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Well, basically, yes, but the answer to your second question, the first one is of course we can ask the co-chairs to give us some more information. I'm not sure whether they'll have something ready by tonight or by tomorrow. But we can try. And maybe they have a slide that easily explains the latest stage of their deliberations.

With regard to your second question, we have one hour tomorrow from 11:00 to 12:00. And the question is how much time do we think we will need for the communique drafting? If we manage to agree on a communique by 5:00 or 6:00, we could then join the CCWG meeting, which I think lasts until 8:00. And, if

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

the GAC would want, we could reconvene at any time tomorrow evening at 8:00 or whatever and try and sort this out.

Ideally, we would agree on something that would go to the CCWG before Thursday morning as they have their last meeting and it would be good to have an input. So I'm prepared to stay on Wednesday night as long as it's necessary. Because later it's probably difficult. And on Thursday we have a number of important internal matters that we should discuss. And so my proposal is let's read whatever we get in writing over the night and see where we are tomorrow from 11:00 to 12:00 and then decide Wednesday afternoon how to spend our Wednesday evening. Yeah. That's more or less the best of what I can come up with so far.

And I think we have to end now because the colleagues from ALAC are already in the room. Just one more quick reaction. U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thanks, Chair. Is one option to move the session 26 on Internet governance to Thursday? That gives you another half hour. We have a shorter coffee break. Ooh, that's controversial.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Well, I'm in your hands. We will not decide about the future of the world in that session, so we may actually follow this proposal. So 26, Internet governance. Should we -- move it to Thursday may also mean it may be sometime on Thursday afternoon or during lunchtime and shrank down to some real basics. But, if you think that is -- we better spent slot 26 on accountability, then I'm happy to do that. Yes, Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. It is a very, very complex issue. And I don't think that has top priority in relation with the models with the transition and so on and so forth. It is a very important issue, but perhaps we should not spend too much time on that at this meeting of GAC.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So that means you would be willing to sacrifice slot 26 and add this to the accountability schedule? So I see people nodding. Any objections to this? No. Okay. That's decided then. And sorry to our colleagues from ALAC to have slightly overtaken.

We'll invite you now to join us. Come to this table and to the other tables, those who need a microphone or wish to have a microphone to speak. Yes.

We'll wait for you to join us.

All right. Let me welcome Alan Greenberg. I guess you all know him, the chair of the ALAC and a very active person in a number of workstreams of ICANN, including accountability. We have agreed on a tentative agenda. This is flexible. We may, of course, add other things. But the elements that we thought would be useful to have an exchange is, of course, the IANA stewardship transition and accountability work and processes.

Another element would be the gTLD safeguards. And, because there has been some activities related to this in ALAC and with ALAC that would be interesting, I guess, for us to know and then exchange a few views.

And another issue that would be useful for us to have an exchange is, of course, the new ICANN meeting structure. And then -- yeah. These would be -- and I suggest that we take the IANA transition and accountability issue at the end because we can easily fill the time with this. So I suggest we start with the other items and then see how much time we have left. Is this acceptable to you? Okay. So the floor is yours, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

We have a lot of new ALAC members coming in this time. Of the 15 members, we have seven people who are new on the ALAC

ICANN | 54
Dublin

and six who are largely new to ICANN. So I'll quickly review what the issue is.

When the new gTLD process was initiated, there was no real provision for special rules for special types of TLDs. The concept originally was the open market would reign and everything would be fine.

As we went through the process, we started discovering that there were certain classes of TLDs which might need different levels of protection, guarantees, treatment.

And, in response to the GAC Beijing -- I think it was the Beijing Communique, the Board new gTLD committee created with the concept of PICs, public interest commitments. There were some who claimed that that was an illegal use of board power and it should have gone through the GNSO, but I'm not going to try to revisit that argument right now. The concept of PICs, public interest commitments, was enhanced a few times. And part of the public interest commitments were made mandatory. That was a decision as a result of the GAC communique, and some of them were voluntary. The original concept was purely voluntary, but some mandatory ones were added afterwards.

In retrospect, there are a number of TLDs, of strings, that in the view of the -- again, the Beijing communique, were particularly sensitive and needed special protection.

The Board implemented most of what the GAC requested and changed the implementation of two of the six or two of the eight recommendations, I think, somewhat.

For whatever reason, nobody said anything. The GAC did not complain. The ALAC, who also was very interested in the protection from a consumer point of view, did not raise any issue at that point.

As time went on and we started looking at some of these strings being deployed -- and examples of some of the ones we're talking about are .DOCTOR, .LAWYER, a variety of ones related to gambling, all strings that are associated -- typically highly regulated in most countries. And some of these strings were delegated to companies that had said they're going to do very stringent checking. .BANK, for instance, said they would not deploy a domain name under

.BANK unless you verified that you really were a bank under what country's rules you resided in. Other ones did not have any such protection at all.

The issue has been around for a while. And there are a number of people, certainly at-large among them, that feel that something must be done. There is a consumer protection issue at hand. In some cases, there are health-related issues at hand. And we felt that something should be done.

We have tried to put together a group of people, including the registries involved. And, basically, this is a group convened by the board. And, to be blunt, it didn't go anywhere. The registries were not particularly interested in having the discussion. In many cases, these are contracts that are already signed. And they're -- you know, they felt that we've signed a contract. We don't have to talk any more, which from a legal point of view is quite correct. And that's where we stand right now.

There are some people who are pushing for us to try to do something. And there has been a suggestion that we put together some sort of cross-community group. I -- you know, not a CCWG, but just a group with representatives from various interested parties, presumably including the registries involved and to see if we can identify things that could be done.

It's not an easy discussion. Because, in some cases, we are talking about things that could be done, which might be very expensive. That is, checking a domain, checking a registrant before registering the domain is a pretty expensive venture. And if they're planning to sell those domains for $10 each, that business model will not work.

My position -- and the ALAC has not discussed this this time around. We have just been too focused on other issues.

My personal position is I'm quite happy to get involved and get the ALAC involved if we can understand how the process will play out. It's fine for a committee to come together and saying we think .DOCTOR should have the following special rules apply to it. But, if it's a signed contract, I don't know the process by which ICANN can enforce that.

And I am personally a little bit reluctant to put a lot of time into it if there's really no way to achieve the end. You know, if -- it will make us feel better that we tried. But I'm not sure it changes the end point.

So that's where we are right now. We have to discuss it. We will not have a chance to do that in Dublin. So we will have to do it sometime in the next month or two.

And the real question is: Do we want to get involved in that process? Do you want to issue a new communique demanding the process, if the process doesn't have a follow-on path that is viable, I guess, is the question. And I -- you know, that's where we stand. So, if we can figure out some reason that what we're going to do is going to be productive and have a good result, I'm delighted to put the effort into it. I think it's important. I'm a little bit worried that all that will come out of it is saying, yes, you're right. But nothing is going to be done.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Alan. Just for those who may not be aware or haven't been there, recall that, as you say, the GAC has issued a large number of pieces of advice since -- in particular, since Beijing. So that's two and a half years ago. And we have not been fully satisfied with the ICANN's responses and neither with the implementation of what they accepted of this advice. And the last piece of advice that we have given in Buenos Aires is a recommendation, which is an advice for ICANN to create a list of commended public interest examples related to verification, validation of credentials, and highly regulated -- for domains in highly regulated sectors and also to create harmonized methodology to assess the number of abusive domain names within the current exercise of assessment of the new gTLD program.

And, in addition, we have asked them to, basically, come up with a clarification of the whole series of advice that we've given to them to what extent they have accepted it or not. And, if they have accepted it, to what extent or how this has been implemented so that we can assess whether this has been implemented in a way that we have -- that our expectation when we've been given the advice.

That answer is still outstanding. We haven't received an answer from the Board on this yet. We're waiting for it. Depending on what the Board intends to do or intends to ask ICANN to do, that

may have an impact on the necessity or duplication with regard to what you would do, the process you outlined. This is just what I would like to add. Maybe GAC members want to comment or ask questions to Alan or to the room about this issue. European Commission.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Yes, thanks very much, and thanks for the opportunity to have a chat. I appreciate your concerns that even such a review might not lead to something, and I can understand that, but quite frankly, I think that's not necessarily a good reason to do it. I think it's better to start with the review, go through it. We discussed this many times. ALAC has also been very positive about this. And even if -- and I'm not sure that would be the case, but even if there were no way of adjusting in the current round, we could at least be able to show for any future round what good practices are, et cetera, et cetera.

So I still think it's a good exercise and something that would be very useful. And to the extent we could make changes now, (French word or phrase) sorry; that's French. So to put it bluntly, I would encourage the work to continue.

ALAN GREENBERG: May I comment?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Certainly to the extent that we can use this to help pave the way to better practices for next time, or to identify, in fact, that there have been abuses and it's not a matter quite of saying "I told you so," but to demonstrate that there are, in fact, problems, yes, certainly, I support that.

I'm not sure I support spending a year reviewing things just to have the paper sit on a shelf unless we can imagine a way forward.

But to the extent that we'll advise in future processes, certainly.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yes, European Commission.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Sorry to come back again but we were just discussing before you came in the CCT review, which is consumer choice, consumer -- not protection. I'm not supposed to say -- no. Trust. Consumer choice, consumer trust, and competition review. And in that context, this work would also be very useful, too, as feed-in and exchange of practices.

So I think it still has a lot of benefit to it. Potential.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Other questions or comments on this issue?

From GAC or from the ALAC.

Yes, United States.

UNITED STATES: Thank you. And thank you to our ALAC colleagues for joining us today and flagging this issue. I think our views have always been fairly consistent with one another, the GAC and the ALAC. And we are proposing to request that ICANN actually help compile a selection of those PICs that do represent the highest standard.

So for those registry operators with strings that represent highly regulated sectors, such as .BANK, we know that they voluntarily agreed to validate and verify credentials. So that is something that the GAC, I think, pending agreement, but I think there's broad -- fairly broad support for this concept, that ICANN should start to compile that so that we can have a sense of what is out there that can stand as a best practice, that would actually represent the highest standard for purposes of future rounds.

Exactly how -- what methods and what procedures the proposal that you are surfacing with us sort of involves, I think United States is certainly a bit hesitant just because we don't know what procedures would -- you know, what workload and resource requirements that particular approach may require. So a bit hesitant on that.

Do support the idea of shining a spotlight so that we can all be better informed, certainly as we look ahead to the next round. So I did want to thank you for flagging that.

Thanks.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Other comments? There is one from U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thank you. And my thanks also to Alan and the ALAC team and stakeholders joining us today.

I'm very much in support of this direction. In our advice from Buenos Aires, we were pretty clear that this is the kind of mechanism that we would like to see created. So this is -- As the U.S. was saying, I think it's very much a way of reassuring us that appropriate measures are being taken by registries, and a good

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

example is exemplars of the kind of safeguards that regulators would like to see created are actually there to ensure that these particular top-level domains can inspire consumer trust and confidence.

So I do support that, and if -- as I say, as I think U.S. is saying, rather, I think it's a bit early to envisage exactly the mechanics of this and the extent to which we would contribute to a sort of oversight or review committee, but I think it's a good initiative that we should consider.

Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. A group within the ALAC did go over each of the TLDs that were listed and tried to assess the risk and what was appropriate for them. And we found there was quite a range.

Certainly something like .BANK, if you don't prevalidate, the amount of phishing and scams that can be -- that would be carried out in the first five or six hours the domain is live, will justify its existence, whereas other domains -- and, you know, arguably, depending on your position, .DOCTOR or something like that that a may be in that category. It's not going to be -- it's potentially life threatening in the long term but it's not

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

necessarily something -- you might get away with verifying in a day or two, which satisfies some -- some of the needs of the registrars and registries.

So they vary heavily. There are a couple which we thought really should be verified, but what do you verify them against?

For instance, .POKER was one of them. What authorities are there in the world to verify that someone has a legitimate use of the .POKER domain? We couldn't find one. Although it's gambling, but it's not something that's regulated as such and there's plenty of uses of it that don't necessarily -- are harmful.

So they range over a very, very large range.

The only thing to note in terms of the Affirmation of Commitments review is that review is going to be starting in January, which means if we want to get input into it, assuming its timeline is what the normal are, we would have to have the results ready by June, July at the latest.

So we're talking about a pretty short timeline to get measurable results of that. We're not against that, but just go into it with that full knowledge, it's going to be some intense work.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Unless we have further requests for the floor on this issue, I would propose given the time that we move to the next one, which would be an exchange about the new meeting structure, which is something that we've already started to discuss at previous meetings in the GAC, and we have another session on Thursday where we discuss internal matters, where we probably would need to take some first decisions on how we plan to organize our year, our next year, including that particular, the B meeting. So we would be interested in hearing from the ALAC -- why are you laughing? -- about your deliberations on how you think or discuss organizing yourself in the new meeting structure. Of course, in particular, with meeting B. So share with us whatever you can, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: If you think we have a lot of wisdom, we may be disappointing you. We're struggling also. We support the concept but we don't quite know what it's going to mean in all cases.

To have a day of outreach where we're bringing in 25 people, you're bringing in a hundred-and-some-odd people, what do we actually do to keep these people busy at that point is going to be the question. Especially where in many cases we're going to be dealing with a language -- potential language problem.

The other real problem, perhaps more so for us than for you, is we have to work around a lot of the public sessions to -- perhaps to a much larger extent than you, because -- not just because of the joint sessions but because of the interests of people within At Large who may be interested in many of the other sessions than the public ones that are going on or some of the private ones.

So we find our scheduling process, there's an awful lot of work that gets done the last week or two before the meeting, or three weeks before the meeting. Therefore, the concept of trying to decide six months ahead exactly where we put sessions is a little bit surrealistic, I think. But we are trying to figure it out, and we have a very active group looking at it and trying to put some plans together.

We've got a couple of people working on that in here. I don't know if anyone wants to add anything.

One. Yeah, I think that's Vanda's hand.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, okay. Thank you. Vanda Scartezini, for the record.

Just for give some general idea, we are discussing about how we are going to do the outreach part of the sessions, how we're going to have more time for intersections and do some internal

outreach and bring more people to participate on that during our internal sections, and trying to get some innovation on the way we are doing the ALAC work. You know, make a completely different perspective about the work we normally do, allow people from the outside or small countries around especially to come and collaborate and be more engaged with us. That is the general idea; not to follow the same schedule that we normally do.

Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. And one of the co-chairs of the group looking at this, Beran -- I think you're somewhere in the back there. Do you have a microphone?

BERAN GILLEN: Yes, I do.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's from The Gambia.

BERAN GILLEN: This is Beran Gillen, for the record and, I'm one of the co-chairs for the meeting strategy working party that's currently within At Large.

So what we're trying to do is we're looking at doing strictly outreach on the first day. We haven't really identified especially which groups we're targeting, but we're looking at NGOs, we're looking at the universities, we're looking at going out there and basically spending time out of the meeting venue. And the second day and third day we're looking at doing internal policy work. What we've realized is in most of the meetings that we have within ICANN, we don't really delve into the nitty-gritties of what we want to discuss within the advisory committee. We just touch on the surface. So we want to basically take those two days and we want to do some really, should I say, drilling of some policy work. And then the last day, we want to take with a cross-community work where we actually work with other ACs and SOs, probably also look at our working within the CCWG if there are other issues that do some up by Panama. And then other Cross-Community Working Groups like the Internet governance and ICG and CWG and so on.

So that's the structure we're look at. The first day of outreach, second and third day of intracommunity work, and the fourth day of intercommunity work.

Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. One of the other challenges we've had is we've had subsets of the ALAC leadership team, for instance, meeting the day after the formal meeting or starting to meet the afternoon before, and we have been told in this new structure we are not allowed to meet outside of the formal days. And I suspect if you have a high-level meeting or something like that, if, indeed, those rules are enforced, you may have an interesting challenge, too.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Well, yes. So far -- Fortunately the next high-level meeting is in the next meeting, so we don't have that problem or at least I'm not aware of us having this problem but you may never know.

So maybe this is the moment also for GAC members to ask questions or make comments. Allow me one personal comment on the community -- intercommunity day. I think one option would be, and this has been discussed several times, that it is try to get everybody together to have a kind of a town hall meeting with a number of key issues where in order to break the silos, people can exchange views across different constituencies on one issue instead of working in silos, writing papers and then reading each other's papers, and so on and so forth, and

engaging bilaterally. But this is just an idea that I personally have.

So I would like to give the floor to the rest of the room, but it's -- ALAC members or GAC members to make comments on the meeting structure.

For us, I think the challenge is we have less days to work on our own substance, to discuss and to take decisions, unless we skip the bilateral meetings that we would then maybe replace with a multilateral town hall idea, but we are not really much further advanced either. So I stop talking with hope that some GAC members will express ideas or views or make -- ask questions.

Thank you.

Yes. We have an ALAC request for the floor.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hello. My name is (saying name). I'm not the GAC. I'm from the ALAC, but as nobody else raise their hand, I just want to give you some inside information because I was recently on that group who developed a new meeting strategy. And it was exactly as you just said. The intent of this B meeting was to get the work done and to get more together and do some outreach and give us the possibility to reach out into regions which are usually not able to hold big meetings like the, in future, A or C meeting.

I see there is a lot of discussions going on in all constituencies how to deal with this B meeting. And I would propose, and I said that also in the ALAC group, to be rather pragmatic. I mean, we have to do at least one circle of this new meeting strategy in order to see how this works out and turns out; maybe to look, okay, what is the other one doing, how can we collaborate. And I think we shouldn't worry too much to get it right in the first place. Maybe to try some new approaches, to try some new movements, that's okay, but I think we will have to adjust afterwards, and I think nobody would have a problem or struggle with that.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. And I think what you say makes absolute sense. Unless we test this, we will not be able to anticipate what works and what doesn't fully in advance.

Other questions, comments on this issue?

If that is not the case, then that would mean we have half an hour left to go into the issue of accountability, and so on and so forth. So maybe let's start with a question to you. How is the discussion in the ALAC going, in case you have had a discussion on this? Are there key issues where you all agree or you all

disagree? Or how do you see the CCWG process? We don't have a particular list of questions here.   I'm just asking some questions to incite the discussion, and then we'll see how this goes.

I think there's enough to exchange. Somebody just needs to start.

So, Alan, I see you have the finger on the microphone.

Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, at the higher level, we have general agreement within At Large. At the specifics on individual subjects, we vary all over the map, often with very strong feelings.

Our position that we formally gave to the proposal that was made in August was we would support it with a number of provisos. There are a number much changes, specifically in the core mission -- or the mission and -- my mind has gone blank. The first part of the bylaws, that we thought were not appropriate. There were a number of things, for instance, where the Board had a certain level of discussion in the current bylaws, and that was removed, and we thought that was inappropriate. And there were a number of other issues like that.

We were willing to support the membership model, but we didn't particularly like it. We felt that -- We have always felt that the level of strict court enforceability is not something we really need because we believe if ICANN ever gets to that, we are in really bad shape. And how it will be perceived by the rest of the world is also going to imply that we're not able to do our job properly anymore.

In terms of IANA itself, if we ever get to the point of exercising all of the processes for removing IANA, the IETF, the RIRs, the registries, and the root servers would have gone away a long time ago. They're not going to wait a year of IANA not working to solve their problems. That's an operational problem which would have to be solved without -- you know, way before we solve a political problem internally.

So we didn't really see the need for a lot of enforceability, but we did see the need to have the community have the ability to force the Board to reconsider things in a better way, to make sure that reconsideration did look at all the issues, not just was the process followed or something like that.

So we certainly support the process.

We were willing to support membership model. As of last Friday, the CCWG is looking at a less powerful model, as it were; certainly a less flex model. And we, in fact, unilaterally -- not

unilaterally -- unanimously withdrew support of the membership model at this point. That's not to say it couldn't be put back some day if the world changes, but at this point, we believe something that will provide the community with a strong way of communicating with the Board and forcing the Board to take action or not take action as appropriate, is what we need at this period of time.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So just for the sake of clarification, when you say you withdrew the support to the membership model, that means you support the way that the discussions are developing with this new escalation stair steps model; is that right?

ALAN GREENBERG: That's correct. In the previous published proposal, there was no other option, so we were reluctantly willing to support it because we didn't want to be in the position of, as a chartering organization, vetoing it, because we thought it could be made to work. But it wasn't the way we wanted to see it go.

Given other options, we reconsidered that.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you for this useful information.

I have a request from the floor for Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sebastien Bachollet speaking. If I may, I will speak in French.

I really thank you very much. I'm Sebastien Bachollet, and it's very interesting because the discussion, well, I'm not sure if the membership model has been supported. We supported the sole-member model. The sole-member model because it was the whole of the community that has to make a decision.

The discussion right now consists of knowing whether the model will be structured in such a way as to represent the voice of the whole of the ICANN components vis-a-vis the Board and the outside world. And then there may be members that would appoint, or this decision is much more open.

So I think that we should move from a member to a designator. If we forget the sole membership, we are leaving aside half of the discussion, and this is the way in which we are today.

So there was a situation whether each piece had wanted to have some power, and now we have a collective power.

What are we talking about? Are we talking about a designator that may be -- may have the support of the community now? I think that we may be satisfied so far.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I agree with Sebastien that the question of being sole is really important, because it means the whole of the community. So the decision will be distributed among the sole designator, sole whatever. But the position of ALAC is quite clear.

I want to ask. Can you, the GAC, say what are you thinking of? Will you be participating in decision-making if a sole-designator model is approved based on a consensus for voting?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: ....

Our discussion on this, but there's a tendency to -- we've with already signaled in our contribution of September that we intend to participate in the deliberations in a community forum. We tend to feed into the structure without knowing how because the model was still under development. And I think the -- it looks like the GAC intends to participate. And if -- In one way or another. If -- And the way it looks now, there's less an the idea of having voting, decisions based on voting but rather a consensus, of course that makes it easier for us to participate. But we are in

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

the stage of discussing this, and I would like to maybe ask my colleagues to complement what I just said, so to see whether I got it right.

So Iran, please.

IRAN: Yes, Thomas, you got it absolutely right. We are discussing or participation, we have not decided, but we should distinguish between participation or support of the sole-designator model. There are some -- there were some discussion a few minutes ago, and you will communicate that to the chair. But that is different from participation at each and every power. That is different issue.

And also we discussed, for information of our ALAC colleagues, that perhaps there is or seems to be a tendency that GAC perhaps may remain an advisory capacity.

Now, just one piece of information. Why sole-designator model was taken? Because ICANN in his 81-page document mentioned that the change of structure to the difficult structure seems to be not implementable and so on and so forth. Then the legal advisor would ask that does this situation or is the current working method of the ICANN is some sort of designating or designator model, the reply is, yes, we are more in a quasi-

designator model. Therefore, take it as that and improve it. That is why the sole-designator model comes. So it is more or less based on the current structure, i.e., does not require further major structure in the ICANN that ICANN board was not in favor.

So, in summary, situation of participation is different from the model of sole-designator model. And what is important for us is we should get out of Dublin to having something, but not again to be in the middle of nowhere. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Iran. Other contributions or discussions? I have India. And then I have the gentleman in the back over there. And then I have France. Thank you.

INDIA: Thank you, Chair. Thank you, Alan, for your comments which were helpful in letting us understand the reasons for ALAC's withdrawal of support for the proposal as it was. It would also be helpful to know if there was a specific reason for the timing of the announcement. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Maybe a quick answer from Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: That was the first time we had met as the ALAC in a formal meeting where we could take a decision. There was nothing either planned or conspired to impact other people's decisions. I'm sure it may well have. There are some people who claim it has reinforced the people who want membership, and others it has discouraged them. So I don't know what it did. But it was simply the first formal meeting of the ALAC and the first opportunity we had to take the decision. And there were a number of people on the ALAC that put forward that concept. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Alan. We have the gentleman -- yeah. In the back.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, this is (saying name) for the transcript record, incoming ALAC member.

I just want to have a question to GAC considering that -- yeah, the statement issued by ALAC, one way or the other helps set some direction on what ALAC is willing to actually look into right now.

Is there an intention within GAC to also help also set some direction on what you are not -- you don't think is on the table for you to look at right now? Because I think at this stage where

we are, it's not helpful for this process to continue looking at multiple ideas. It's good to focus on a particular model or a solution. So maybe a way to focus would be to say what we don't want to focus on.

I think the ALAC has said something. It doesn't mean that we can't go back to that.

But is GAC looking at doing something similar just in case we happen to go with -- to leave Dublin, I realize that we are still looking at multiple things. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. As has been explained before by myself and Kavouss, we are still discussing this. And we may -- we're discussing about issuing some kind of communication, if we get there by tomorrow night. That's the plan that we are trying to achieve. And then we will see what is in there. But we try to give some feedback from our side before we leave Dublin.

I have France, and then I have Paraguay.

FRANCE: Thank you, very much, Mr. Chairman. I have one question. And this is to this the ALAC representative at the CCWG. Have you

made -- have you taken any position regarding the stress test 18? Thank you very much.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: There's a question to ALAC. Maybe we can have a quick reaction to this, if you wish.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, the formal answer is no, we have not taken any formal position. And to be -- I believe we have not discussed it formally. I suspect each of us may have some opinions, and some of us can go back and forth with different arguments. Being an advisory committee, it does potentially impact us. But we -- I certainly cannot speak on behalf of the ALAC as to have taken any position. If someone wants my personal one, I'll give you both of them.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Alan. Thanks to Alan's -- any other answer from ALAC on this question? If not, I will then proceed with Paraguay and the U.K. Thank you.

PARAGUAY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted the gentleman who asked the question before the distinguished colleague from France

spoke to repeat the question. Because, to tell the truth, I didn't understand. So would you please repeat?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: If I may try, I think the question was whether we plan to issue a statement of preference like the ALAC has done on one model, i.e., the membership -- the sole membership model or sole designator, whatever, I. Think that was your question whether there will be some guidance from the GAC on which model we would prefer or object to or support or whatever. I think that was the question.

Okay. United Kingdom.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes. Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to pick up on your aside there, Alan. It may impact on us. Can you explain how you mean? Are you talking about how you reached decisions and consensus and the regard for that by the Board or -- or am I reading too much into that? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're reading too much into it. Simply, right now the Board has said, but it is not in a bylaw, that if we ever give advice, they'll answer us. Now, that's in the context of a few years ago. We

never even got a confirmation email that they received it. Never mind addressed what it said.

So we're in a much better world right now. And, clearly, if the rules change regarding how advisory committee's advice is treated, it could ripple through. But there's nothing more specific. And I -- again, don't read too much into it.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Alan.

Olivier. Yes, sorry. Forgot.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Thomas. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I wanted to answer a couple of questions that were asked here. First, a personal feeling with regard to stress test 18. I think when Alan said it might impact us, the way I see "it might impact us" is that another part of ICANN would tell the ALAC how to work. And I'm not quite sure how the ALAC would feel about being told how to reach consensus or whether to use voting, et cetera.

We are -- we have redrafted our rules of procedures in past years. Yes, we have had to pass them by the Board to make sure that they were in line with the ICANN bylaws, et cetera. But we've not actually been told to change our rules of procedure.

Not in my knowledge in one way or another for these things. Perhaps Alan, who has more knowledge about these things, will be able to add to this.

I just wanted to let you know also how the ALAC worked with regards to feeding its representatives, its members in both the CCWG and the CWG accountability.

We have a working group that we have put together that actually had the two issues feeding into the same working group. Because I think very early on it was very obvious that those two issues were interrelated.

So the working group had weekly calls, sometimes even more than weekly calls. And so our representatives, our members, of those working groups were in the calls. And, therefore, we have been able to relate and to coordinate the work that our members have been engaging in the CCWG and in the CWG.

As far as the ALAC is concerned, we have our monthly calls. But, as Alan said, the work has changed so much and the situation has changed so quickly in the past weeks as far as the CCWG is concerned, we have met over the weekend. And this is why we had I think it was four or five hours of discussions on these things. And it was pretty clear that the membership model was something that a lot of the ALAC members had really big concerns about.

I'll share my own concerns. I know I'm not going to repeat all the concerns that we heard around the table. But my own concerns were that we have at the moment a process which imposes or is looking at bringing accountability on ICANN, on the Board of ICANN. If you provide more power to the community, some concerns are that the community also needs to have a high level of accountability as well.

And that balance needs to be understood. The membership model was something which might not have been able to work if we didn't add an additional number of accountability mechanisms. And it was just too complex. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yes, thank you. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. The ALAC makes decisions two different ways. We either make decisions by what we call consensus. And I'm sure you know every part of ICANN defines consensus differently. Our definition of consensus -- and it's written in our rules -- essentially, says there aren't very many people objecting. So it's 85% or something if you had to put a number on it.

Should we not reach consensus, we will take a vote and simple majority rules. That's our decision. Virtually votes in the ALAC

they're not unanimous necessarily. But consensus normally rules by our definition of consensus. Personally, I won't be prepared to forward on as chair on what I call capital A advice unless the ALAC had made a formal decision. So I don't believe the Board would ever tell us how to change our rules, nor does the bylaw change -- I don't think -- recommend how the GAC should make its rules but talks about how the Board would react to it: So --

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Thomas. If I am sitting in discussions in ALAC, I had the same view as Olivier. I don't want that any other community tell to GAC how to come up with this operating principle. It is up to GAC to decide. I don't think that bylaw needs to put up that one. According to the circumstances, we will decide. If one day we decide to do this or you decide that. Working method of operating principle you call it. I take it from other organizations. It is exclusively in prerogative of a group. It is not coming from the bylaw or from the constitution or from the convention, from other group. We don't want such dictations from other groups or so on and so forth. They should do that. I wonder or even surprise when in one part of this stress test 18 it was mentioned

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

that GAC may in future change its operating principle. It is absolutely unnecessary. It is more or less some sort of, I would say, interference in our work. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Iran.

Other questions, comments, from ALAC or from GAC members? Hungary.

HUNGARY: Just a short one. Peter Major from Hungary. What is the definition of consensus in ALAC?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'd have to look at the words to verify. But it's something like -- I believe what it says is, if there aren't too many objections -- and then there's a rule of thumb which I think says something like 85%. But I'll point out that the rules allow anyone to object to the Chair's call for consensus, at which point we take a vote.

So we're a different environment, and different sets of rules apply. I think that's why every group in ICANN defines consensus differently, because the dynamics are different.

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. The question is about the consensus for the CCWG. That is a lot of -- there is several levels of consensus as it is now proposed. So the consensus is not unique. For some powers you have a certain consensus, nor example, not less than three support and not more than one objection. For others you have -- you need more support. So it is -- the level of consensus is different. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Other questions, comments? We have three minutes left.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah. This is (saying name) again. Since there is more time, I thought I should just ask this question.

One of the days I actually received some specific level of completion within the CCWG is the aspect of individual board removal. This is the process that's upon us before a board, an individual board member is removed.

It simply says that the appointed SO or AC starts and completes that process.

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

What is the view of GAC in relation to that particular power, as GAC actually talked about it?   And then do you have any opposing view to that process? Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, IC.

Iran, would you like to respond to this question?

IRAN: Not on behalf of GAC, but I would explain what I understand. First of all, we are not designator.   We don't designate any director.   However, this does not prevent us to discuss in the consultation and so on so forth.   Petition is made not by us because we don't have a director to remove individual director.

But the SO and AC -- in fact, ALAC is the only AC operations director. If they go to petitions and go to the pre-call and so on and so forth and, if we were consulted, we would participate in the sort of consultations. But this -- after consultation yesterday was discussed deliberately on the CCWG that it should go to the entire community. And their recommendations, views, opinions, should come back to the SO or AC initiated this task. And they have to take that into account.   They have to take that into account. It was mentioned they have to consider they should take that into account. But, nevertheless, the designator AC and

SO is the one who makes the final actions. But, after consultation and after taking into account views of the entire SO and ACs. That was discussed when the Board was not in favor of that director will be automatically removed by designator. It says that it should go to the entire community. Consultation will be carried out. Everybody's views should being taken into account because board acting on support of the collegial actions, so on and so forth. That is the whole process. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Iran. So we haven't spent time on this particular question in detail.

I think I have the U.K. And then I think we would need to stop, because it's half past. So a quick comment or question from the U.K., please.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thanks. While it is just a quick U.K perspective on this, and that is broadly in line with what Iran has just said, that you see a board member really as really somebody who is serving the whole community. So it should be a community decision to petition to remove him or her. Because that's -- you know, it should not be the prerogative of the sponsoring SO to be able to

EN

do that. So I don't know if that's helpful. But we see it as a member of the board having that sort of responsibility to the whole community, to the public interest, indeed, to the global public interest. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, U.K., for this input.

So we are at the end of this session. I think this was a very useful and good exchange that was enriching our deliberation. So we would like to thank you very much for this. And yeah. Hope to see you again very soon in different places and on different calls and so on and so forth. So thank you very much.

[Applause]

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So, please, GAC members, this is not a coffee break; not for us, at least. We have another important thing that we need to do, which is prepare the session with the Board.

So we have one additional, and it's actually a mistake, at least on the paper that I have. It's item number 24, preparation for the meeting with the Board. Yeah, we are not done yet. Yes, now.

We not meet the Board today but we have to prepare the meeting with the Board today.

Do you want to make a five-minute break? That means that we -- Okay. But we have to -- And maybe one thing to give you for think about on the five-minutes break, we may have two different types of issues with the Board. One is information items where we would not expect a discussion, but the Board to take note, and others that we would clearly communicate to the Board that we expect a discussion, a substantive discussion. So this is just for you to know. This is the proposal that we're going to make.

Okay. Five minutes, but not 25.

Thank you.

[Coffee break]

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. Please take your seats. We need to resume our work. So thank you for sitting down and taking your seats.

An agenda item we can't skip because it's the preparation for tomorrow's exchange of the GAC with the ICANN Board is the next agenda item. So maybe we get this done very quickly, but we need to give the Board some information about what we like to discuss or exchange or inform with it tomorrow. So, yes.

As I outlined before, I would suggest that in order to clarify a little bit the expectations, that we may collect issues under two headings. One heading could be items for information to the Board where we don't expect a discussion, a substantive discussion; where we expect them to take note or maybe say yes or no to something, and then another list could be items for discussion where we expect a substantive discussion with the Board.

So I would just like you to raise issues, propose issues for either of these two headings. So bring up issues that you would like to inform the -- you think the GAC should inform the Board about or that you would like to have a discussion with the Board.

So the floor is yours, please.

Thank you.

Who would like to start?

Yes, Norway. Thank you.

NORWAY: Thank you, Chair, I was just wondering with all the talks we have in the hallway, also about stress test 18, different proposal and how we're going to deal with this. I was just wondering if we could have some clarification from the Board on the timeline. Because we had Fadi pushing a timeline that said we needed to do something within this year, otherwise this and that. And now we're having discussion about -- or question about if there's going to be a third draft from the CCWG and when that is going to be on the table. Are we going to have a hearing on that?

I mean, internally, for the GAC procedure for the clearance of how we can do with this.

Maybe we can ask the Board. Of course they don't have any set answers because they don't know either, but any thoughts around this.

How -- Yeah. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. Well, in the end, I guess this is up to the are CCWG to develop the timeline but we can ask the Board if they have any information that we don't have, and that will be a quick

question. So I note. I think this doesn't do any harm if you ask the Board if you agree.

Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Chair. I don't think that Board has anything more than what is publicly available to the CCWG. There is a timeline, three scenarios. Look at that three, and that would give you.

The only thing that we should discuss, whether or not we have third public comment and the duration of that.

I don't think that that is a question for the Board to answer.

CCWG remains within the same timeline, but just shorten, in an expedited manner. So I don't think that is a question to the Board, and I don't think that any answer they given would guide us. And this question should be raised to the CCWG, and CCWG reply to that question, taking account of the consequences of the public comment and so on and so forth. But I don't think there's both.

You ask the question, I want to reply to you. I think we have to limit the number of the issues that we want to raise the Board because of the very, very intensive involvement of the Board in

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

many other issues. We have to raise the questions of priorities, importance, urgent, that need any reply or action by the Board.

But informing of the Board of something, I think we can communicate it to you and you could send it to the Board. But let us limit to the question to very few one which has high degree of priority and importance and major issue for GAC for which we waiting for reply and reply is not given. And we want to listen the reason why reply was not given or why action has not been taken.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yes, thank you.

Other comments -- not comments. Proposals?

We have with an indicative list on the screen for your information. So these are issues that we may raise. Maybe that helps us get that list together.

I give you one minute to quickly look through this list.

U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thank you, Chair. Can I just seek clarification on whether we have received responses to all the previous advice from the Board? What is the situation, for example, on the safeguards? Did we get a complete response.

Forgive me if I should know this.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. With regard to safeguards, no. We are still waiting for a response, a substantive response, on our Buenos Aires advice. So I guess that is it -- point two is alluding to this.

This would be a piece of information that we could tell the Board, "We expect you to come to us as soon as possible on our advice." That would be a piece of information that would take one minute and they would probably take note.

U.S.

UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. And I think I'd like to ask colleagues whether it is acceptable to them that we actually formally table our proposal to them. That will appear in the communique, once approved by everybody and edited, of course; that we are expecting a scorecard, actually. That that is the best possible way for us to assess sort of progress that's been made, what has been accepted, what has been

implemented, what is still in implementation, and then what has been rejected. And we all know which one that is: validation, verification, with an explanation why. You know, that. But that way we kind of finally capture in a nutshell precisely what we have managed to accomplish.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, U.S. I think that will be a part of the text in the communique. The question is we can't just raise it orally with the Board in addition, what you just said, that we expect an answer, a clear answer, including a scorecard from them. So that will just be a one-minute information. And I'm very happy if you, for instance, as one of the co-leads on this issue, could convey that message, if nobody objects.

Indonesia.

INDONESIA: Yeah. It's what Kavouss mentioned, but request for -- for the Board. That's why you have not done this and you have not responses for this, this, and so on.

Will be possible if we put some sort of examples that really have we discussed here in the GAC? Just, for example, how what -- I

don't know, what really have we discussed here? Like .AFRICA, for example, what is the response of the Board. This is just one example.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. To be honest, I don't really understand. Is this related to safeguards or is .AFRICA an issue that -- The thing is with .AFRICA, the ball is now in our hands. The Board has asked us to reply to their letter. So I'm not sure whether it makes sense to ask them something. The ball is in our hands. We should give that reply. We can inform them that we will give them the reply as another piece of information, if you wish, but I don't see what you're aiming at.

INDONESIA: No, no. What I mean is is it possible from the list of response from the board that we are still waiting or the board has not responses? Can we put some examples which are -- have we discussed here? My example of .AFRICA might be wrong.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: But I think that the safeguards advice and the request for a scorecard is exactly that example that I guess you're looking for. So I consider that.

Okay. Thank you.

China.

CHINA: Thank you, Chair. I'll speak in Chinese.

With the meeting that we're going to be meeting with the Board tomorrow, we're planning to raise three topics. The first is going to regard -- is going to regard the effectiveness of the GAC's advice. We are currently doing the assessment of this, and it's connected with the GAC board -- with the Board, and we want to communicate with them regarding this. And the second is regarding the stress test 18. We're planning to ask the board member their views on this stress test 18, and also what they think about the different views and different opinions. And the deep -- The third question is regarding the root zone administrator proposal. And we know the published -- the supervising or monitor draft, and it's regarded to the IANA transition, and we want to ask the Board and Fadi regarding the next steps that's going to be taken in this area.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, China.

May I ask for -- Before I give the floor to others, may I ask for views on the three proposals that have been put forward by China?

One is the effectiveness of advice, and the other one is stress test 18, and the other one is the root zone. And then I will continue with -- Just a quick -- Shall we put the effectiveness on the list?

I see people nodding.

European Commission.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Well, it's just a question. I appreciate very much the idea from China, and I think it's a good idea to ask the Board's opinion of GAC advice or how they see it or how -- you know, how they would like to improve it or how we can make it more effective, but I'm just really wondering if it's appropriate in this context to ask the Board about the effectiveness of GAC advice. It's really up to the GAC, I think, to determine whether its advice has been effective or not, is it not?

But I have no problem, and I think it's a good idea to ask the Board about the relations, how they see it, et cetera. Something like that.

So perhaps it's just a nuance on the word, or maybe there's a better word in Chinese for what was being proposed.

Thanks.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

I think we have -- first of all, we have we have some text on this in the communique. And it may be just a piece of information that we have started to look at the effectiveness of our advice, and we may tell them that we're interest -- or the expectation is that ICANN is helping us with tracking advice, and so on and so forth. That may be a piece of information where we do not expect to have a long discussion. If I take this as accepted.

Then what about the second proposal, about discussing stress test 18 with the Board and asking them for their views? Any comments on this aspect of the Chinese proposal?

Yes, Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. While I do not have any counter views to the essence of the subject of the stress test 18, I don't think that we should raise this question with the Board.

Those who are read the email, some email saying that stress test 18 is to protect the Board. So I understand that the Board like stress test 18.

Do you want to have "Yes, we like it?" Do we take that advice? Because they like it, we take it? I don't think it is related to the Board. It is up to us to decide the consequences of stress test 18, but not the Board.

And the other question they're talking about, the transition, I think Fadi Chehade mentioned in half an hour or for three-quarters everything about what he want to say about the transition. So I don't think that we need to raise this question again.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So your proposal is not to talk about the transition in general or not about stress test 18?

IRAN: No, none of these two, but effectiveness of the advice. Perhaps the Board may say -- may say that I have heard from that, some of your advice, the language is not clear. That is something. But not about the effectiveness of.

Advice is advice. I don't think effectiveness of the advice, I don't think the Board should comment on the effectiveness of our advice. This is something that is a bylaw. But whether the Board says some of the advice of the GAC is not clear in the language, so on and so forth, Board cannot really understand what to do about that. Perhaps try -- they ask the GAC try to make it a more simpler language, understandable language. That's something. But I don't think these questions -- I don't see any effectiveness of that.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

I think we have to try to be as brief as possible. I think we agreed that we would just inform the Board that we are looking at the effectiveness the way we see it on the advice and (indiscernible).

So very briefly on stress test 18, I have France and Switzerland and Argentina.

FRANCE: I would like to speak about what our Chinese colleague has said. This is a multistakeholder process, and as Kavouss has already said, it's useless to hear the Board saying they agree. We want to know why. We want to know why the Board agrees to this stress test, because we haven't heard those reasons yet.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: ....You support the Board or you don't support.

                     You would like to ask the Board. So you support the Chinese proposal.

                     Okay. Switzerland, very briefly.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you. Very briefly. The Board has taken a position on this, so I think rationale from their side would be -- would benefit our discussions.

                     Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Argentina.

                     Please only answer on this one. We will go to the other issues later.

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

Thank you.

ARGENTINA: Yes, Chair. Thank you.

As the proposal of stress test 18 is somehow to protect the Board, it would be interesting to get some feedback from them, especially because not all of them participate actively in the Cross-Community Working Group. And at the same time, as the proposal, at least in our opinion, comes from some members of the working party, one, and we have seen exchange in the CCWG email list that it's not supported by other members of other SOs and ACs, having that opinion from them for us would be valuable.

So we support the request from China.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

I have Brazil.

BRAZIL: Very briefly, Chair. Just we'd like to say I couldn't agree more with the statement of the representative of Switzerland. We

have to remember that the Board has presented a proposal in the CCWG, and I think this is an opportunity for us to exchange views with the Board, just like we did with the ALAC this afternoon.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

So given the strong statements for raising this, can we agree to raise this?

Senegal, is your comment on stress test 18?

SENEGAL: Yes.

We take the floor for the first time to thank all participants and to raise a topic that we would like the Board of Directors to address. It seems simple that since people are allowed to participate in GAC, we may say that there are lots of African countries, lots of African colleagues that couldn't come here because of visa issues.

This is a topic that the Board may cure, but we would like to point out and put on record that these people are not here and

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

so our discussions are less rich. So we want this problem to be fully considered.

Making people from Africa come to here is quite easy, but unfortunately, they couldn't get their visas. This is why they are not here. And we want this issue to be settled once and for all.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much.   I think that we may include this as another bullet point. This will be an information topic, and we may say something in this respect because then we will be conveying this message to the Board.

It will be included in the communique but may also be mentioned in the meeting with the board.

Going back to stress test 18, do we all agree that we have to raise this issue to the Board?

I see there is no objections, no strong objections, so I propose to ask this question to the Board.

....Root zone administration -- administrator proposal. Is this also something that you would want to raise?

Your views on this, please.

Or let me put it the other way around. Any objection to raising this? No?

So that is also on the agenda.

Okay. All right. We already have quite a list, so let's try and stick to what we really think is necessary.

U.K., I think you were trying to take the floor, and then Spain.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thank you, Chair. Sorry, I'm just back on that last point. I wasn't quite clear exactly what the rationale for raising root zone is. Would it be helpful for all of us to have a little bit more understanding of the Chinese proposal?

I have a couple of other points off that.

Sorry.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. I think we should go back first and ask our colleagues from China to give us the rationale for this, please.

So China, please, if you expand a little bit why you think this should be raised with the Board at this stage. Thank you.

CHINA: Thank you, Chairman. And thank you, U.K., for your feedback on this proposal.

We think that the proposal related to the root zone administrator is a very important issue. It is related to the IANA stewardship transition and also the accountability issue in it.

And just now we just received -- we just have seen the proposal, the draft proposal. So we want to have a kind of follow-up on that issue.

I think because (indiscernible) that proposal is link the two party in the future administration of the root zone, the proposal was -- the two parties are ICANN and VeriSign. I think we should get some information on -- from the ICANN Board on this issue.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. This would actually be a third category where we do not necessarily want to discuss, and it's not us who have to convey information but it's a raise for information from their side. Do I understand this right? So you would like to receive more information on where they are with this issue. Okay.

Can we accept this and move on?

Then I think the U.K. wanted to raise a few other points. And if anybody else -- Spain is next after you, and then Namibia. These are the three ones that I have on the list.

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

Okay.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thank you, Chair.

There are couple of points I wanted to raise, perhaps. One is information point about the high-level governmental meeting where we would expect the chair of the Board and the CEO to be involved in all of the proceedings. I hope this concurs with Morocco's expectations as host.

So an information point about the high-level governmental meeting. We're still finalizing the agenda. But the key themes, I think, are pretty much clear. Perhaps Morocco might wish to provide that as an information point.

My second issue is about -- I think it connects with earlier point about ICANN's outreach to developing countries and small island developing states ensuring their full participation in ICANN, could we have a sort of overview from the Board side on the efforts to enhance that level of participation? I table that as a proposal for asking the Board. It's a continuously difficult issue. We're seeing it in respect to visas for attendance. But also there's a wider issue, I think, of continuing to ensure ICANN is a truly global entity. Thanks.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. So you're proposing to ask them. They will not be able to give us the answer tomorrow, because they're not prepared for this. But we can ask or request that they give us this information later in one or two sentences. I think that is -- should be fine. So Spain.

SPAIN: Thank you. My question concerns the last proposed item. I'm not clear about the intention of the question to the Board about ICANN reviews of the current gTLD round and the possibility to engage colleagues in public administration that are not regular GAC attendees.

Is this an information point that we wish to involve colleagues in capitals in this review? Or are we asking then if we can do it? I don't think it's the second option, because all processes in ICANN are open, even for people who are not participating as regularly. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. What you have on the screen is just proposal. If nobody brings them up and supports that they raise it, we don't have to raise it. If we think that this is not necessary or relevant or a priority at this stage, because it's not a clear question, we just need to do -- I think we just need to do our work with regard

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

to feeding into these processes. But it's not necessarily that we need to spend time talking to the Board about this.

So, if nobody insists on this point, then we can just decide not to raise this particular point with the Board.

Any insisting on talking about the next rounds with the Board? I don't see this. So we won't raise it. Namibia is next.

NAMIBIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I think I want to come back to what you mentioned earlier. I am feeling like my brother Mr. Moctar about the .AFRICA issue. And I do think that it is in our hands, as you say. But -- and we have agreed that the AUC will work on some text and so on. Our understanding was that it would be enhanced by some consultations with the Board when we meet them. And then, secondly, also perhaps in the GAC advice.

So I do think that the Board has indicated that we must refine our advice or something to that extent.

And we -- I think we are not quite clear whether we should give new advice, whether we should just answer the letter which is out of the public domain or what do they want by saying refine your advice?

It's also against the current developments. We have seen some other developments that has come up amongst others that the Board itself is being challenged that they operate outside the rules, the ICANN rules and bylaws. So maybe it's something that we can highlight to them and hear what they say about it. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Of course, we can talk about .AFRICA. But we were clear that we would send an answer in writing that would, basically, build on the fact that we think we have given the rationale and that the advice has been clear, the rationale has been clear that we followed the procedure in the Applicant Guidebook. So I don't think we should ask them what they mean with precising advice or whatsoever.

But we may inform them that this letter will come soon, for instance. But yes, U.S., you want to react to this?

UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. And I'm just mindful of the discussion that we've already had on the subject in the discussion in the GAC where my recollection or my takeaway recommended a considerable amount of support around the GAC room for the concerns and the proposal made by the AUC.

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

So, actually, I think it would be completely reasonable to have .AFRICA on the agenda so that the AUC has an opportunity in a very public setting to indicate what the -- very abbreviated version of the rationale that was endorsed by the GAC in Beijing, which was not made public because of the guidebook's procedures did not require that. But I should think that might go a long way to clearing the air. And, of course, you follow up with the actual letter so that everything is documented. I just think it might be very useful for the community to hear that. So I would endorse the suggestion that you add .AFRICA to the agenda. Thanks.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: As a piece of information but not for discussion, that we, basically -- somebody would -- or the AUC would, basically, inform what will be coming as in the form of a letter's answer. Okay? Let's add this to the information items.

Did we have any -- yes. Egypt, thank you.

EGYPT: Thank you, Chair. I also support putting .AFRICA for the info in the list. And I was also going to ask, because in previous meetings we used to share this list of questions in advance with

the Board. So do we intend to share this in advance so that we can expect substantial answers to our questions? Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Egypt, for asking this question. Indeed, this is the purpose why we are trying to get this list together. We'll send this -- once we've done it, we'll send this to the Board with the indication which items are for information where we do not expect them to engage in a discussion. But we would -- because this hasn't always been meeting our expectation, at least expectation of many. We would indicate where we would wish to have a substantive discussion with them. But so far we have quite a large number of information items and a very short list of items for discussion.

So the answer is yes, in that sense.

We already are running quite late. And we already have quite a long list. Actually, but most of the items are for information. We so far have only one real item for discussion.

Looking at the bullet points that we have on the table, what we haven't put on our list is the first one, the two-character country codes at the second level and the implementation of this.

I think, given the urgency of this, you may consider that we raise this with the Board. Because, as we have discussed earlier, at

least my sense was that the GAC felt that this was not implemented in a way that the GAC advice was meant.

So the question is: Do you want to raise this, or should we leave it at the communique level where we will have a text on this? Up to you. If nobody supports this, then we'll drop it. So drop it. Okay.

And the last one is the ATRT recommendation 6.5. Do you want to raise this maybe in conjunction with stress test 18, or do you think this is not something that you would want to raise? You remember there is one element of the ATRT recommendation that is not completed. It's put on hold, which is the proposal to demand a supermajority of two-thirds in the board to reject GAC advice. CTU.

CTU: Thank you, Mr. Chair. To my mind, if stress test 18 is going to be discussed, this needs to be discussed as well. Because this is kind of going in the other direction from what stress test 18 is seeking to propose.

So I don't see that you can have one without the other. So, I mean, however, it is brought up, whether by itself or in association with -- I think it would be appropriate.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. Does everybody agree or -- turn it around. Is anybody objecting that we raise this as well? I don't see an objection. So that will be on the list for discussion as well after -- or somehow in connection with stress test 18.

Okay.

I think we should -- we may quickly go through the list so that you hear it. I try and read. So we have the following information items where we would inform the Board. One is about our expectation with regard to their participation as a board in the high-level government meeting, the NomCom update. Do we have this -- we don't have this on the list.

Then information about our expectations on the Board regarding the safeguards and our advices. We will inform them that we are looking more closely into the effectiveness of our advice. We informed them about our concerns regarding the visa, in particular with regard to the next meeting.

And then .AFRICA we will convey some basic information about what we will answer them.

And then we have two issues where we would request that information from them. One is about the next step regarding the root zone administrator proposal. And the other one is about ICANN's outreach to developing countries. So these would be

the items for information. And then we have two items for discussion. One is stress test 18, the view of the board and the rationale for their views. And the other one is the status of ATRT recommendation 6.5. That's what we have so far.

Is that all, or are there additional items? If not, then that is the list that we'll send to the Board later today. Basically, that means that we're done with the agenda of today. That would be it for today, if you don't have any -- Brazil, would you --

BRAZIL: Thank you, Chair. I just wonder if you could have some additional time to come back to the discussion on the stress test 18. Tomorrow we have a CCWG meeting and an engagement session tomorrow in which for sure this issue will be discussed. There are several proposals in the GAC mailing list that have been presented by colleagues. I think we need at least some time to get back to this in order to at least -- to make clear our positions in preparation for the CCWG meeting tomorrow.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Brazil. I'm in your hands. I have -- I'm free. So -- I don't know about you. The question would be whether or not we would have the interpreters if we run over.

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

The question is for how long would you want to -- should we say half an hour and then we see where we are? Is that okay? All right. So let's -- it's half past. So let's give it until 7:00. I'm in your hands.

If somebody wants to object, then this is the moment. Otherwise, we'll do as proposed. Okay.

Yes. I know that some people were wishing to take the floor on stress test 18 earlier in the afternoon. So maybe those can come in and make their points. Well, those who want to discuss stress test 18, I think you should take the floor. Otherwise, it doesn't make much sense. So thank you, Brazil.

BRAZIL: Thank you, Chair. I just want to say that I believe you had an interesting meeting with ALAC this afternoon did shed light on some key points we were discussing, including stress test 18. In our view, the meeting with ALAC indeed confirmed that our impression that each and every SO and AC should be the master of its own procedures and not be forced to change its decision-making process in a hurry because of extended pressure.

As you well know, we have repeatedly expressed our positions here in the GAC, in the CCWG, that we fail to see the need for this bylaw amendment.   We believe this discussion has been

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

surrounded by a number of misperceptions, some deliberate ones, unfortunately. And, in our view, this rationale, the rationale for this discussion is offensive and indeed conveys some deep mistrust of the way governments collectively operate.

I think the discussion we had in the GAC on Sunday and the session today with the ALAC demonstrate that, not only quite a lot of numbers of countries in the GAC do not support stress test 18, but also non-governmental members of the CCWG also have expressed opposition to stress test 18. In our view, this indicates that there's no broad community consensus for that -- for that proposal.

And, in light of what I've said, I just would like to reiterate that we firmly reject it and we fail to see it as a prerequisite for the transition.

Before concluding, I just would like to also express our view that we'll be ready, however, to explore a possible compromise solution on the understanding that the current text of the proposed stress test 18 is not acceptable to us for the reasons I have mentioned before. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Brazil. France.

FRANCE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I listened carefully to the words of my Brazilian colleague. We have much more information now than we had two days ago. It is very interesting information. But, despite all of this, the conceptual rationale to promote stress test 18 is still inexistent. It is so much so that the main promoter within the CCWG sent a message or a copy with the remarks of the four members of the U.S. Congress saying that this stress test is required because this stress test is necessary.

So, if the CCWG wants to include in its proposal the stress test 18, it means that it is because the Congress members are requiring that. And I should say that this is not my notion, my conception of the multistakeholder model. So let's stop talking about the multistakeholder model when we want to qualify this process.

Besides, I'm surprised that knowing that since a year ago when this transition started, it is ultimately the U.S. executive power that we have the last word on this subject matter and not the legislative power. And I'm at a loss here.

It is sure that in my country, there is also a Parliament. And that is the case in all the countries represented here at GAC. And, as

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

a government representative, I have to be accountable to my Parliament. And then the Parliament members in my country will find it difficult to accept that the internal government, decision making rules will be blocked or may be imposed by a reduced group of non-governmental stakeholders. That is not captured. That is hijacking.

And we are talking about a public service of a global nature where all the citizens and the community members are involved. So this is to say that my country's position will not change regarding stress test 18.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, France. Russia has the floor.

RUSSIA: I will speak in Russian also.

I would like to express our position. We just sent some information by mail where we showed our position. In this respect, we can't agree. As well as Brazil just said, we can't agree that a stress test has to be considered obligatory. We don't see any sense in it. We don't see any reality of this threat that was proposed. And we also don't -- we also see a threat that in the future of the transition takes place, ICANN board will have a desire to accept recommendations and get GAC advice.

We consider that this is a risk that is real. We're very happy to say that not only governmental organizations but also non-governmental organizations consider this as well. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Russia. Who's next? Iran and Argentina.

IRAN: Thank you, Thomas.

In April 2015, in one of the nights call of the working party on the stress test, I, as a participant, was the only one strongly object discussion on that, to the extent that my intervention was interrupted because it was not wanted by the chair of the group. And they called me three times. Kavouss, Kavouss, Kavouss and then interrupted. They didn't want to discuss.

To the extent my intervention was interrupted because was not wanted by the Chair of the group.

And they called me three times, Kavouss, Kavouss, Kavouss, and then was interrupted. They didn't want that I discuss. I said this is an issue should be discussed and decided by the GAC and not by the CCWG.

And I mention that rules of procedures or operating principles is an issue exclusively prerogative to the GAC; should not come

ICANN | 54
Dublin

from outside that. And I mention clearly that there is no relation between the stability of the DNS and stress test 18, nor any accountability and stress test 18. It might have other origin. Therefore, I was not in favor.

Sometimes, maybe few days after, another colleague from GAC, Olga, reacted, and then few more. Not more than three or five. Never ever anyone reacted until very recently.

I felt in danger of this stress test 18 from the very beginning. It has nothing to do with accountability, nothing to do the stability, nothing to do with the capture of the ICANN by the GAC, but has other origins. Therefore, I think that Board has been dealing with the stress test -- with the GAC advice for 17 years. Perhaps it might be some difficulty in the text or language of a particular text but not the substance of the accountability -- of the issue, of the advice. Therefore, it was not relevant. But we are not listened. That is that.

And I continued to raise that up to now, and I think this is a matter we should discuss. And we are not in favor of changing anything today. It should remain as it is, very general. We have lived with that without any difficulty. We have not had any complaint from the Board from the essence and substance of the advice.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Iran.

Argentina.

ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. I will speak in Spanish.

I would like to support the comments made by my colleagues from Brazil, France, Russia and Iran.

I remember exactly, Kavouss, when for the first time he wanted to stress that issue, and he was not allowed to speak. They took more to interrupt Kavouss instead of letting Kavouss explain what he wanted to say.

So he made me think -- thank you, Kavouss, because you made me think about the real impact of all this.

I would like to go beyond all that and I would like to think of a scenario that they have said if the stress test is not included in the proposal, the proposal will not be successful.

So this is a rule that should have been reported to us from the very beginning. This has not been so.

So if we have been reported about that from the very beginning so as not to have any obstacle during the transition, perhaps we

should have analyzed it from a different point of view and our reaction would have been different.

However, regardless of the final outcome, if the transition exists and if the stress test is included in the bylaws as it is today, because it's one of the essential requirements, what type of legitimacy would help to the international community when this stress test as not been supported by a significant number of countries that participate in this multistakeholder environment that is called ICANN?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Other comments?

Yes, please, go ahead.

VENEZUELA: Thank you, Chairman. I will speak in Spanish.

My name is Rivera from Venezuela. I have been listening to other comments, and as we said on Sunday, if I am not mistaken, many countries from the Latin American region and many other countries from Europe and Asia have said so my administration would like to support the comments that have been made before.

We haven't found sufficient grounds regarding the rationale for the need to include the stress test 18, and then amend the bylaws. We have certainly reviewed and re-read all the proposals and all the documents regarding the rationale behind this behavior proposed by the Cross-Community Working Group, and certainly we have found no grounds.

Today we have learned this is a condition, and as my colleague from France has said regarding the Congressman that were asked about this, that this was a kind of condition precedent, but certainly we do not agree with that condition. As Argentina has said, the rules of the game have to be clear from the very beginning. And so no proposal should be made to the Internet community and to the governments in this case if finally there are some conditions precedent to the approval.

So we are against this proposal including the stress test 18 as it is right now.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Venezuela.

Other comments? Japan and then Norway.

JAPAN: Thank you, Chairman.

Yes, we saw the email list that circulated to CCWG members and transferred to GAC email list. It says U.S. Congress views was expressed by its staff concerning stress test 18. Most of them were afternoon session here.

They said the U.S. Congress are still watching our discussion for the proposal. Proposed bylaw change could be introduced as a part of the transition process.

(Indiscernible) for that system where GAC has produced consensus is very important for them. So it's necessary to find out conclusions that concern the CCWG and to finally, as Congress is (indiscernible) swept out of in order to pass this transition.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Norway.

NORWAY: Thank you, Chair. No. It was just a very brief comment on the text that was forwarded by others on behalf of the -- or it was originally forward by NZ, Steve DelBianco, a new suggestion for a solution. And for the record, if anyone from the CCWG is to read our transcript, I think it's worth considering it's making the

discussion we have about stress test 18 more generic. It's pointing to, in general, advisory committee advice and not to GAC advice as such.

So I just wanted to have it on the record that we got this on the GAC list now.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Sorry. Could you -- Maybe I'm the only one, but I have problems in understanding what your point is. If you could quickly repeat it.

NORWAY: Yes, I could.

Anders, or Sweden I should say, just forwarded on the GAC list a suggestion, like a new solution than the original stress test 18, a more general term that is posted or put on the CCWG list, I believe, from .NZ, who is a member of the CCWG.

And this solution that is forwarded there, it has text that the Board should not be placed in a position to arbitrate among diverse view within an Advisory Committee. It's more general text than pointing to the GAC and the GAC methods for making our decision.

So I just wanted everyone who can see it on the list to be aware of this, and that that might be something we can look more into.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Norway.

We have 15 minutes left that we may use, if you wish.

Yes, Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Chairman.

Perhaps I also have not understood properly what Norway said and what Anders says. If the issue is that in one of the email mentioned that ICANN should not be involved in resolution of dispute between GAC member but resolution of problem between ICANN and the GAC, that is -- Is it the same text? We don't agree with that. I don't think that such a discussion is valid. It is divergence of that. I don't agree with this text. I don't know what the text is.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I have a question to those who forwarded this text. Is there any other advisory committee where the Board has the

obligation to try to find a mutually acceptable solution? And if the GAC is the only one where this obligation exists, then I don't really see much of a difference apart from the fact that the GAC is not explicitly but implicitly mentioned in this text. But maybe, Norway, you could clarify whether we understand this correctly.

NORWAY: No, I can't clarify because you are right. I think we are the only one who have this position.

The CCWG is also giving us -- doing the work for the future. So this could be a solution also to tell how the committees and how the dialogue between advisory committees and the Board also could be in the future. We don't know that. We don't know how that could change.

So this could be a solution now, and especially also not -- from where we are now, it's only for the GAC. But that we don't know. But still, it's a generic text, not pointed only to the GAC.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you for this clarification.

I have the U.K. next on the list.

UNITED KINGDOM:	Yes, thank you, Chair. I mean, just on that point. Is it worth me reading the text? If I read the text: Ment 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 advisory committee advice, the Board shall have no obligation to try to find a mutually acceptable solution where the advisory committee advice was not supported by consensus among committee members. Full stop, period. So that's the text.

The point I -- The reason why I wanted to raise my hand was, first of all, I think this whole issue revolves around what was seen as a risk of extending the role of governments in the model, because if the Board is required to try and find a mutually acceptable solution where it has rejected advice which is not consensus-based advice -- in other words, that there are governments saying one thing and other governments saying another thing -- that, by its nature, means that it's an extension, really, of the role of governments in the model.

I think -- That's my understanding of the concern at the heart of the rationale for stress test 18.   And that's why the U.K. government has always said we support that it -- the stress test 18 for those reasons.

ICANN | 54
Dublin

And, secondly, I just want to react. I'm sure it was a well-meaning point by Iran, but the stress test 18 has been in the CCWG proposal going way back. And I remember it was discussed at the -- at the first physical meeting in Frankfurt. And the point was made then that there was no intention to interfere or intervene in the way the GAC determines what is consensus, what is consensus advice. And I've recounted that many times.

So the inference that I understood from Iran that this was an interference I think is incorrect. It's never been the intention to -- to condition the GAC in any way or determine how it reaches consensus advice or how it defines consensus. That's not the case.

So, I think, Iran's comment on this in the interaction with ALAC I think was not one that I would support, because we do not consider it an interference. And if that is still Iran's view, I have to say the U.K. does not agree.

You I hope those comments are helpful.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, U.K.

Next is New Zealand.

NEW ZEALAND: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to note, and this is perhaps why we're finding this a bit challenging, stress tests are designed to look at extreme cases. It's understandable that a lot of the things that the stress test is designed for we don't see occurring today. The broader community considered there was a risk of the GAC moving towards allowing voting and that that might suppress some views or make it difficult for a smaller view to be made clear to the community.

I don't think anybody wants this. And I've heard quite a few comments across the last few days about the value the GAC places in consensus and ensuring that everybody is able to express their opinions.

I've also heard that it's important to the U.S. Congress who do have to consider this proposal.

I think that given that consensus is valuable to the GAC, we've got some workable options on the table that speak to the value we hold and consensus and how we can ensure that these do continue to be the working methods of GAC. I'd simply encourage everyone to have a look at the many different options that our colleagues have expressed through the working group -- sorry, through the email list overnight and perhaps see if we can find a way to satisfy the requirements for transition.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, New Zealand.

Further views? CTO.

CTU: Thank you. CTU.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Sorry.

CTU: After the U.K.'s understanding, and -- I don't know, I have a difficulty understanding. I have a different interpretation about extending the influence, because we keep -- notwithstanding, regardless of how we define consensus, the Board, to my mind, is not being placed in a position to arbitrate anything because, if we read the bylaws, subsection K, it says the Board has the final decision-making authority. And the Board has final decision-making authority now and the Board would have the same final decision-making authority in the future even if one accepts stress test 18; all right?

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

And in terms of this text that was just put up there, I think not supported by consensus among committee members would still be subject to what does "consensus" mean. And if even we're talking about it as a general text, right, what does consensus mean? And what if the definition of consensus changes? I don't know that it is sufficiently robust in that sense.

But my point is that it is unnecessary. It is unnecessary in the first place.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, CTU.

We have six minutes left. We can listen to more statements or we can try and discuss how to continue with this. I suggest that we go for the latter.

We have the still, basically -- unless we change our minds, we have the idea that we would read and digest whatever we find in terms of proposals on our mailing list, and the secretariat would maybe put them into one document later tonight, and then resend it to us, which shouldn't impede you from going through them one by one on the mailing list. Then we would get together tomorrow, and then figure out what to do with this.

I think there are two options. One is we finally agree on a common position on the substance; i.e., stress test 18 and bylaw changes, and so on and so forth; or on an alternative proposal that we would put forward to the CCWG. If not, we then need to start thinking about how we convey the fact that we don't have consensus on the substance and would have to discuss about what -- if so and what to formulate as a message to the CCWG.

I've heard -- So basically I personally have reserved my entire Wednesday evening for this, if necessary, for your information. I hope that we will have -- if that happens and go the GAC is willing to work until we agree on something, even if that means agree on formulating different positions, that we have this room available for as long as we may need it, because we shouldn't have artificial, let's say, deadline based on logistical grounds. So I would just like to ask staff to make sure that we have space and time tomorrow night.

So any comments? Should we stick to the agreement that we would digest and think about how to move this forward?

I have Iran.

I have Iran. Thank you.

IRAN: Chair, two comments. First the original. This famous stress test 18 is because of the community power that may be exercised by GAC. That's all.

Couldn't we address that issue independent from the GAC advice to the Board? Is it not possible? Suppose that there were no accountability issue, no transition. Would somebody come to the Board and to the Board coming to the GAC saying that we want that you modify this or GAC is informed that Board wants to modify the Article IX, section 2, and so on and so forth? No. It was just created or initiated because of the accountability and transition and because of the likelihood that GAC participates in decision making of the community power.

Couldn't we address that issue? Once we address that, perhaps, we may not need a stress test 18 any more. This is first point.

Second point, the essence of stress test 18 is everything by consensus. Now, we are discussing an issue that is stress test 18 itself. If you don't have any consensus, that means the issue is full, it is out. And there's no consensus. There's no consensus on the acceptance or otherwise on that. So the status quo prevails. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

If there's no, let's say, alternative proposal on how to move this on, I think that we leave it at giving us a reading and reflecting exercise and that we continue to come back tomorrow and see what we do.

Okay? All right.

So -- yeah.

You may recall that there's a board cocktail to which we're invited at 7:15 on the 5th floor, right? Level 5. So that's above level 4. I haven't been there, but there must be a level 5 in that case. All right.

Okay. I'm not sure. But, if they say so, let's assume there is a level 5, unless we fall on the top of the roof. Thank you very much. Thank you to the interpreters for having stayed with us and all the technical support staff. And see you tomorrow formally. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]