DUBLIN – GAC Tuesday Morning Sessions
Tuesday, October 20, 2015 – 09:00 to 12:30 IST
ICANN54 | Dublin, Ireland

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Good morning, everybody. Please take your seats. We will start.

All right. It's now Tuesday morning, and we are at agenda item 16, which is an update about the working groups and also some work that our secretariat has done with the chairs and co-chairs of the working group in the attempts to get a little bit more of clarity and, let's say, the streamlined procedures and make sure that things are -- that there are relationships between, also, between the working groups and the GAC are clear to everybody. So I will given the floor to Tracey from our secretariat and she will introduce the issue.

Thank you.

TRACEY HIND: Thank you, Thomas, and good morning, everybody.

The briefing paper for this agenda item goes through what all the working groups are. The thing I wanted to get your feedback on this morning is Appendix A to that briefing paper, which has some procedures in it that we have drafted to try to bring some

consistency to the way that the GAC working groups are both managed and the nature of the output that you as the GAC can expect to see from those working groups.

And in support of those objectives, we drafted some templates, so some templates around what the terms of reference should look like, but also a template in terms of what a GAC working group work plan might look like. And that document lists the tasks be and who's going to do them and when they're going to do them by, who the stakeholders are, and what sort of output is expected.

The working group procedures document goes through the roles and responsibilities of each of the people in the working group, being the chair, the co-chair, the working group team member, GAC leadership, GAC members, ICANN GAC support staff and the secretariat staff.

So at this stage, this is a proposal for you. It has been consulted with the leads of all of the GAC working groups who have contributed to it as well, but we wanted to put this to you at this meeting to see if you had any enhancements, any feedback, any comments, and, indeed, whether or not you support this type of structure to try to guide the process and support and outputs for our very valuable GAC working groups.

So I just wanted to open the floor for a couple of minutes to see if there's any comments or feedback on that before I invite the chairs of the four working groups, the four GAC working groups who do not have their own slot here at Dublin, to speak.

So are there any comments on that briefing paper and the roles and responsibilities and template?

Thank you.

Excellent. So that means that we'll put those -- we'll put those into practice, and hopefully it means that you start to get some support if you're a working group lead or a working group chair or chair co-chair, some structured support in terms of knowing what to expect from the support team and the secretariats in respect to GAC working groups. And also for GAC members to have some kind of expectation on the type of formats and templates and outputs from the working groups that you should expect to see.

Now we've got four working groups here at Dublin who don't have their own slot on the GAC agenda, because we devoted so much time to accountability. So I'd like to call -- They're going to give a five-minute update on their activity to everybody. I'd like to call first on one of the co-can chairs of the Public Safety Working Group to give a five-minute update on their activities to the GAC.

AFRICAN UNION COMMISSION: Thank you very much, Tracey. Perhaps you can go to the next group. I'm trying to get my -- Oh, yes, it's there. I've got a brief presentation, so perhaps the next working group chair can --

TRACEY HIND: Okay.

AFRICAN UNION COMMISSION: Oh, it's up. Thank you.

The first -- Okay. We've had two meetings, one on Monday -- no. We first had an intersessional meeting in September 10th in Washington, D.C., where we discussed a number of issues and we shared that report with GAC colleagues. And yesterday we held a public forum where members of the Public Safety Working Group presented and had discussions, interactions with the ICANN community, and we had a very interactive session there with very interesting questions and proposals.

Next slide, please.

At the private meeting we developed also -- these are the current members of the working group, and the reason why we are presenting this is to just show the diversity but also encourage

ICANN | 54 Dublin

GAC colleagues to kindly encourage their law enforcement agents or, you know, other agencies with the specific skills to join the Public Safety Working Group. We need that. And we also need that level of diversity.

Next slide, please.

Just to note that the terms of reference for the Public Safety Working Group are completed and endorsed by the GAC in ICANN 53, and we've been very active. And so far we've provided key input into WHOIS accuracy program specification review. That was in August. And then we provided comments on the privacy and proxy accreditation services, endorsed by the GAC as well. And the next generation registration directory services as well, and submitted in August 2015.

And as mentioned, we had a second face-to-face meeting on the 10th of December in D.C.

Next slide, please.

So the current -- considerations for the current plan of work going forward. We would like to submit a letter to the Number Resource Organization on IP address WHOIS accuracy, and we're going to be sharing the rationale for that and the letter with the GAC for discussions and comments and for endorsements before we do that.

We also agreed that it's important to develop case studies in several areas that provide, again, a rationale for the reason why the Public Safety Working Group is proposing certain activities or certain comments or providing certain comments.

Another area that we are going to be focusing on is encouraging collaboration and outreach and also soliciting support from registries and registrars.

Next slide, please.

We also are going to be looking very carefully at the area of outreach, and to this end, we may actually come back to the GAC for support in how to go about that. And mostly, we're looking at perhaps ICANN supporting that area through the various departments that work in outreach. And we also agreed that we're going to hold an intersessional -- second intersessional meeting, likely in London, and likely early next year. And the U.K. kindly agreed to host that. Regarding outreach again and collaboration, the issue of encouraging law enforcement agents to apply for the ICANN fellowship so we encourage more of them to join and contribute.

And another one that's coming up as a work plan area is the new gTLD security framework, specification 11. We've drafted comments, and they've been presented to the ICANN Security Framework Working Group. That was done in October. And the

goal is to develop guidelines, ready for public comment by Marrakech. And again, that relies a lot on registry/registrar cooperation.

And just a note that on Wednesday, 21st, there's going to be a session on spec 11, and we'd invite all those who are interested in this area to kindly participate and contribute.

Next slide, please.

We're also looking at developing an addendum for illegal/counterfeiting drug and reporting to -- and working with ICANN compliance. And the draft will obviously be discussed first at the PSWG level. The lead for this specific activity is the U.S. Food and Drug Administration and the European Union, and they're going to be presenting case studies as well. And the main focus here and objective is to ensure -- also to ensure that generic drugs are not mistakenly included and confused, was one of the issues that was raised. And we're going to have case studies as well for this area.

And then we discussed and agreed that we do need to begin to look at how the GAC engages with the GNSO, early engagement, and especially areas where the Public Safety Working Group is required to provide input, and the importance of engaging earlier so that we're not providing comments during the public

comment period; rather, we're engaging with the process as it starts early engagement.

Then there was a call for participation, and to this I would like to defer back to our chair because I think according to the AoC, the GAC chair does contribute in electing members. Working group. And the Public Safety Working Group would like to participate or have one member participating in this -- in this review team, so we're going to be sending a notice to our GAC chair.

We do also realize that these are self-nominations, so we've encouraged individuals to self-nominate, but the Public Safety Working Group would just like to mention that we're going to be providing support for one of our members to join this review team.

Next slide, please.

So we're providing -- we're presenting this program for GAC approval. We're going to be providing the NRO letter, presenting the NRO letter, perhaps by the end of the week or beginning of next week for GAC comments and consideration.

We're, again, requesting that a member of the Public Safety Working Group be considered to join the consumer trust and consumer choice review team.

Again, a reminder for all those interested in the subject matter of spec 11 that Wednesday, 21st, there's going to be a session. And we are going to be sending details regarding the timings of the intersessional meeting next year, early next year, just prior to Marrakech. And once again, thank you to the U.K. for accepting to host this.

And also, encourage regulator collaboration. At this point, again, a call to our GAC colleagues to assist us to that and to ensure that we have diversity in the Public Safety Working Group, including especially subject matters in some of the areas that we're working on.

I think this is the end of the presentation.

Thank you very much, Tracey, and thank you, Chair.

TRACEY HIND: Are there any comments from the GAC in relation to the update for -- from the African Union Commission and the co-chair for this working group?

In that case, I'd like to invite one of the co-chairs from the Human Rights and International Law Working Group, please. United Kingdom.

UNITED KINGDOM:	Yes, thank you, Tracey, and good morning to everybody. I am one of the co-chairs. There are three now.

Recently, Jorge Cancio of Switzerland joined the co-chair team, which is myself and Milagros for Peru. So we have three co-chairs now. We have envisage quite an extensive range of work so we kind of thought that strengthening the co-chair -- the leadership team, would be advantageous.

We are due to meet tomorrow at 12:45 to 1:15. So we haven't met at this meeting yet.

Just to go back a little bit, for colleagues who may not be familiar with the genesis of this working group, it was agreed back at the Singapore meeting that the GAC should form a working group on human rights and international law, primarily with the objective of ensuring that the Domain Name System and ICANN's management of it takes full account of human rights and relevant international law.

So this is set out in a draft of the terms of reference, which has been provided to colleagues here for this meeting. It builds on a discussion that was held at the last GAC meeting in Buenos Aires.

So we have the terms of reference in draft. It will be introduced at the meeting tomorrow. And we'll invite written comments on

that -- on those terms of reference, I'm going to propose within a period of four weeks following this meeting. So there's that invitation out to colleagues to review the draft and come back to us with comments with a view to finalizing the terms of reference by some time in December. Hopefully, certainly, by the end of this year.

And we -- at the time of the Buenos Aires meeting, we had many expressions of interest from colleagues to join the working group, and that invitation is still open, of course. So anybody who hasn't registered their interest in participating is welcome to do so.

We do look for colleagues in particular who can commit actively to the work of the working group and who have expertise or ready access to expertise that will inform its work.

As you may have seen from the draft terms of reference, there is specific reference to cross-community working party on rights. The exact title is Cross-Community Working Party on ICANN's Corporate and Social Responsibility to Respect Human Rights. That is an ICANN-wide, as the name describes, cross-community grouping, and we envisage consistent linkage with that in terms of interaction and so on.

Indeed, I believe the cross-community working party is meeting tomorrow, and one of the members of our working group has

volunteered to attend that. It's at the same time as we are meeting with the Board. That is the Council of Europe representative here, Lee Hibbard, he has offered to attend that cross-community working party meeting.

So that's the state of play. We hope to get up and running in the early part of next year, after the terms of reference have been finalized, and there will be, obviously, important to inform our work plan, an invitation going out to colleagues on the working group to submit their views on priorities for the work.

We are aware of offers to assist in providing research and data, and so on. And again, I'm very grateful for the contribution of the Council of Europe in that regard. But again, our message from the co-chair team is that we do look for active contributions from colleagues who have access to expertise to join with the Council of Europe and others in getting the work under way.

I think that's basically where we are. I don't know if my fellow co-chairs want to add in if I've omitted anything or want to add further comment on the prospects for the working group. But we really look forward to contributions from colleagues and, as I say, responses in terms of confirming membership of the working group, and so on.

I hope that's helpful for the meeting today. Thank you.

TRACEY HIND: Thank you, U.K. Any questions or comments or discussion for this Human Rights and International Law Working Group before we move on?

In that case I'd like to call on Trinidad and Tobago to give an update on the underserved regions working group, please.

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO: Thank you, Tracey. The Underserved Regions Working Group met face to face yesterday after we had one or two intersessional exchanges. We had several GAC members from the ACP region -- that will be the Africa, Caribbean, and Pacific region -- in attendance as well as ICANN, GAC, and outreach staff.

Some of the topics we discussed yesterday were the ccTLD survey that is currently underway as requested by the GAC leadership team and the ability of that survey to inform some of the discussions we're having on strengthening the DNS industry and the role of ccTLDs and that and the government's role in facilitating that issue.

We also discovered and learned about several market reviews currently underway that were done by the ICANN regional strategy teams. We were aware of Middle East survey that was

done and is completed. We also have LAC, Latin American and Caribbean market survey, that's currently in procurement mode. And we were also informed by an FE TLD representative of an African market survey that was done as well. So we have requested that that information be provided and pooled and perhaps circulated to the working group, which could be valuable information to one of our objectives, which is to strengthen the DNS industry and to provide perhaps some suggestions to the GAC for approval to move forward with some recommendations.

We also discussed the area of capacity building and training. And we learned as well that there were several initiatives currently underway that ICANN was involved with in the regions in the African, Caribbean, and Pacific region in particular. And we agreed that we should pool those resources and make them available to the GAC as a whole. Because we did indicate that the GAC members coming in would need some sort of induction-type documentation. And, although we do have some documentation in the GAC website that has been prepared by the secretariat, some of the information that is available beyond that is not easily accessible except via Google search or some other method. So we are aware of several webinars and live webcasts that were done that we're going to pool and put in our location on the GAC Web site as well as a series of presentations

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

that were done, for example, by CaribNOG and Pacific NOG and so on.

We also discussed the related area of training and talked about working with the ICANN team, staff, in strengthening the ICANN Learn Platform and getting some information there for the GAC members who are new. Because we did, in fact, discover yesterday that every Pacific Island, except for one, is a GAC member now, which I think is a very good milestone. And we are obtaining new GAC members from underserved regions literally on a monthly basis. I believe the membership list is now 155. And the majority of those new members are coming from these regions. So we do want to ensure that there is some information made available and some training material available to assist these members coming forward.

And, finally, we also looked at the possibility of -- and I think it may come up in the next session -- having a large representation that is strengthened at the high-level meeting in Marrakech. One of the representatives there who might be in the room today raised the possibilities of ministers coming to that meeting without the necessary information or correct information, especially coming, perhaps, without their GAC rep, if that was the case.

So that information being provided in advance of that meeting would certainly help the ministers and the government secretaries and the other high-level officials from underserved regions coming to be thoroughly informed of the issues and we'll contribute in part more effectively.

We discussed, finally, the difference between increasing the numbers of GAC members and participation of GAC members. And we wanted to ensure that it is not just a numbers game that we're playing. But we're also talking about increased participation of GAC members in the discussions, in the working groups, in the issues that ICANN was addressing and having somewhat of an equal footing with the more -- I guess experienced GAC members in these issues. So a work plan is going to be developed next and I guess put to the GAC for approval.

And, moving forward, and we hope to have before Marrakech some achievements on these areas that we spoke to at that meeting today. And we will share that with you on Thursday. We would also share some information on the GAC Web site that would perhaps strengthen this information that we talked about a few minutes ago. Thank you very much.

TRACEY HIND:	Thank you, Trinidad and Tobago. Are there any questions or discussion items from the room for that working group? I see the United Kingdom and then Indonesia.
UNITED KINGDOM:	Yes, thank you, Tracey. And thank you, Tracy, for the presentation. Just to say this is a very important working group. And we fully support it.

As colleagues may well know, I've been working with -- as the U.K. is a member of the commonwealth, I've been working with the Commonwealth Telecommunications Organization. And we have a commonwealth meeting, indeed, today at 12:30. So there's a plug for that. Please come with colleagues. I hope you can join us at 12:30 today in this room.

But I just wanted to comment in view of the commonwealth membership comprising many developing countries and small island developing states, there's an obvious synergy with the work of the commonwealth grouping within the GAC. And we also have, as one of our objectives, outreach to commonwealth members who are not members of the GAC. So we look forward to working jointly with the Underserved Regions Working Group on helping to bring those remaining countries into the fold. For the commonwealth they are Belize, Guyana, Lesotho, Maldives, St. Kitts, and St. Vincent. And Bangladesh, I should add as well,

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

is another important state which we should reach out to. And, hopefully, they will join as members. Thank you.

TRACEY HIND: Thank you. Indonesia.

INDONESIA: Thank you, Tracey. Ashwin, for the record. First of all, appreciate the job of the secretariat giving us all the information. My morning ritual is always searching email from Olof, Julia Charvolen, Tracey Hind. And because they always bring important news to me.

Now, I understand that, during all these ICANN emails and meetings, there's so many piles of things I have to read and to learn. So I just wonder if, from this group, working group, we can make some sort of things to be -- things which might be concern of the GAC members, something like warning for the GAC members or letters and so on. Because we -- in some cases, we may have countries like Indonesia, we need more and more specialists. And with information -- focused information like that that may help us to work better. For example, related to the first presentation about the WHOIS security and so on, then perhaps the warning is, okay, be careful with WHOIS. And look up this table because they may look up this, this, this, according

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

to Mr. FBI, Mr. Europol, and Mr. WHOIS yesterday -- INTERPOL and so on. Be careful this, this, this. This may not be the case of some countries, but maybe the case of many other countries.

Another is about the underserved region. Perhaps we have to be warned that, okay, you are underserved. But IP number has already gone or very small. Can you transfer to IP version 6 like that? Otherwise, we cannot serve you. Indonesia is a big country. So perhaps the part of the country already connected has IP version 4 address but may not get more IP numbers. So these are the kind of things that might be interesting. Certainly give us the point.

International law and human rights, perhaps you can tell directly, okay, no more law available. Make it yourself. Or you can follow European -- European model or U.N. model law or whatever.

Those are the kinds of things that perhaps directly give us focus and look at a lot big step things that we get all of them. Just try to help the job of the work of the GAC members for the secretariat to help the job of the GAC members. But, of course, perhaps also the Secretariat needs specialist and more funding and more funding. That's another job for our chairman, Mr. Thomas Schneider. Thank you.

TRACEY HIND: Thank you. Did Trinidad and Tobago want to respond to that at all?

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO: Well, I think the issue of having GAC members fully briefed on all of the range of Internet governance and ICANN issues is one that is not only for underserved regions. But, certainly, the working group can champion it because we do have that remit for our portfolio.

I know my cochair, Alice, has been -- I'm sorry. Kenya, AUC -- has been doing work in Africa in terms of providing some information on a certain topic. I don't know if she may want to add anything to the issue.

But, as far as the working group is concerned, anything that the GAC is perceiving as important, certainly, we would be willing to champion that and have that information provided in one location that's easily accessible and organized in a way that you can find that very quickly. And we have been reaching out to the ICANN staff in that regard. And we hope that we'll be able to continue doing that work. I don't know if there's anything that maybe AUC may want to add or perhaps Secretariat to that.

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you very much, Tracey, and Tracy. Yes, the African Union Commission has been working very, very well with ACIG in terms of providing very important and critical policy briefs on various issues that the GAC is covering. And the most important issue here has been trying to ensure that we are approaching the issue from an African context so that it's understood and African member states are able to assign people who have the interest and skill in those areas. We have several examples that, if colleagues are interested, we can share.

Some of the policy briefs have been, for example, one, explaining what the Public Safety Working Group is about and the need for having law enforcement agents joining through their GAC representative or playing an active role. Another was on the two-character code and on the CCWG and accountability. So we've been doing this consistently for quite a while now and working quite well with this ACIG. So that's one way of approaching it. Thank you.

TRACEY HIND: I don't see any other hands raised. So I would like to invite Argentina to speak on the NomCom GAC working group.

ARGENTINA: Thank you very much, Tracey. My apologies for being late this morning.

This working group was created in reaction or responding in initiative -- initiated by the board. I'm not sure how much has evolved since its presentation in Los Angeles meeting.

The idea was to change the structure of the NomCom. The NomCom today is built with participants appointed by different supporting organizations or advisory committees. But the GAC doesn't participate. But the GAC today has only one seat, which is non-voting as an observer. But, at the same time, the GAC has not participated even in an observation -- how to say? My English is very bad this morning. I need more coffee. Even in that non-voting position, the GAC has not been participating.

Why Argentina thinks this is an important issue? The NomCom selects half of the Board of ICANN. So, if the NomCom is comprised or made by appointees by other supporting organizations like the ccNSO, the GNSO, and they select people from the community, they may have a perspective that does not perhaps reflect the interests of the government. Because they come from other parts of the community, from the business stakeholders or civil society stakeholders. And that's fine.

So, from our perspective, this is not so much aligned with the multistakeholder model because we should have the same

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

opportunities to participate. This is why we thought it was a good idea to think about why the GAC is not even using that non-voting seat or if it would be willing to participate in the proposed new structure that was explained during the Los Angeles meeting one year and a half ago that proposed five voting seats for the GAC. That was one option.

So this is the purpose of this working group, analyzing why we're not participating, which are the constraints or the concerns expressed by some countries, especially related with a confidentiality of the information of the candidates that can or cannot be shared in the process of the selection.

So for the moment we have developed some kind of suggestions for the members of the NomCom to have in mind at the time of making the selection. This is related with the interest of the governments in which are the candidates that would have that governmental perspective or governmental understanding of the problems of governments.

And, for moving forward, we need to approve our terms of reference that we couldn't do that in Buenos Aires. Those terms of reference were circulated before Buenos Aires and were recirculated before this meeting.

So I would like to know if I haven't -- we haven't received in the working group list any -- or in the GAC list any comments about

those terms of reference. I would like to know if they are okay, if there are comments, if we want to revise them again, or if we can approve them and move forward with the working plan.

I see nobody. So I think that would be okay with the terms of reference. What do you think? Sorry, Tracey. I cannot hear you.

TRACEY HIND: The terms of reference for this NomCom working group are actually at appendix B in the briefing paper that was sent to you for this item, if you want to quickly refer to that.

ARGENTINA: Yes. I think they were circulated in the GAC list, like, two times. So, if there are no comments, I think we may think that they're okay. Yeah, sure, Suzanne. United States, sorry.

UNITED STATES: Thanks, Argentina. Just a quick question. This is not a meeting of the working group, right? So could we perhaps issue a deadline for comments, because there hasn't been a meeting for quite some time. So to conduct working group business during the full GAC, I'm just a little disoriented. So, if we could just establish some deadlines in keeping with the Secretariat 's very useful paper that has procedures. It talks about timeliness of

documents and a clear sense of what we are deciding and when we might be making those decisions. Thank you.

ARGENTINA: Thank you, United States, for your comments. We tried to arrange two conference calls, but it was extremely difficult for -- because of the many calls that we have been having these days.

So fine. I suggest that we recirculate the terms of reference again. And we set up a new deadline for accepting those. Thank you very much. But that's the update I have for the moment. Once we have that done, we will develop the working plan.

TRACEY HIND: Thank you, Argentina. We still have 10 minutes left if there are any questions or comments that people want to make before I close this session and hand back to the chair.

Does anybody want to say anything? No, we finish early, chair

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Well thank you very much. Just one comment or two, actually, of course we tried to have meetings of the working group as part or also outside the GAC schedule. Which is something that is useful, I guess. And it is not always possible. So maybe something to add to the guidelines if it's not already there but I

don't recall it being there. But in case there would be no meetings or I guess in every case there should be some written form of briefing or update of what the working group has done since the last written update ideally every time, so that also among the documents that we get before a meeting, then we would get an update. It doesn't have to be 100 pages. It depends on how much we know about the work of the working group and about how much has actually happened. But to get a written update including next steps, timelines and so on and so forth, so that people know what is expected -- what has been going on and what is expected to be decided or -- and so on, for every of the working groups. I think that may be something that may be useful for all of us, in particular, those who are not able to follow every of these working groups in detail.

I see people nodding. So I think we should check the guidelines and see whether we could add something in that direction. Thank you.

TRACEY HIND: Thank you, Thomas. The guidelines do suggest that already. And the template allows for that, but we can strengthen that.

African Union Commission.

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

AFRICAN UNION COMMISSION: Yeah. Two questions: Apologies if you've already discussed this. But to mention that we had a working group -- a meeting of working group chairs and co-chairs because of some concerns that were raised, especially by the Public Safety Working Group, regarding some of the terms of reference of the Human Rights Working Group and possible overlaps and to note that we're going to be presenting a report on that and also to note that we noted that the terms of reference for the Human Rights Working Group have not yet been finalized.

So, as the group is working on that, to be aware of the Public Safety Working Group terms of reference or where there might be overlaps so we're then able to see how we collaborate and work together. And from -- coming from meeting there was an agreement that we would have these meetings at least quarterly. Because it's likely to be working groups that finish their works and are closed off and new ones coming up and to ensure that there's no overlap.

My second question is regarding the working group on operating principles, where it is at and if there's any update on that.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Well, this is tabled, if I'm not mistaken, for Thursday. So this session was to give some space to those who do not have a proper session for their own. So....

U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thank you, Chair. Just very briefly to concur wholeheartedly with African Union Commission's reporting of how we should ensure that there is no -- no unnecessary duplication or overlap or even sort of contradiction between the work of working groups that are obviously working on issues that are relevant to more than one working group. So that's a very important point.

And at our discussion about this -- was it yesterday? I can't remember. Yesterday. I need a coffee, too. We -- you know, we did agree to have this mechanism for the co-chairs to -- of all the working groups to convene, certainly before GAC meetings and ideally four times a year, I think was the broad agreement. So that's a very important coordinating mechanism that we should institute.

Yeah. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. The European Commission also wanted to take the floor, or was that together?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone).

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Ah.

Tom.

TOM DALE: Thank you, Thomas. Just a point about drafting material in the communique concerning the working group activities. In the GAC's communique for Buenos Aires, we simply listed what working groups existed because at that time they were having their first meetings and sorting out work programs.

The reporting in some of the meetings this week suggested they might be scoped to suggest some basic information on progress in a number of the working groups. So I'm just seeking the GAC's guidance on whether that would be a good thing to include in the communique. And if so, perhaps the chairs or co-chairs of the relevant working groups could provide me with just a couple of lines, sentences, and so on, to include in the relevant part of the communique, if people think that's a good idea.

And I think silence is consent, to use a well-worn phrase.

Thank you, Chair.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Are there any more questions or comments either from the secretariat or from GAC members and observers?

Yes, Argentina.

ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair.

I think that the work group -- working groups are listed in the private section of our Web site. Am I correct? And there the countries are -- no? No?

I was thinking about the summary of the updates of the groups maybe could be added there, but I'm not sure what is in the Web site or what is not.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Olof.

OLOF NORDLING: Thank you. Olof Nordling, for the record.

It's a recent development that we have moved over the working group information to -- if you see a tab on the GAC Web site marked "GAC Work," under there you have all the information about all the working groups. So it's in the open area. So just to make that clear.

ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. I was thinking about the suggestion of doing an update or some document that you suggested. Maybe that could be also added. But I'm not sure if it has to go to the open section or the closed section. Just a suggestion or a comment.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Argentina. I think this is, of course, a good suggestion, to have this information available if somebody actively seeks for it. But I think that that is one half, and the other one is to distribute it in time before a meeting, to distribute an update. So there's both things. If somebody is looking for something, then he or her should find it on the Web site, but then those who are not actively looking or who don't have the time, they should just receive information on every working group every time before a meeting, in case that information has not already been circulated through other channels.

Thank you for this.

Any further comments or questions?

If that is not the case, then we will move to the next agenda item, which is number 17, if I'm not mistaken. And this is about -- yes, about the third high-level governmental meeting which is scheduled for our next meeting in Marrakech in March 2016.

We have a colleague from Morocco here who is willing to give us an update on their preparatory work for that part of the Marrakech meeting.

Please, Redouane, the floor is yours.

MOROCCO: Thank you very much. Good morning, dear colleagues. I am Morocco GAC representative for the (indiscernible). I will speak in French.

Mr. Chair, thank you for giving me the opportunity to address my GAC colleagues to report on the preparations for the high-level governmental meeting in Morocco, the phases that have been completed and the work that still has to be done after this meeting.

After the briefing that I gave to the GAC in Buenos Aires, I worked together with the secretariat and the colleagues that were

ICANN | 54
Dublin

interested, mainly the chair and the vice chairs, to speed up the preparations mainly for sending invitations to the ministers.

Despite the holiday season, we made a lot of progress, and we were able to send out many letters in late September 2015. So we have covered 85% of the letters out of a total of 182.

This was possible thanks to the efforts of our ministry, the Ministry for cooperation and the Ministry for Information Technology. But also, we had a lot of support from the embassies of Morocco all over the world that took to sending this these invitations to the potential attendees.

It has not been easy. My colleague from the U.K. had already warned me about the difficulties of organizing such a meeting, and I thank him for his advice.

I would like to say that there are certain countries in which Morocco has no diplomatic representation.

So now let's talk about substance. Morocco, with GAC chair and other colleagues, have prepared a document on the topics that could be part of the agenda, and that was together with the secretariat and the GAC meetings before their meeting in Dublin.

According to the agenda put together with the chair and the vice chairs, Morocco made a blueprint of that Marrakech meeting,

and this was presented by the secretariat. And you can see it before you.

This is the draft agenda that we have put together. Of course it can be enhanced, but this is just a one-day meeting, and managing time here will be a challenge for the chair of that meeting.

Only a few months are ahead of us before the Marrakech meeting, so our committee would have to agree on the topics so that Morocco can send out the second invitations, include the agenda, the topics to be discussed, and other organizational aspects for GAC members and non-GAC members.

It is important to highlight the role of the delegates here in terms of disseminating information and raising awareness among their ministers so that we can have a good meeting from a qualitative and quantitative standpoint.

It will be the first one in Africa and within the Arab world. It is a relevant meeting for all the GAC members, and we hope that this meeting will be successful.

Of course we will do our best to make sure that this will be a successful meeting.

Before concluding, I would like to thank the small team that worked together with me, although they are not present here in

Dublin. In July and August they worked to prepare the letters and send them out.

I also want to thank the GAC chair for his collaboration and his contribution. That is always constructive. The GAC secretariat and the ICANN support staff have been really helpful in the preparations of this meeting. Michelle, Tom, Olof, Julia, and all the other members.

Morocco has the expertise of the secretariat to ensure its success.

Thank you so much.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Morocco, for this presentation, for this report, and all the work that you have done. And I'm sure that all the GAC members will find this draft agenda very interesting.

On the whole of the presentation, but also on the draft program, I think it is important that when we are leaving Dublin, we have a draft program that we can share, that you can take home and show to your high-level officials as a working document, but as something that is clearly pointing out the direction of what we intend to be discussing in Marrakech.

So thank you very much to my Moroccan colleague for bringing this up.

I have Spain, and Iran, and U.K.

SPAIN: Thank you.   Thank you very much, Redouane, for the presentation.   I have a small question regarding the draft agenda.   I see no reference to the issue of relationship between governments and their corresponding ccTLDs.   I don't know whether the small group that has been working on the agenda has considered that maybe it is in an earlier stage yet to be discussed in Marrakech.   Anyway, I would like to know about your views on this issue and the possibility to discuss this in the high-level governmental meeting.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much, Spain.

Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.   I would like to thank my colleagues from Morocco.

I think there is a problem here at GAC, and I would like to remind you that all the instructions have to be sent to the Moroccan embassy with all their information for visas, because in our experience, there have been some difficulties in previous meetings with visa requirements.

Secondly, just to make Spain aware of this, I don't think that the relationship between governments and the ccTLD managers is a topic that has to be discussed in this high-level meeting.

I believe that when I was at the ccNSO meeting, this topic was raised, and it actually does not need to be part of the agenda, considering that there are many topics that cannot be fully discussed there. So we need to set priorities for the most important issues.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Iran. You mentioned the visa requirements. We have already talked about this, and it is clear that for the high-level governmental meeting, we are going to focus our attention on facilitating that, and we are going to work with ICANN and with the countries to make sure that everything goes out smoothly.

The U.K. has the floor.

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

UNITED KINGDOM:	Yes, thank you, Chair, and thank you very much, Morocco, for providing this update. And our appreciation goes to the full team preparing this work. And it's quite demanding work from our experience, and I know you're experiencing the same emphasis on applying sufficient resources to it. And I know you're doing that, so that's great.

We do have a couple of comments on the agenda and the concept paper. We can provide those separately, I think, but I think generally to say we broadly agree with the concept for the meeting and the objectives. And we really look for this perhaps as an opportunity to examine how ICANN and governments can ensure that administrations have sufficient capacity to contribute on the public-policy input into ICANN policy development processes and decisions and so on, and I guess I'm looking at session two in particular about the government's role. And I think one of our comments will major on capacity building for administrations to be able to participate actively and fully in ICANN's processes, and the new framework of governance which is now being finalized.

So we'll submit some comments shortly on the agenda and the concept paper.

We did note in the context part of the concept paper, the second bullet, enable governments to have a leading role in the new organizational framework of ICANN. I think that might need tweaking in view of our general consensus that ICANN is multistakeholder. Perhaps "leading role" is not quite the right phrase, but we might suggest alternative wording for that in particular.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, United Kingdom.

Actually, we have time now to actually hear comments, substantive comments, in particular on the program, because I think we should somehow, at least as a draft, try and agree on this and agree on what will be sent out after this meeting. So your comments in particular on the program are very welcome, those who have them yet. So just to let you know, this would be a good time to make comments on the proposed program, on the issues. And so that would help us to move it to the next step as a first draft to be shared.

Peru.

PERU: I would like to speak in Spanish.

I think that the program in general is okay. However, I think that it's quite premature to agree on a program because we should be remind of the meeting that will be held in December in New York City, and it will be related to the world conference on social -- on Information Society.

So I think that there will be some discussions over there, some final documents that perhaps may lead to a change or condition to the Marrakech program or perhaps enrich the Marrakech agenda. So I think that we should do our best -- we should make our best efforts for drafting an agenda. Right now this may change in December.

Additionally, I would like to know if some consideration has been given for funding the travel expenses of the high-level officials in addition to those that are generally provided to GAC members. Thank you very much.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: It's up to the GAC to decide how it plans to finalize this program in the end.

It is just the experience has shown here but also with other conferences that are targeted toward ministers and high-level

officials that, the later you come with a substantive program, the more difficult it is to actually get high-level people to something.

So the earlier we have a draft and -- a set of draft, it's not a final program. The earlier we have a draft that we can share so that they have an idea what this is about in terms of a program, that, of course, is very important for discussing with ministers and high-level persons.

So, hence, the idea that it's now 5 -- 4 1/2 to 5 months before, if I calculate right from October to March, yes, more or less -- around five months before the meeting. And it would be a very good time to issue a draft program now. If you think that this is premature, it's your decision. Please, please give us your views. But I would strongly urge that we come up with a draft program now and share it with the people.

If that may change, I think that we can indicate that that may change. But I wouldn't wait until December, because that's two months to go then. And I am afraid that that will be too late. So your views, please.

U.K. and then --

PERU: Peru speaking. I hadn't thought that this should come to a halt until December. That was not my idea that we may agree upon

right now. Should be subject to any change after December, this was my intention.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: I think we're clear that this was a draft. So a draft may change if people think that it will have to change. So you would agree that we could send it out as a draft. Okay. Then, I didn't get you exactly.

U.K., do you still want to -- yes. Okay. Thank you.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes. Thank you, Chair. I don't think we should send it out, really, as a draft. We should finalize it. I agree very much with your intent here. The WSIS is, obviously, an important and crucial review, and after the final stage will be in December, indeed.

But the focus of this high-level governmental meeting is on ICANN. It's not on issues that are much broader relating to the information society, which the review is addressing in terms of the review of implementation of outcomes in Tunis in 2005.

So I note the point. I think I can understand the point that Peru is making. But I don't think it should hold us up. And I think we now agree that we should steam ahead with issuing the final agenda. And no doubt the content of the WSIS review outcomes

from December will filter through into discussions in Marrakech. But I don't think -- I don't expect them to impact directly on our proposal and the agenda, which Morocco is facilitating. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Before I give the floor to other GAC members, I would like to give Olof the floor to respond to the other question that was raised by Peru on the funding. This is in discussion. And there is additional funding, I think, available. But Olof will give you the details of where we are so far. Thank you.

OLOF NORDLING: Thank you, Chair. And Olof Nordling, for the record.

Indeed, we have for SO lists fiscal year, we have 30 spots for supported travelers for each GAC meeting. That is for the normal meetings. Like for this meeting we had 30 available slots.

For the high-level governmental meeting we have 30 additional slots. So I think I would say that we're well prepared for the extra support that's needed.

And, well, it follows the same travel support rules that we already have well-established for the GAC with one distinction,

that it's not limited to existing GAC members. Also governments that are not yet members of the GAC can apply and receive travel support. And the priorities, as for well-known rules we have, priority for least developed countries, well, small island developing states and so upwards in the economic ladder. So it's the same treatment, basically, with the distinction that there's not -- it's also possible for non-GAC members to apply.

May I use my -- also make a little observation on the agenda? And perhaps that's worth discussing. It says, "national statements" under each session or session 1 and session 2. And, of course, that can be in interpreted in various ways. Either it's prepared statements by ministers, which can take some time, or it's national statements in the form of exchanges. So perhaps that's worthwhile discussing as well. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Olof. Just a quick reaction on your last point. Actually, this is a very valuable contribution. We should consider -- but, again, this is up to the GAC to decide. But I would suggest we consider having an interactive dialogue as much as we can instead of just people just reading their national statements in particular if they tend to be long. So this is something that we may look further into.

I'd just like to go -- continue with the speaking order. I have China and then Lebanon so far. Okay. I note Argentina, Hungary, India, European Commission. That's it so far. And Iran.

Okay. Please be brief. Then we have officially 10 minutes left. So China, please.

CHINA: Thank you, Chair. And thank you, Morocco, for the presentation and for the preparation of the high-level meeting until now. And I would like to share with you the preliminary thoughts from our side on this high-level meeting, especially on the agenda.

By looking at the agenda, I see many things cover the topic of ICANN. I think, because it is a high-level meeting, I suggest that we can treat the Internet governance as a broader issue to discuss the Internet governance, to treat internet governance as a theme, at least. I'm not saying that ICANN issue is not important. I think ICANN topic is important on this high-level meeting. But whether we can have something as a theme about internet governance. Like, we can talk about, like, what happened in U.N. system or other platforms like IGF, NETMundial, the follow-up of NETMundial and the NETMundial initiative and also maybe SSTD. That's my thought.

But also I still want to take this agenda paper back to my capital. And maybe we will have a more formal feedback to you and to Morocco. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, China, for this substantive contribution. Lebanon, please.

Sorry. That was -- due to change of seating order, that was a mistake. So I have Hungary next.

HUNGARY: Thank you, Thomas. First of all, I would like to thank Morocco for this draft agenda. (Non-English word or phrase)

First, when I was reading the paper, I found it quite balanced. And I just found one agenda item -- this is on session number 2 -- a bit contradictory.

As the title goes, governments are in the new framework of ICANN. But, if you go to point 2, the role of governments in the new global internet governance ecosystem. To me, it's a much broader term. Unfortunately, having listened to many of the interventions and, first of all, to the intervention of Peru and now China, I think it might have been wishful thinking to leave this ambiguity to allow for the outcome of the WSIS high-level

meeting to be included. So I think after -- I do agree with the agenda as is. And I propose to endorse it and finalize it. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Hungary. Next I have India.

INDIA: Thank you, Chair. Rahul Gosain, Government of India, for the record.

The draft program is very well received. And we strongly support the inclusion of session 3 on ICANN and developing countries. We have specific comments and suggestions, which we will share in writing in due course. The second bullet point under session 3 is, in particular, an important issue. Because there are most certainly invisible barriers that hinder participation in multistakeholder processes at ICANN. Workstream 2 of the accountability debate is supposed to also focus on increased accountability of the SOs and ACs. So, in that context, this is a very important decision, discussion.

We just want to place on record our thanks to the Kingdom of Morocco for including this issue in the agenda. And we welcome the chance to participate in fleshing this out. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, India. I have the European Commission.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Yes, thank you very much.   Well, thank you, of course, to Morocco for this proposal. And also we know how much work is involved in these things.   I just wanted to echo one of the suggestions as well.   Thomas, you had mentioned the idea of having interactive discussions with ministers.   And, of course, we're open to whatever possibility there is. But I just would like the outline of the agenda.

I just wondered if it was an idea to slightly reorder the agenda so that you discuss NTIA stewardship transition, ICANN accountability, and the government's role in the framework of new ICANN together with, after that, those presentations, then the ministerial discussion, whether it's in the form of statements or a discussion.

Then you concentrate the ministers' interventions and their discussion on these three issues, which really go together. And then in the afternoon you concentrate on -- which, of course, we also think is a very important issue -- the role of ICANN in developing countries. You could allow that to extend also, of course, to issues relating to SDG. I mean, there are all sorts of

issues that have been discussed over the last issues, which are not central to this but which are tangential and that could be pulled in. That would allow in the afternoon a greater discussion of those issues. That's just an idea. Thanks.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, European Commission. Actually, you're right. It may make sense to get the package, as we are working on it here in ICANN, also together in this and move the accountability part into the session one and two, that that is a package. So we'll take that into account, if everybody agrees. Next is Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I think, first of all, the point to encourage the non-GAC member participation is very good idea. And we have to really mobilize the situation. It is important if the minister or high-level people attending this, there would be more of a situation of GAC and there would be more participation. That is number one.

Number 2: I'm worried about these national statements. If 2 -- sorry, if 20 minutes their Vice Minister wants to have three minutes of nationalist statement, you have 60 minutes. Ed Vaizey was very kind and said be brief. But even saying be brief, people tried to have sometimes even more than three minutes.

So could we have some other arrangement for that? In that one hour and 15 minutes, nationalist statement doesn't fit. That's all.

Nationalist statement about subject of the government and ICANN, on the transition. If you go on the transition, you have long national statements. So please kindly look at that.

And, having the floor, I just heard our distinguished colleague from U.K. wants to reword we should avoid the leading role of government. Because yesterday we opposing leading role of the private sector. We should not come back now. We are the leaders. So thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Iran. United Kingdom?

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes. Thank you, Chair. The main point I wanted to make was with regard to the scope. And I noted the proposals from our colleague from China on this.

I think -- in considering that substantive contribution to finalizing the agenda, I think we should bear in mind why we have these high-level governmental meetings. And the origin of that I think is from the first accountability and transparency

review, which recommended creating a mechanism and opportunity for ICANN, the ICANN community, ICANN leadership to engage at a high level with governments, with ministers and so on for the purpose of securing a more effective understanding by ministers and high-level officials and administrations of the kind of strategic approach of ICANN and ICANN's evolution and, particularly, of course, at this time with the stewardship transition of the IANA functions.

So I think the focus is right. And it's -- of the agenda as we now have it. And it's consistent with the original objectives of the concept of a high-level governmental meeting.

But, as I said earlier, no doubt there will be elements of the outcomes in the WSIS+10 review negotiations that may be relevant to ICANN. And no doubt those will filter through into the discussions. I don't preclude that.

But, in terms of agenda setting, I think the approach taken by our colleagues from Morocco is right and fits with the concept and with the current environment of change and evolution that ICANN is going through.

As regards the statements, I think I understand how that's come in. Because, of course, ministers say I'm going to go to a high-level meeting and what am I going to say. They will expect some kind of opportunity to -- as a politician, to be able to make their

mark and so on. So I think that's what this is signifying, national statements. But, of course, there is the worry that you'll have a tedious long list of statements. And we want to avoid that, certainly. So maybe the actual modality of that needs careful thinking. I'm sure our colleagues from Morocco are paying attention to that. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much. Next I have Council of Europe, then U.S.A., then Argentina and then Norway.

COUNCIL OF EUROPE: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Thank you very much to Morocco for the invitation to the Council of Europe to participate in this high-level meeting. I think, looking at session 3 in particular, I have one point in regard to reference to developing countries, which is the question of access to the Internet. I think it's unavoidable. But, when we look at this session, there's a lot of working being done also on Internet Governance Forum for connecting the next billion. Access to the Internet and questions of access are being discussed a lot and will be one of the main focuses, main themes for discussion. I think it's inevitable that that will come up in that session. Even if the scope is the scope you're talking about, the question of access and accessibility for

that matter will come up for sure in that session. So the work of other forums will probably creep into this work. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. United States.

UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. And thank you to our colleagues from Morocco for sharing this draft agenda.

Please correct me, if I'm wrong. But I think there's been a reference to a concept paper, a background paper that may have helped shape the agenda. And, if that is the case, could I ask if that could be circulated? Because I think it would be helpful for us to understand the context that was used to develop the agenda and to ask, if the agenda is still in draft, will we have the opportunity to weigh in and perhaps make some suggested edits? We would certainly appreciate that opportunity. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Just for clarification, there was a concept paper that was circulated among the group that was supporting Morocco with the preparations. So that was not distributed to the GAC.

And, with regard to your second question, I think, given that we have some divergence of views on the scope of this, we may also give a deadline of something like two weeks to make comments on the agenda. And then we'll try to sort it out electronically. If not, I would then think of having a meeting call to sort it out. Because we can't wait until the next physical meeting, of course, because that's the Marrakech meeting. So we need to sort this out before. But I would like to have some kind of consensus and support for the agenda, at least a rough consensus as soon as possible. So, if that answers the question.

Argentina.

ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. First, Argentina wants to thank Morocco for first hosting the meeting. We are very pleased to participate in it. Also for hosting this high-level meeting and for this draft agenda.

In general, we agree with the agenda. We like the suggestion made by our colleague from European Commission about, perhaps, reordering the priorities of the issues. I have a comment, a question for Olof. There was a meeting with chair, vice chairs of the GAC and Fadi Chehade and his leadership team in Los Angeles, I think it was. And I requested him if ICANN could have more slots for funding GAC members. He said yes.

And I understood, if I'm not wrong, that that was going to start in Morocco. And you said that there are 30 slots available. And that request was going from 30 to 50.

I think this is especially important in this meeting because it's in Africa. We may increase participation from other regions, especially considering that we may have members -- countries that are not participating today in the GAC. And they could benefit from that funding. If you can perhaps give me an update on that. Thank you.

OLOF NORDLING: With pleasure. Previously, like, for last year, we had 25 -- we could support 25 GAC travelers per GAC meeting. 25. It was a request. And it was agreed in Los Angeles that that should be upped. That's one part of the whole thing.

The second request was that we had a last-minute request for travel funding for the London high-level governmental meeting. And that was agreed. And it became a pretty rushed matter. But it was agreed. And it was used but not fully utilized because it came select.

So, in order to prepare for this year's -- for the coming -- this fiscal year's HLGM, we introduced a request from the GAC to have that -- to not only to increase the normal travel support

from 25 to something higher. That became 30, which was approved. But also to add 30 extra slots for the high-level governmental meeting. So, in practice, that means that a total of 60 then for Marrakech. Which is -- well, maybe you had wanted to have even more. But, then again, that is what we got.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Norway. And then I think we should go into our deserved coffee break. I see people nodding. So, Norway, please don't exceed 10 minutes. I have one more additional slot after Norway, two. Indonesia. Please be brief. I stop here. Thank you.

NORWAY: Yes. Thank you, Chair. We also want to thank Morocco for hosting this meeting and also thank them for this draft agenda. We also think it covers high-level issues and is also in line with the comments from the U.K. That was also the purpose of establishing the high-level meetings. So I think it's a very good draft agenda.

Also, just a quick comment on the national statements. I think also in line with the U.K., I think, if we are going to get political participation on this meeting, I think they also would expect to

have an opportunity to provide at least a short statement during the meeting. So thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. We are aware of the modality issues. And I think we will try to find a compromise between the traditional ministry statement thing and something more interactive, which is always a challenge. Please be very brief. The lady to the right -- unfortunately, I don't have your country in my list. Please just introduce yourself.

KIRIBATI: Okay. I'm introducing myself. I'm Renga from Kiribati in the Pacific. Yeah. We thank Morocco for the invitation we just received in September. And I understand that the underserved region for the Pacific small island states just joining the GAC this year.

And we do have comments for high-level meeting for funding instruction, as Olof explaining today, regarding the extra slot. I understand that the minister will attend this meeting is quite new to this. And, actually, in the Pacific or in government situation, actually, the senior official or the GAC rep or maybe the technical should support the minister while attending there. And I just request, on behalf of my Pacific colleagues, if we could

allow extra slot for the senior official to support the minister. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much. Indonesia.

INDONESIA: Yes. First of all, thanks to Morocco and especially, of course, (saying name) to my friend who have been working a lot of activities for this.

Just for the national statement, I just want to remind perhaps all of us about our experience in London where the British minister has to cut the -- what you call it -- the statements from several ministers. I hope that will not happen in Morocco.

So I --

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Sorry to interrupt. I think we will continue that debate on how to do it, because we'd like to give us a little bit of time. But thank you.

[Speaking simultaneously.]

You're very warmly invited to join your experience with us.

So I've -- maybe I have -- because you're sitting so far to the margin, if, Egypt, you want to add something quickly, you may do. Otherwise, we'll go to the coffee break. Sorry. Organization of Islamic States, you wanted to take --

ORGANIZATION OF ISLAMIC STATES: Thanks, Thomas. First I wanted to thank very much the Kingdom of Morocco for the invitation. We support this draft agenda which covers all the important topics. OIC also offers its support to Kingdom of Morocco for any supports in furthering this meeting. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much. Egypt, if you can make a point in 30 seconds.

EGYPT: In less than 30 seconds. Also to thank Morocco and to apologize for not participating more actively intersessionally due to the workload. We have comments on the concept paper and glad to know we extended the deadline for two weeks and, hopefully, will provide them in due time. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. Thank you. So we'll stop here. We note that we will give it another two weeks deadline to comment on the agenda. And then we somehow try and figure out a draft that we can release as soon as possible after this.

So now this is the coffee break. And I have the honor to inform you that we have a deputy Prime Minister here in the room who is here in Dublin. It is Mr. Honorable Siaosi Sovaleni from the Ministry of Meteorology, Energy, Information, Disaster Management, Environment, Climate Change and Communications of Tonga. Welcome to you, Deputy Prime Minister. Thank you.

[Applause]

It's a coffee break.

[Coffee break]

MEETING WITH ccNSO.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: All right. Coffee break is over. Please take your seats.

Okay. Thank you for taking your seats, and welcome to the next session which is agenda item 18 which is our traditional meeting with the ccNSO. So I would like to warmly welcome our colleagues from the ccNSO; in particular, of course, the chair, Byron, who is sitting next to me. And I would immediately start with giving the floor to Byron.

Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you very much, Thomas. It's a pleasure to be here, especially given the particular importance of ICANN 54.

We have what I think will be a relatively full agenda, and we are going to make one minor adjustment, and that is to take the third agenda item that you see and move it into second place. It should be a relatively short update. Our understanding is that there has been some discussion in the GAC on this already. And leave, therefore, as much time as the session allows for what you see as the current second agenda item.

So with that minor adjustment to the agenda, we'll get under way.

The first agenda item is an update on the progress implementation of the Framework of Interpretation Working Group's recommendations, as well as some other associated items. And for that, I will turn it over to Keith.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thank you. Keith Davidson for the transcript.

The Framework of Interpretation on issues relating to delegations and redelegations of ccTLDs was accepted by the ICANN Board at the last ICANN meeting and moved forwards toward implementation. And Becky Burr and myself were appointed by the ccNSO to assist to be points people for the IANA staff to assist with that implementation.

So -- And reporting on that implementation is under way, and the first milestone has been for IANA to archive the former documents, like ICP-1, News Memo 1, and the GAC Principles 2000 from their Web site, so that it should be referring purely to RFC 1591 and the GAC Principles 2005 as being the appropriate policies and guidelines to guide ccTLD delegations and redelegations.

We're quite pleased to see this completed quickly because some of the ccTLDs gave their approval for the IANA transition names proposal on the basis that the FOI would be implemented. And so we're pleased to see that progress, and we have posed two questions to ICANN today. One is to understand when the implementation of the FOI will be concluded, and the second is requesting them to formally acknowledge that they have archived these policies or these other documents that had been assumed to be policies but were not.

And that really concludes my report. Thank you, Byron.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Keith. Are there any other questions or comments? As you remember, we had an intense discussion about this a few meetings ago, so maybe you would want to ask questions or make comments.

If this is not the case, then let me ask Byron whether you have additional comments or questions on this to the GAC.

BYRON HOLLAND: Not on this topic, no.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. That would then mean that we move on to the second agenda item, which is now the issue of the --

BYRON HOLLAND: Country and territory names.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: And with that, we'll pass it over to Annebeth.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Thank you. Ann Annebeth Lange for the record.

And as you know, the Cross-Community Working Group is now in the process of discussing three-letter codes as TLDs in the future. So this is the second thing we are discussing. Started with two-letter codes. Now we are discussing three-letter codes, so we go on to full country and territory names when we have finished this discussion.

And this was discussed in the GAC Sunday after an excellent presentation occurring, so I don't go into the substance of it. You know it already.

I would just encourage you to answer the questions that are already out there. But I will use the opportunity to thank you and appreciate that the unclarity on where the border lines were between the GAC working group on geographical names and the Cross-Community Working Group on country and territories names as TLDs now have been sorted out. And we are happy in ccNSO to see that the GAC members are increasing their participation in the Cross-Community Working Group. And if country and territory names as TLDs should be allowed for the next round and how it should be used, this is really interesting for all of us, and we have to find a framework and principles that we can agree on.

So it's essential that the GAC engage and we have the views of the governments in this into the process, together with the views of the ccTLDs, to balance the huge interest. We know it's there from the GNSO stakeholder groups.

So I would just end and say please engage. And if there's anything you would like to ask me about, wherever, whenever, just come to me.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much.

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

I think we have had already a beginning of a discussion on this issue among GAC members during this meeting. And of course that will be one of the elements in -- as part of the review of the first round and also ideas about modalities, changes or not, for the second round. So I would like to invite GAC members to share their views with the ccNSO, because this is, of course, an issue of common interest.

Thank you very much. Iran and Norway.

IRAN: Thank you very much. I apologize if we have not been able to timely participate or follow-up the discussions.

Two -- One question and one comment. The question is objectives and reasons from going from the two-character to three-character. And once or -- if we move to that, what will happen to the two-character?

And the comment is that you know that in some other organizations, the three-character is widely used. One of them in particular, ITU. You have three-character many things. IRN in Iran, IRS in Indonesia, and many, many other things. And then the confusion that may raise with the three-characters for the people for some time. So we would like that all this be taken into account. But first I would request the reasons, objectives

and why this is and also the necessity of that? What is the shortcoming of the existing two characters? Is it that you want these characters to be released, be given for use on the second level or is something else? And what is the consequences of people have been used for years on this, and now what will happen at the time (indiscernible).

I'm sorry; I think this is very elementary question, perhaps. I apologize. But I would appreciate if you can reply. If you are not in a position to reply, do it by mail. Thank you.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Thank you, Iran, for the question. It's Annebeth Lange again.

The reason why we started this at all, this Cross-Community Working Group, is that it was an exemption in the first round, and the GAC asked for taking out the two-letter codes, the three-letter codes, and the country and territory names for being able to apply for in the first round because we knew it had to be complicated, it would be complicated.

So what we are doing now is to try to see what and if and how it could be used in the next round.

As for the two-letter codes, we have discussed that in the Cross-Community Working Group already. That is the less difficult part, because they are there. The CCs have their two-letter

codes. Those that are on the ISO3166 list already, they are there to be used by the CCs.

The rest of the two-letter codes, that was the discussion, actually, because there are a lot of other combinations of two-letter codes, but not that much since it is only two letters.

But the resulting discussion in the Cross-Community Working Group, both Gs and CCs were -- agree -- we agreed that the rest of the two-letter codes or the two-letter combinations, to be exact, should be left there for new countries if they were established. Yes. So so far we agree on that.

Of course this will be sent out in a final report when all of the elements have been discussed. But so far, at least the Cross-Community Working Group agree that this is the most sensible solution.

We are not in the business of deciding what is a new -- new country. So when it is a new country out there, they should be able to have their two-letter code. That's that discussion.

As for three-letter codes, that is the following -- If for Norway, then, for example, .NO, and then the rest of the ISO list is .NOR.

So so far they have not been able to use those in the gTLD process. But as you say, .COM is on that list. It's been there. But that was made before we had this combination or thought about

the countries at all. So it's been around for a long, long time. So it will always be there, of course. But that doesn't necessarily mean that the 300 other on that list should be used as commercial gTLDs. It doesn't mean that. That's up to us to decide what to do with them.

And those outside the ISO list, it's a lot of combinations -- three-letter combinations outside. A lot of them have already been registered. That has been allowed in this round as well. It's more than 70,000 combinations of three letters. So of course that will be more or less impossible.

But those that are on the ISO list, it's more or less that we are going to think what to do with.

And in the group, we don't have any view as leader of this group. But every country and every CC should think through what will be the consequences. Perhaps the answer is we open up everything, but what we see so far is that, on one hand, we get answers no restrictions, everybody can have everything. On the other hand we get answers that, no, leave it alone; it's a lot of other things you can use out there as gTLD.

So that's how the status is now.

I would like to talk to you if you have more questions.

IRAN:	But you have not answered my question. Does the existing two-letter remain without any change?
ANNEBETH LANGE:	Yes.
IRAN:	And then you have a three-letter in addition?
ANNEBETH LANGE:	We don't know that yet. We don't know yet. That is what we are discussing, what to do with the three letters. But the two-letter codes will stay as they are, and new countries will have their combination of two letters.
CHAIR SCHNEIDER:	Thank you.

Before giving the floor to the others, I just wanted to mention that that shows that it's important that more GAC members in the future participate in this working group. I think that's the first take-away.

And I just wanted to inform you that we've received these seven questions coming from that group about three-letter characters -- three-character codes, and we have started to discuss it. We

plan to give you a written answer in the coming weeks, not months but weeks, hopefully, if other issues allow us to do that as well. So just for information. The answers will come.

Next on the list, I have Norway and then Peru.

Thank you.

NORWAY: Yes, thank you, Chair. And thanks to Annebeth for providing this overview.

Just to say that we will continue to participate in this working group. Also, I want to encourage the other GAC members to participate.

As we expressed the view that we do not want to have the three-character codes to be used in either as ccTLDs also, but as we discussed two days ago, that's -- several GAC members have different views. So, therefore, I think it's important for those GAC members that have other views -- for example, that they want to use the three-character code for a ccTLD -- that they also participate and convey their rationale and views on why they want to use it, and so on.

So it's just a general, also, encouragement for us, as you also said, Thomas, to participate and convey the views.

And also, this is the opportunity also we have discussed in the past for the GAC to express views early in the processes. And that is important as well. And that we not come at the end when the process is finished.

Thanks.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Norway.

Peru.

PERU: I will speak in Spanish.

I really want to thank the committee that is studying this topic. It's a very sensitive topic, and thoroughly affects most of us. It has been discussed within the GAC, and I think it will continue being discussed.

We have also prepared a list of all countries that would be willing or not to give their authorization or not to the use of their relevant -- use of their relevant names or acronym. I thought that was enough, but apparently it is not.

Peru, for instance, reserves the right to use any two-character or three-character code or initial for the name of the country or for

ICANN | 54
Dublin

the name of any department, province, district that may be related to Peru.

I think that at the end of the day, when we may give you a thoughtful analysis to all this, you should also consider that this is not just the name of a country, but the name of a community. It's not just -- it's not just reserving the name of the country but protecting certain communities that have rights.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Peru.

I think what -- the list that we put together, for clarification, has been on the country and territory names, the full names, and we've expressed several advices, as you remember, on two-letter codes. But I can't recall that -- This three-letter discussion is actually, at least to my knowledge, something new, at least with a view for the second round.

Annebeth.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Just a little comment that we have to be really clear that we are discussing the first level. So we'll not confuse it with the discussion that you have with the second level. So two-letter

codes -- or two-letter characters used for the second level and three letter for the second level, that's another discussion.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yes. Thank you for clarifying this.

Next, I have Greece.

GREECE: Thank you, Thomas, and thank you Annebeth for your presentation. I would just like to raise your attention that there are actually other lists apart from the ISO3166 (indiscernible) codes list. It is the International Olympic Committee and the FIFA list that gives the very wide link. For example, Greece has GRC as a three-letter code in the ISO list. That is used in ITU, for example. But on the other occasions, like FIFA, like International Olympic Committee uses GRE, "Gre." And sometimes you can see that the ELL is also used for programming -- program purposes.

So I don't want to open this kind of discussion. I would like to say I would be very happy to contribute to the work of the working group. And I just want to say that for the different lists just for the record.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Just before giving you the floor, I would also like to inform you that we also briefly started to discuss, to make it even more complicated, the IDN issue, and then, of course, the issue of three character gets a completely different dimension. But I think we shouldn't go too much into detail because we need time also for the last agenda item.

Yes, of course. Thanks.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Just a short comment. What we are working with is the ISO3166, and that's our mandate and that's what was -- if you look at the Applicant Guidebook, what's considered as a country and territory name.

And I know it's a lot of lists out there, and lists are difficult. So we have to stick to the ISO3166.

Thanks.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Next on the list I have Thailand.

THAILAND: Thank you, Chair. Wanawit for the record.

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

So I think we have been also participate and try to answer several questions, but from the meeting yesterday, some of the point that we raised about in the Applicant Guidebook, that what GAC need to looking at. I urge the GAC to looking at the non-objections or the support from governments and some of the clause that mention about applicant may seek the GAC advice.

That will be the things that we working out on the GAC, constructively. Then how could we support the applicant to be sure that it will be -- not be a hundred or early warning and have to get into the GAC for seeking consensus, so that will delay the process. That was the first issue.

And the last issue that has been point out is that as these three character would go to G, gTLD, it's not the C, but with the C it's also led to delegation and redelegation process, which having something to do with the GAC.

So then with the same ccTLD they have two process involved. That's some other thing that the GAC should really sit down and start working with the sovereign in one entity. There's two process involved. That will be challenge for us to have a look that what should we have a policy on that issue.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Thailand, for adding to the complexity. But, of course, your points are very relevant. And we should actually take them into account.

India.

INDIA: Thank you, Chair. Rahul Gosain, for the record. The point is well taken that the two-character discussion was in the context of the second level and, whereas, the three-character discussion is in the context of the top level. However, I think there's still scope for applying some of the learnings, you know, which we have gained from out discussions about two characters when we're formulating our advice for three characters at the top level. And, specifically, we should keep in mind strings which are not easily capable of confusion with strings on the ISO3166 list. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, India. Other comments, questions? That does not seem to be the case. Maybe you want to have the final wrapup or --

ANNEBETH LANGE: Thank you for having the opportunity to talk to you about this, and I hope this week has raised the interest to engage in this, and we welcome everyone from you to the working group.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I think you will have 155 new participants in the working group.

With this, I would like to hand over again to Byron for the next agenda item.

Thank you, Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, and well done, Annebeth. That was a great recruiting effort.

The next topic is regarding implementation. We'll follow on with the related implementation process around the proposal of the CCWG. And then there will be a follow-on topic just around thoughts and views on whether there is -- may be any need for an intersessional meeting.

But, to begin with, we'd like to solicit the views and opinions of the people in the GAC around the implementation processes associated with the outcomes of the CWG and the CCWG.

There are a number of ways that we could look at it. But it is within the ICANN construct, essentially, once the proposal, the final proposal has been put forward, a project to be executed on within the -- within ICANN. And there are opportunities to do some of that work before the NTIA has actually certified the proposal. Given the tight timelines that I think that we're operating under or we would appear to be operating under, you know, if there are any thoughts for members of the GAC around what could be done in advance, how much could be done in advance, are there any issues that would be of particular concern to do before certification, we'd be interested in those views.

Also, the idea that there can be a separation of the bylaws from other implementation issues in that the bylaws can be worked on on a separate track from other implementation issues as long as they come together, presumably, in the end, but that, in fact, there can be a separation of bylaw related implementation issues in drafting versus operational and other issues in drafting. So it would be interested in views on that.

And then, third, I will put it out is also on roles and responsibilities. If ICANN, the organization, is tasked with the majority of implementation or tasked with implementation of the CCWG proposal and CWG proposals, where does that leave community input? Where does that leave the CCWG and CWG in

terms of their roles going forward? What sort of oversight should we have potentially? Is there an opportunity for them to form some kind of a steering committee to provide oversight and guidance to ICANN, the implementer, et cetera? And we would be interested in views from the GAC on that. Roles and responsibilities with regards to the implementation itself. So you have the three particular questions. But I'm also looking for any issues that the GAC would like to flag to the ccNSO.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Byron, for raising a number of very good questions. And I will ask GAC members to share their thoughts with you. I just wanted to signal to you that we spend a lot of time trying to catch up with the development of the actual proposal. And we haven't had any opportunity to formally exchange ideas about its implementation. But I'm sure that some GAC members may have had some reflections on this and, of course, invite them to share. And, actually, also it would be interesting for us to know from your side your ideas and reflections that you seem to have been doing already on the implementation. So it would be interesting to get answers from yourself and the questions that you pose. So the floor is open. Yes, Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. For me, that -- following the CCWG very closely, the question is not clear. In CCWG currently discussing three plans -- scenario 1, scenario 2, and scenario 3. One of them without any further public comment. And two other with public comment. One os standard public comment of 40 days. The other is expedited manner. If you take the extremist one is February, the report will be ready.

Are you asking between February 2016 and 30 September 2016 what we have to do in terms of the ccNSO only or in the overall, Chair. When you're talking about implementation, you're talking about implementation of entire CCWG proposals from community mechanism, from empowerment of the community, from many, many other things or only as ccNSO issue is concerned.

And the second issue you said that the task of CCWG and CWG, are you dealing that what these two groups should do? That is, I think, up to those two groups to decide. In ICG, for instance, we discussed this matter. What would be our task, task of ICG after we deliver our -- we said that we had a charter. And charter has given us a duty. Duty has been completed. We are in the hand of the community. If the community asks us to do something, we do something with a new charter or amended charter based on something. But we could not create a new job for us.

So I think, if I am not mistaken, the question what CCWG and CWG are doing after delivery of the proposals or after the implementation 30 of September, it's up to those two groups, but not up to the GAC nor up to those groups. But there's no problem that the GAC comment on the issue.

But the third point is that there is something in the report of CWG relating to the implementations issue of the IRP. And in that we said that this is a matter that ccNSO -- ccTLD is not subject to that panel. And it is left to ccNSO and GNSO to get together and provide a method how that appeal could be done. That is something that could be looked at. So I'm not very quite clear what the question is and the relevance of the questions. I would be very appreciated if you clarify the matter. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Thank you for your comments. I was looking for a broad perspective when it comes to the implementation issues. The thoughts from GAC members but also, of course, specifically, anything to do with the ccNSO in terms of implementation would be very helpful.

In terms of the role, potentially, of the CWG and CCWG going forward, in essence, they are creatures of the various SOs and ACs. And, thus, it's interesting to note your perspective that they would determine what to do going forward. I think the

supporting organizations and advisory committees themselves may have some thoughts on that. And that was what I was trying to solicit if the GAC as an AC had a particular view on the role of the CCWG and CWG going forward.

And their involvement would have been an extension of the charter, reconstituting a different group to help provide oversight, leaving ICANN to do implementation on their own to narrow down the question. It was really around getting thoughts from GAC members on how to move forward with oversight of the implementation.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Byron, for clarifying. Any more views or questions? Hi, yes. United Kingdom.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes. Thank you, Chair. And thank you for -- to ccNSO colleagues for joining us in this session. Thank you, Byron, for setting out some interesting questions on implementation, in particular, as I think it's very valuable. We tend to be a bit overwhelmed with the proposal at this time. But we should be mindful of the GAC's role and the ccNSO's role in the crucial period ahead after the final part of the jigsaw that CCWG proposals on accountability are finalized, which we hope very much will happen very shortly.

Your first question, as I noted down about separate track for bylaws, I think that's probably the very useful modality to implement.

We heard from the CEO that -- Fadi Chehade that ICANN staff is steaming ahead with work on that area and also more widely on preparing for implementation. That's valuable from the ICANN staff side. We hope there will be transparency and clarity as to how their work is proceeding.

And, sort of linking to your second question about the idea of steering committee, on the face of it that sounds a very valuable approach to take to ensure that all the key constituencies within the ICANN community, including the ccNSO and the GAC, have a kind of seat in the oversight of implementation to ensure that our particular concerns are taken into -- taken into account.

On the first take I think that's a good proposal. We will need to have a bit of a discussion in the GAC about that and the modalities that would best suit. So I guess we're going to have that discussion later during the course of this meeting.

On the specific elements of implementation, what immediately springs to mind for me in the U.K. is -- for the U.K. is that the sort of escalation process that has been -- is being worked out. And I've taken part in some of the CCWG subgroup discussions about that -- is very important.

This, you know, recall and community forum and the process and the threshold for taking decisions at the different steps of escalation and how the SOs and the ACs contribute to those decisions. But not only those decisions, but how we contribute to identifying solutions before having to take those decisions, before they become escalated and up to what some say amounts to a vote, you know, of -- if the modality is fixed in that way, that you need three SOs and one AC, you know, to endorse a step forward to implementing an empowerment mechanism or a different threshold depending on what particular empowerment mechanism we're talking about whether it's a budget issue or a membership of the board issue or removal of the entire board, the thresholds need careful thinking about. So these are the kind of issues I've been focusing on.

And, as I say, the -- what perhaps is less emphasized or less explored is how these various steps could actually avoid a major step being taken to overturn a board decision or remove people from the Board.

So, even at the precall stage, once an issue or complaint has been submitted for consideration by all the SOs and the ACs, by at least two, as I understand it, at the precall stage, can we actually find a way to get out of having to go further? Is there already a solution already available to avoid that? And then in a community forum, I think that's a very important part of the

phase for the SOs and ACs to fully understand the issue, fully explore what is available in terms of solutions to get a way out of it.

So this is the kind of element of implementation that certainly is catching my particular eye and how that is deployed so that ccNSO and the GAC can fully contribute on the issue as -- with record to that particular mandate of the GAC is the public interest and what is the standing, for example, in the community forum of a GAC input on public interest?

This is the kind of thing that I would flag at this opportunity to exchange with you. I broadly agree with the kind of approach you're contemplating subject to further discussion in the GAC, as I say. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you very much. I think those are actually very helpful comments. I know we have quite a number of CCWG members in the room right now. And we talk about detail about how we would actually be implementing this on the ground, those are very helpful comments.

In the interest of time, I think we might want to move to the final discussion point, which is around the potential need for an intersessional meeting.

And, again, there is an underlying assumption here that, hopefully, we'll entertain and that that is a proposal is successfully put to the community in the not too distant future.

However, if there are any changes within that proposal from what we've seen in proposal two of the current proposal on the table, does the GAC yet have any thoughts on whether any kind of face-to-face or intersessional-style meeting would be required to come to approval between here and Marrakech?

And, again, there's another underlying assumption there that waiting until Marrakech may not meet the timelines of delivering a successful outcome for September 2016. So I recognize that my question has two assumptions that underpin it. But my question is really around has the GAC had an opportunity to think about the idea of an intersessional and whether or not it would be required?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Before giving the floor to our members, maybe two points. I think so far we are trying, given the proposed timeline or proposed modified timeline, we're trying to clear as much as we can here. So we have tried not to yet think about an intersessional meeting also because this is a very difficult exercise for many of us who already are at the limits of traveling around the world three times a year for a week. And a fourth

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

meeting would, of course, be something that we, if possible, would try to avoid. I guess we haven't discussed this openly, but I think many would tend to share my view on this.

The question is -- and then I will give the floor to GAC members. It would also be interesting, as you may know, that, based on the discussions we had so far, the GAC actually, at least that's my recollection, seems to be quite positive about the development of the proposal in the latest discussion in the direction that this is seen to be reasonable and feasible. Of course, there's some details that will need to be watched once it's finalized. But there's a general feeling that many issues are developing, in particular, also this idea of the model with these escalation steps as something that was received rather positively.

Of course, there's one area of discomfort to many people in the GAC, which I guess everybody knows.

It may also be interesting for us to see where are you with this or do you think that you will be able to more or less say yes to this or what is the discussion in the ccNSO, like are there also elements of fundamental concern? So that would also be helpful for us, I guess.

I'll stop here. And just noting, I haven't spoken on behalf of the GAC with what I said. It was just an attempt to try to quickly

convey to you where we are. So don't quote me on every single word. I was just trying to be efficient and give you feedback. So the floor is open to everybody. Norway and then Iran.

NORWAY: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

Just a quick comment from our side. And we know that it has been discussed about the potential intersessional meeting. And I think the question is that is this a draft proposal from the CCWG mature enough for us to comment, have final comments during this meeting? So I think that is what would drive or not drive the requirement for intersessional meeting, how many changes or no changes will be made to the proposals so that we have an opportunity to have a sort of finished proposal to discuss and take sort of final decisions on. So, therefore, to us, there is a -- might need to be an intersessional meeting. But, of course, it depends on some developments on the maturity of the final proposal. Thanks.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Norway. Iran.

IRAN: Thank you. In the three draft timeline, all of them, they have one element -- submission of the final proposal of CCWG to chartering organizations. In fact, we have discussed that briefly in GAC whether we could do it online or by virtual meeting or by physical meeting. Even one and a half months before this GAC meeting it was on the mailing list. Some GAC colleagues say that, yes, we can do it on the mailing list or virtual meeting. Some others say that it may be difficult. So that was at least preliminarily discussed. But we have not yet decided. It depends on the situation. As far as I understand, the degree of changes is so much that may require the third public comment. And after that finalization and the finalization in order to GAC as a chartering organization provide its comments, perhaps maybe physical meeting may be more appropriate unless we have 100% sure that to the virtual meeting we could have that agreement. What would be the agreement, we don't know. Whether we say, yes, we agree with that and these are the conditions or we say that the no consensus on the agreement, that I don't know. But the situation is that it's very difficult, at least as far as I know, to have some agreement on the virtual meeting or on the mailing list. Face-to-face meeting may be required. Whether or not it is possible, that is something else. But I want to give this an opportunity.

You and United Kingdom referred to the previous part about the oversighting. Who is going to oversight? Are we going to create a, say, super board, CCWG oversighting or GAC oversighting or CCWG oversighting? The United Kingdom referred to the three SO and AC. Three SO is here. One AC is here, ALAC. Perhaps it totally excluded GAC for any decision or any action. I want to be very, very clear that is very sensitive. And then there's an issue that we raised. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Would you like to respond for clarification?

BYRON HOLLAND: Sure.   And, really, just on the first part and perhaps what I constituted as a steering committee. And, just to be clear, I raised it in the context of traditional management oversight. At the end of the day, whatever comes out of the proposal will become a project within ICANN the organization.   But the proposal itself came from the CCWG.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.   Would you very quickly want to respond for clarification?

BYRON HOLLAND: Sure, and really just on the part around what I constituted as a Steering Committee. And just to be clear, I raised it in the context of essentially traditional project management oversight.

At the end of the day, whatever comes out of the proposal will become a project within ICANN, the organization, but the proposal itself came from the CCWG.

So my question was around the interface of the content of the proposal as it -- as it morphs into a project to be executed by ICANN and just is -- what does the role of the communities look like in terms of any potential Steering Committee or oversight of the project to make sure that the essence of the proposal is getting translated into execution by ICANN, the organization. There's no superboards or anything like that. This was strictly meant from an operational project management perspective, does there continue to be a role for the CWG or CCWG or some evolution of those bodies which are a creature of the SOs and ACs.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

U.K. and then Niue.

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

KEITH DAVIDSON: Yes, thank you, Chair.

On that last point, that was my understanding, too, is kind of operational project management, ensuring that's inclusive and comprehensive in terms of participation, diversity, and so on. So nothing heavy. Not overweight; overheavy structure as such, but a project-based approach, as we would contemplate at national level with a national policy implementation. You then revert to how you manage that as a project. So it seems to make very obvious practicable sense to me, but subject to further discussion.

The reason I was going to speak again was about the prospect of an intersessional meeting. The GAC has done that in the past. We had one in Brussels on new gTLDs, and so it's not beyond our capacity to convene intersessionally. But I agree with Norway and Iran's points that it all depends on how things move forward from Dublin, and we don't know whether there will be a third proposal, and so on. So it's an open question.

I'm inclined to think that this is so critical that it would necessitate a physical meeting of the GAC. And if there were some coordination with the other chartering organizations, that would be probably very useful in efficiency terms, and so on, to -- or all the charterings organizations to meet intersessionally at

some point, whenever it might be. But it's an open question still.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, U.K. We do not have much time left, so Niue. Then I have Egypt.

NIUE: Thank you, Chair. I'll keep it short.

Redelegation issues will (indiscernible) be a matter exclusively for the ccNSO, not any IRP.

So I think we would welcome transparency and a dialogue in any redelegation issues.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Egypt.

EGYPT: Thank you, Thomas, and thank you, Byron, for the discussion.

Actually, I think for this what you referred to as Steering Committee, I think definitely those who are involved in the

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

proposal itself should be involved also in seeing that is this is implemented and being put in place.

So whether -- doesn't have to be that big of a group, but, again, it does have to include those who participated and all the relevant parties.

For an intersessional meeting, like my U.K. colleague mentioned, we've already done this before at the GAC. And I agree with my colleagues from U.K. and Iran also that it's not that clear now whether we need one or not.

But again, I would urge that this is not left till the very, very last moment, because for people who need logistics and visa and thing, to be as inclusive as possible, we have to have some deadline to decide on this. So just flagging this.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Do you want to make some comments from your side about the issue of an intersessional meeting? Is this discussed in the GNSO? And if so, how?

BYRON HOLLAND: In the ccNSO.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Sorry.

BYRON HOLLAND: Byron Holland, for the record.

Our constituency days are really today and tomorrow. We will be spending the better part of the next day and a half discussing these issues. So right now I would be remiss if I claim to have sort of an official sense of the ccNSO. However, certainly we are faced with many of the same challenges that were just raised by Egypt in terms of travel funding, visas, the logistics, et cetera. An intersessional meeting would be a material challenge, I think, in terms of the number of participants that would be available to engage in it. And of course, therefore, would always -- you know, we would not -- we would not want to be in a position where just strictly the numbers challenge potentially the legitimacy of the outcome.

Now, the request he itself almost is becoming potentially, from what I've seen and heard in the last few days, overtaken by events. We're seeing positive progress. We've already heard from GAC colleagues here -- GAC members, rather, that the sense is there may be an opportunity to see new proposals

sooner than later. In fact, even when this agenda was first drafted.

But to answer your question in short, an intersessional meeting would certainly be a challenge, although this is a topic that is extremely important to CCs as well. It seeks to the essence of our operations. So it's a something we will consider over the next day and a half, but it would be a significant challenge for us.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Maybe to conclude, I would like to ask you a question. What is the -- what are you intending to give as feedback as the ccNSO in Dublin in this meeting? Will you make a statement of the ccNSO at the end of this meeting that will feed into this or will you just leave it up to the individual members that participate in the CCWG?

And it would also be helpful, I think, for us to understand on how, on a very informal level, ccNSO members or what the temperature is, what would be areas of concerns or of disagreement.

I don't know if you are able to give us a little bit of a direction that we can see how this is discussed in the ccNSO.

Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Well, in the process over the next day and a half, most of the sessions are dedicated to these topics and a whole range of specific issues will be addressed.

During each of the various sessions, we will be soliciting the input of the room. And on a number of topics, we actually do take the temperature of the room. We hold up cards -- green, orange, red -- to give a sense of how is the community feeling about it. We will also be taking specific note of any outcomes. And all of our members know that when they were chosen and appointed by the community, it was to represent the views of the community, and we will certainly reiterate that requirement. And it's also to bring back the views of the CCWG into our community so we can hear it firsthand. Their role is a two-way role. But it will provide us the opportunity to give guidance to those members through the visual display of our cards as well as the note-taking during meetings.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: That's interesting. Thank you.

I think our time is up so we need to move on in our agenda, so I would like to end with thanking you very much for this very useful exchange.

BYRON HOLLAND: And on behalf of the ccNSO, thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: We have another agenda item before the lunch break which is on universal acceptance. We've received a paper from ICANN that we will be presented. So welcome members from ICANN staff. Maybe, Olof, it would be helpful for us, if you could quickly introduce what this is about and introduce also the gentleman on stage so that we know where they come from, if that's okay for you, Olof.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Yes, absolutely. Thank you. We appreciate the opportunity to update the GAC on the issue of universal acceptance, which we will explain in a moment.

My name is Christian Dawson, and to my right is Edmon Chung, and we are two of the vice chairs of the Universal Acceptance Steering Group, which is a community-driven action within the ICANN community.

Our chair, Ram Mohan, who is also on the Board of Directors of ICANN, he is the chair of the Universal Acceptance Steering

Group. He could not be here today so we are giving a short presentation to you on this subject on his behalf.

So if we can advance to the next slide we can tell you a little bit about the topic of universal acceptance.

Universal acceptance is the idea that all domain names should operate equally. Now, we're talking about the systems of the world. So not within the global root, but on Web forms and in email clients. This group, the Universal Acceptance Steering Group, is an initiative that is built to do outreach to the communities of the world to talk to them about updating their systems to comply with the modern state of the global root. We are talking about acceptance, validation, storage, processing, and display of all domain names, with regards -- including Internationalized Domain Names and email address internationalization.

This also focuses on long ASCII strings. The idea is no matter what the length of the TLD, it should be accepted by the systems of the world.

This includes recently added gTLDs, but internationalized strings, non-Latin strings are very key to our initiative, making sure that systems are updated so that they can accept domains that are in various languages other than Latin character languages.

We can move on to the next slide.

The Universal Acceptance Steering Group is a community initiative. It is supported by ICANN so it does receive ICANN budget funds. We as an organization have chosen to pull ourselves together into four workstreams. Those workstreams are the top line and technical issues workstream, an internationalization workstream that works on IDN issues; measurement and monitoring; and then community outreach where we're focused on how we get to the world to get them and convince them to update their systems.

We can move to the next slide.

So here are ways that we can -- that we would like to solicit your help and engagement on this issue.

We're looking for you to help identify ways of raising awareness outside of traditional ICANN communities; the need for universal acceptance.

We would like to ask you to raise awareness within your own governments through government CIOs or departmental and ministerial CIOs. And talk to them about updating the government systems to be inclusive of all modern TLDs.

And we would love it if within your countries and communities you could raise this issue with your local software communities

so that those software developers also take a look at the modern TLD system and make sure that their systems are compliant with universal acceptance.

The next slide details some resources that are available to you that we would like you to take a look at, if this is a topic of interest to you.

We need and want more participants, people in our communities who are interested in these issues. And we are looking for greater diversity, particularly geographic, language, and gender diversity.

Are there other things you would like to add?

EDMON CHUNG: Sure. Thank you, Christian. And I think this -- This is Edmon Chung here, and also vice chair from the UASG, as mentioned.

I just want to add a few things for emphasis. One of the things is that it's not just about the new gTLDs but also about the IDN ccTLDs that represents the country codes as well. And this is, I think, a very important element also of diversity and access, accessibility to the Internet. So universal -- universal acceptance is about the people being able to use their native language to navigate the Internet. And that's also very important, I think, related to the U.N. sustainable development goals. I think that's

one of the areas that, really, this community from GAC, we would like to work with you to think about how this is also part of the U.N. SDG in terms of accessibility and sustainable development in terms of diversity.

And through that, we hope to work with the GAC representatives here to meet the government CIOs or equivalents, and that's really the -- So this is not just a call for participation at this point. It's really a call for taking some action to actually make it work.

And finally, one particular point. We did an update to the ALAC yesterday as well, and understanding that there are different -- while we create all these materials, I guess, in the global level, when we go to the local level, we really need your help, and perhaps even having local coordinators or work teams, like especially for the cultural differences in the language, to actually connect with the local people in India or in China or in Russia that specifically have additional coordination work through the GAC representatives and ALAC, and perhaps the ccTLD as well. That will really make this effort effective.

So that's why we're here, and that's what I wanted to add.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Thank you for your time today.

EDMON CHUNG: Any question?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I think it would be good --

OLOF NORDLING: I had no time to introduce you. You managed it all by yourselves like big boys. So thanks for that.

But perhaps I could start out with one little observation while you're thinking about useful questions to put to these gentlemen, and that is, well, governments have a particular clout in this regard because they have government procurement of their own equipment and services. And that's proven a pretty useful tool to nudge introduction of IPv6 forward in various countries.

So I suppose that's a particularly interesting step that governments can take regarding this. Well, just a thought.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: That's a tremendously good point. And also, I do think that thinking about this in a similar vein to IPv6 is the right way to be thinking about this. So thank you for that point. We agree.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:	Thank you. I think there are some wishes for taking the floor, so I have Greece and then Sweden, and U.K.
GREECE:	Thank you. And thank you the members of the universal acceptance working group for the presentation. It's very important. For example, I have many occasions where Greek characters have no display or are transmitted well. So, yes, I think you do something very important.
	And I would like your presentations to be distributed to the GAC list so the GAC members interested find a way to have the links in order to contribute to your work and join the mailing list.
	Thanks.
CHRISTIAN DAWSON:	We will make sure this presentation gets sent to you but we have actually put together a briefing paper which we have sent along as well, which hopefully has already been distributed.
GREECE:	Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Yes, the briefing paper has already been distributed to the GAC list.

Sweden.

SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair, and thank you for the presentation. It seems that there is some sort of need for a P.R. campaign or at least some universal material that can be distributed.

We would certainly be interested in contributing to distributing such material.

I made a quick visit to the Web sites here. I didn't see anything that I would there have my procurement people go into. It would need to be something more informative, describing the problem and what needs to be done and when.

So that's just an idea to put out there.

Thank you.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Thank you very much. We are in the process of developing a number of documents at this time. This is a community-driven initiative that came up as an idea two meetings ago, and we had our first formal meetings in person during the last meeting.

So we're still in very early stages. We are currently working on internal drafts of a CIO guidebook which could prove to be very useful.

And we are slated to try to get that to public consumption levels by the beginning of next year. We'll keep you aware of our stages in that.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes. Thank you, Chair. Just a big thank you to the guys for this presentation. Really, really interesting stuff. In the U.K. we have sort of a couple of different departments who would kind of look into this issue and deal with it. So I'll take this away, and I'll sort of speak to some people. We'll sort of share an exchange, contact details and then, yeah, look how we can sort of develop some feedback from the U.K. But thank you very much for the presentation.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: That would be great.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Egypt.

EGYPT: Also to add my thanks to you for the presentation and for sparing the time and effort for this important topic, which I believe is one pillar that would push the IDNs forward.

And also to congratulate you on the nice logo that identifies the scope of your work. I expected to see it here, but it's not. But it's very interesting and creative. So thank you again and looking forward to your progress and further developments. Thank you.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Thank you so much. I would like to give credit where credit is due. Edmon here is the designer of that logo. We will make sure when we come back to give you subsequent briefings that we showcase it appropriately. We do have somewhere around here -- and we'll try to get someone to bring them back -- some stickers that we can spread around and give to you with the logo on it.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. We have Thailand and then the EBU.

THAILAND: Hi. Pitinan, for the record. Also, I join our colleagues to thank you for our work. And, actually, it's quite important for a

country that is not using English and we do have some activities before this meeting with an internationalized email address. Also, we are just -- in Thailand we just formed a LGR, the label generations root. I'm not sure can you explain more how is it fitting with the UASG. And maybe you can start drawing other countries to do the LGR as well.

EDMON CHUNG: Edmon here. So there are two different projects. However, of course, there is some relation to it. The key relation is, of course, in terms of the IDIDNs, Internationalized Domain Names which also bleed into the internationalized email addresses. The LGR work is much more currently focused on the root and how we enter the top-level domains in the different languages in the root but that have downstream -- then have downstream effect on what the UASG would be doing.

I think that's a good -- however, what you brought up I think is a very good suggestion in terms of when we outreach for the efforts on the LGR or when we outreach for the efforts on the UASG or universal acceptance, we should bring each other the message of each other along. And I think we should take that note and make sure that we include it in the future. Thank you.

ICANN | 54
Dublin

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. EBU.

EBU: Yeah. I appreciate the effort that you are doing. But I think you probably need to talk to the other part of the constituencies within ICANN. Because the message that is given through the blockade to all community applications is very negative. Most of the community applications are largely represented worldwide covering all the countries of the world. And the message that there is only the interests of economic money and power that prevail on the rest of the world is very contradictory to the rest. So, if you can pass the message through, I think this will be the more efficient communication you can make.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: We believe that we need to communicate the importance of this not just to other communities within ICANN; but, really, it is a global effort. And most of our efforts probably need to go to the businesses of the world, the nonprofits of the world, software developers. We need to reach just about everybody. It's a pretty massive scope.

EDMON CHUNG: Edmon here. Just to add to that, yes, we are also reaching out to other constituencies. Of course, I mentioned some others. But

one of the things that I think Olof mentioned as well earlier is that this is also -- you know, the countries and the governments are a very good conduit to reach the local community, which is very important.

And I mentioned one point. And I see Avri here, which brought us the -- to the attention of the sustainable development goals from the U.N. And I think this has actually direct implications on it. I don't know whether Avri can have time to add to that. But -- and that's also a reason why we want to bring it to the attention of this community. But, of course, other consistencies are especially important as well.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: India.

INDIA: Thank you, Chair. The Universal Acceptance Steering Group is doing important work. And thank you for the presentation. The issue of email interoperability with IDNs, for example, is something that we are grappling with right now. As you may be aware, we have rolled out our IDN ccTLD in eight Indian languages or more. And domains under these IDN ccTLDs are usable only if the internationalized email addresses are available or rolled out as well and supported by everyone.

However, there's definitely quite a bit of work that needs to be done on this. And we support the work of the steering groups. Thank you.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Thank you very much. One of the issues that we have to deal with is, when you're talking about systems like sending an email -- sending an email touches -- getting it from one place to the other place, it may touch dozens if not hundreds of different systems. And any step along the way can cause a problem. That's why this outreach effort is so important. Because the need is so expansive to make sure that we eventually reach that end goal where it's not so difficult for you to achieve the goals that you're trying to achieve.

EDMON CHUNG: Just adding to that -- in fact, I'm thinking aloud a little bit here. While we outreach and get your participation in taking action, I understand that a number of you, including in India and probably in China and Russia, you are already doing some work in this area. And perhaps it is to us to reach out and create those coordination works so that our message and their message could be leveraged and echo each other to be more efficient into the future as well.

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Any more requests for the floor? If that is not the case, then I think I'd like to thank you very much for this interesting presentation and the very useful exchange which, I guess, will be continued. And yes, thank you very much.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: We appreciate the time.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: We have some small administrative announcements before the lunch break.

TOM DALE: Thank you, Thomas. Just two things. A reminder to members of the GAC, if you have not already done so, please drop your business card, printed or handwritten, into the plastic bowl at the door in order to be eligible for a door prize. If you have already done so, please do not put in another card in the hope of increasing your chances. We are awake to such trickery.

[Laughter]

And, secondly, I did circulate yesterday two versions of a draft communique. And a number of people have provided feedback, which is very helpful. Before I revise it and circulate another

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

version later today, if there are any further comments that people have on the first version that you feel so affronted by the text that you will stop the meeting to argue the point, then please let me know sometime this afternoon before I send out a revised version.

Thank you very much, Thomas.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Tom. And also thank you for this really good work with the communique preparation. I think that is very useful and helps us having lighter Wednesday afternoons.

I see the U.K. would like to take the floor. Thank you.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thanks. Just by way of announcement to colleagues from commonwealth member states that we are now meeting here at 12:30 until 1:15 to allow some lunch. And also we're kind of jointly meeting as well with the African Union Commission members, because there's an obvious overlap. So that's happening here for the next 45 minutes. So please, colleagues and Secretary General of the Commonwealth Telecommunications Organization, Shirley Taylor is going to chair for the CTO, commonwealth group meeting. Thanks.

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Mark, for this announcement. United States.

UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. Not to take too much time. And thank you, Tom, for circulating the draft. With apologies we have not had a chance to look at it. But I did want to assure you that the EU and the United States are collaborating on text that would refer to the safeguards issue. You should be getting that later today. Thank you.

TOM DALE: I had no doubts at all about the diligence of both of those delegations, Suzanne. But thank you for reassuring me. I take it for granted that that work is being done as promised always. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. Thanks to all of you. Enjoy your lunch break. Thank you. See you at 2:00.

[Lunch break]