
MARRAKECH – GAC Thursday Sessions
Thursday, March 10, 2016 - 09:00 to 12:30 WET
ICANN55 | Marrakech, Morocco

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Good morning everybody. For those who are here, thank you for showing up. We're a slightly smaller group than some days before. So thank you all for not having left already or staying in bed but actually for continuing to work. Because we have maybe some less what some people may call sexy issues but, nevertheless, some very important issues to -- of work to finalize. Thank you.

So what we do have on the agenda now is operating principles and our process of reviewing those. We have our vice chair Henri from Namibia who is taking care of this. And I'll give the floor to him immediately. Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN: Thank you, Thomas. Thank you for the opportunity. Good morning, colleagues. I don't know why Thomas is talking so -- in such a low voice this morning after the -- it's probably after the long negotiations that went down the past two days. It's a very slow start in the morning. Really low voice starting "good morning."

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

But we have the operating principles to get your marching orders today in terms of us reviewing the operating principles.

We have received -- I just wanted to refer to a last mail that we have received after a long intersessional process and two face-to-face meetings also where we were presenting operating principles, our terms of reference for review.

And the last mail was the 7th of February where we have updated the same and taken into account the comments that we have received intersessionally. In terms of the committee, we have met intersessionally in terms of our consultation as agreed.

So the background to it, in short, is that we agreed in 2014 to review the operating principles.

Just a quick background, 2015, all of 2015, we were getting ourselves in order in terms of establishing the working group that's chaired by myself. We then agreed -- there was some intersessionally -- or intersessional change. We agreed to the amendment of the vice chairs from three to five. And then we debated intersessionally as well as face-to-face in terms of the reference in terms of the operating principles committee.

In terms of the committee structure at this stage, we are proposing also just -- or we are also proposing that we probably

-- we need a vice chair, perhaps, to assist, because this is very important. And India gracefully offered to be the vice chair for the committee. So for the -- just for the members to take note and perhaps comment on that as we proceed.

Then, in terms of today's session, we have three main objectives. One is to agree and endorse the terms of reference being the first and most critical objective. Then we agree on a review approach. So terms, first. Second slide.

Terms first. The approach. And then we need to prioritize.

We can recall that, at previous meetings -- or the original draft terms of reference had specific areas of specific principles to be reviewed. And, through our consultations intersessionally, we, of course, we agreed to either take that out and make it generic, start -- make the terms of reference open-ended so that the GAC can give us guidelines in terms of what is the priorities. So, hence, the third objective to prioritize which principles are a review priority. We know that they are principles that is of a routine state of nature. And those ones we will look at the approach, and we have a suggestion regarding that.

The next slide, please.

So we have circulated the terms of reference. We have discussed it intersessionally. We have updated the terms of reference by

taking out those specific principles that was originally identified so that it can be open-ended. I now hope that we had enough time to look at that. And I, basically, submit it for your endorsement now so that the committee can start with its substantive work.

Short and sweet.

We have a pass mark and a fail mark. So we have given a lot of pass marks in terms of the CCWG proposal. So, hopefully, that will be carried over to this one. We have this, too, green and red. Is there any comments, any objections to adopting or to give us approval for the terms of reference so that we can -- our comments would be substantive work?

Thank you very much.

The terms of reference then, with your endorsement then -- we thank you very much for your cooperation and for your assistance and support.

The approach would then be -- next slide, please. We have -- as I've said, we have -- no, no, no. The previous slide.

We have an approach. We have suggested three ways of going about the review process. The one being that we review the articles one by one at the time and look at them the full GAC. And then we have 60 days to comment. And then we accept the

changes. Then GAC meeting to accept the changes. And then the operating principles is updated as each change is accepted. This approach was the scary one that we submitted, I think, in Dublin even.

We attached a preliminary time frame to that. And colleagues can recall it was somewhere around 2019.

And we failed it. But to -- we are stretching it too far. So that's when we go article by article at the time. And, in terms of the time frames and the principles requirements to have it adopted, it may take up to 2019.

Approach 2 it's, as per approach 1, plus a concurrent administrative review by ACIG. And this is the one where I said that you have principles that is not in contention, like maybe principle 3 or 2, where there's just -- we just need to add to take - to add electronic communications, for instance. Because remember previously we had the issue of fax communications with the GAC and electronic communications. So there are basic routine administrative sections or principles that probably need to be -- just to be added a one word or so to make it administratively expedient. So that's approach 2. We go -- we deal with the articles one by one, but then we have a concurrent administrative review by ACIG. It's, basically, to review the administrative principles, those ones that is not contentious.

And then the working group then focus on the -- on the contentious ones, the ones that you will now give us to prioritize. That is approach 2.

And then approach 3 is the one where we defer the review all together and wait for the outcome of the IANA transition. I think we did this one a lot -- a little bit pessimistically because we were -- we were not 100% sure whether this great body and the GAC will endorse the accountability proposal. I think at the time there was a lot of pro and con views on that. So we said okay. Then maybe we add this as an option.

But, in any case, we are of the view that now that we are -- we have endorsed and we have provided our support and all the other charter organizations have done that, it is possibly -- it will now take flight that process. And, when we start with ours, ours will, of course, not be done from now to June, to Helsinki, perhaps -- I'm not sure where it will be. But we're sure that our review will exceed the final transition. We will be in the process of reviewing our principles. And then we will then have the new setup. While we are busy, we can then adjust our principles to take into account the new roles and the new proposals that will come from the finalization or the final setup after the transition has been completed.

We -- I submit the three approaches. Maybe Michelle can add or amplify, if she wishes to. Thank you.

MICHELLE SCOTT-TUCKER: Thank you, Henri. Approach 1 is almost a strawman/woman approach. You've looked at it in Dublin, and you didn't like it.

Approach 2 is a hybrid approach. We're hoping that, if you go with that today, you will as a next step decide which are the principles that you record the highest priority to be reviewed. And then we'll review -- the working group will review those. And, concurrently, ACIG will work through a review of which principles are really just administrative changes, bringing them up to speed with current practice or, as Henri said, taking out words like "facsimile" and fixing up some of the typos in there.

And approach 3 is another alternative approach to just leave it until the transition is finalized. But, as Henri said, by the time we finish this operating principles review, the IANA transition will be a long way down the track. And we can tweak the principles as necessary to take into account any implications of the transition for our GAC operating principles, which I think will mainly affect the preamble, which sort of sets the scene for the context in which the GAC operates. And we would do that last anyway.

So back to you, Henri. Thanks.

HENRI KASSEN: Thank you, Michelle. So that is the three approaches. Maybe let's open it up for comments and views on them. And perhaps a preference. So that we can -- it's -- I think one of the areas where the direction setting views of the GAC will now come out. We, of course, will still develop then a detailed action plan. Once we have the approach, a direction on the approach, then we will have -- we will develop a detailed action plan in terms of which we will then proceed. So the floor is open. Thank you very much. Thank you. New Zealand.

NEW ZEALAND: Thank you, Chair. Firstly, we very much appreciate the work that's been going on intersessionally to get this working group up and running. We've been keen to look at the operating principles, but have also been a bit intimidated with all that involves. New Zealand would support approach 2. We think this would both allow us to look at all of the operating principles that we need to while focusing on the ones that require protecting a working group involvement. We've also spoken a bit this week about how important working methods are to us. So I would also note that that's something we would recommend as the first thing for the working group to perhaps look at. Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN: Egypt. Thank you.

EGYPT: Thank you. And, yes, I add my thanks to all the work that has been done intersessionally and concur with what New Zealand had said regarding approach 2.

So I think maybe we can go through the articles and categorize them. I mean, which articles ACIG would take care of as a routine or administrative task, which articles that we need to look at and discuss, and maybe mark a few that may need a second iteration when the IANA transition takes place. Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN: Thank you, Egypt. The next slide will, basically, ask which principles do we need to prioritize. But thank you very much. It is important. Michelle.

MICHELLE SCOTT-TUCKER: Thanks, Manal. I think what we would do, if the GAC agrees to go with approach 2, is that, as a first step, the working group would ask ACIG to produce a report of exactly what you say. Here's the principles that we think ACIG can look after administratively.

Here are the principles identified by the GAC as priority issues. And here are some principles that might need to be put aside until the IANA transition is done. And that would be one of the first acts of the working group to ask ACIG to do that. We'll do that intersessionally, get that back to the working group as soon as we can. And then the working group can decide its work plan on the basis of that assessment that's been provided by ACIG. We'd be happy to do that.

HENRI KASSEN:

Thank you, Michelle. Yes, the -- it is important that we -- that we get a report to chart the way forward. The idea now is just to get principle okay from GAC to say approach 2. Then our work is then cut out for us, then, I suppose.

European Union.

EUROPEAN UNION:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Actually, I have a question. If we could go back to the previous slides where we have the different approaches.

So I understood that approach 1 didn't gain traction in Dublin. But then we are now going to support approach 2, which is, basically, approach 1 plus the administrative review.

So I'm not sure I fully understand why we would then go for that. I mean, I have -- I agree that it would be useful and good to proceed and correct any factual or typographical errors that we have in the operating principles. No problem with that.

But I'm a bit unsure about why we would go for approach 2. And also considering latest developments and the need for the GAC to clearly agree and then define its role within the new ICANN setup after the IANA transition. I think that approach 3 is very logical in a way.

So I guess that, after the IANA transition, we can have an overall idea of what needs to be changed in the operating principles.

And, as a final remark, I also think that, even if we go article by article and we report back to the full GAC, I think it would then be important to wait and see the full review before we have the agreement on the new operating principles. I think that would be also important to see how the different articles work together. Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN: Thank you, European Union. I have Switzerland and then India.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Pakistan.

HENRI KASSEN: Pakistan. My apologies. Switzerland, please.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you very much, and good morning. I was actually going to put a similar question as the European Commission. I especially have some doubts on approach 2 as it is approach 1 plus the administrative review. And this means that we would take approach 1 with this idea of reviewing two articles between each GAC meeting. And this takes us back to the problems with the calendar year you mentioned at the beginning. And I think that that wouldn't be very efficient nor useful for having the operating principles reviewed in an adequate time frame.

So I'm not sure whether my ideas or my intuitions would fit with any of the three approaches. But I think -- and I -- I feel this point was made before the Dublin meeting by us -- is that we should first ask the working group on an open-ended fashion with some deadline what are the principles or what are the sections in the principles you think need a review? And on the basis of the feedback by the working group members we could start to prioritize what -- where there is traction so to say what sections are problematic.

Then we could see what of those sections are more administrative or what are more political and prioritize that. That would be on the basis of the operating principles as they stand today and according to the functions we have today.

And a separate track would be to define what are the requirements put to the GAC by the transition, and especially the accountability part of the transition. And according to those requirements, what kind of needs we would have on an operating level for the GAC. And based on that, we could start to develop ideas and agreed understandings on how we could respond to such requirements.

So I'm sorry that these reflections don't fit neatly into any of the three approaches, but it's more a functionally approach on one side on what is the operating principles today and the functions of the GAC today, what are the problems based on the feedback of the working group members how to prioritize, divide them into political and administrative issues, and, on the other side, identify requirements stemming from the transition. And there it would be perhaps a longer process than to agree on what are the needs for adoption on our side.

Thank you, and excuse this long intervention.

HENRI KASSEN: Thank you, Switzerland.

We have Pakistan, Egypt, and the U.S.

PAKISTAN: Thank you very much. You are proposing three approaches. Approach 1 and approach 2, but approach 2 contains also the approach one.

After the remarks by Manal, from Egypt, we may select approach 2, but we also include the one step more, that these -- first of all we prioritize that these are -- these articles need to be updated, or need to be reviewed. Then we -- when we select that these are the articles which we need reviewed, then we made another check that whether these reviews need to be updated before the IANA transition or after the IANA transition.

So we -- maybe it's -- maybe I'm wrong. We need another approach with the combination of three, because the third one is also -- one step is very important, because those are (indiscernible) which are affected by the IANA transition, we may remain unchanged.

Another thing, it is possible that there may be addition of another articles. So we also considered this factor as well.

Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN: Thank you, Pakistan.
Egypt.

EGYPT: Thank you, Chair. And I have the feeling that we're already saying the same thing and that it's not described in any of the three approaches on the screen, but it's what you have described, Michelle. I mean, they are not mutually exclusive approaches. I think the approach you described already grasps all the comments that have been made, but it's not on the screen.
Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN: Thank you, Egypt.
U.S.

UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. And thank you to colleagues who have spoken before, particularly Manal from Egypt because she captured exactly what I have was going to suggest.

I don't see that there's any huge inconsistency. We're obviously refining the possible approaches, and certainly I feel confident that Michelle can capture the essence of what we've agreed to do. But I do think it's imperative that we start now here; that we don't defer any longer.

Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN: Thank you, Suzanne.

We have Singapore.

SINGAPORE: Thank you, Chair. Yes, basically we agree on the approach 2. As has been adequately explained by Egypt, I think basically use approach 2, but the way we go about to discuss another approach 2, we can take up the suggestion from Egypt. We also feel the three approaches, they are not mutually exclusive, and then it is important that we focus on which approach we want to sort of go ahead in a review.

Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN: Thank you very much. That's the first round of questions.

Spain, Gema.

SPAIN:

Thank you, and good morning to everyone.

I would like to support comments made by Switzerland. Maybe its implicit in all of the approaches we have been presented with, but I think it's only logical to agree on the areas that we want to review, and then we will decide which articles refer to those areas, and consequently should be reviewed. Whether this approach with 1, 2, or 3, looks like an ancillary issue, but the main text we have to undertake before sitting to actually review the text is identify the issues that need to be reviewed.

Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN:

Thank you, Spain.

New Zealand.

NEW ZEALAND:

Thank you. I think, yes, we're all coalescing around the same approach now, but I just want to change my original statement that we should start with working methods. I think there's something quite clear coming out here that the first thing to

report back to the GAC is a list of which articles go in which section and to get approval on how we proceed on that.

Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN: And then we -- we -- possibly some of the questions that is lingering may be answered through the responses.

Mr. Chair.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Henri.

I would tend to agree with those who say that what we are discuss something actually none of these approaches. If approach 1 is contained in approach 2, I don't think it's realistic on a timeline basis but also on a process basis that we can go through article one by one and agree on one by one. It's what the European Commission said. Probably people will want to see the whole thing in the end, see that the logic is coherent, and not prejudice the logic that may lead you somewhere where you don't want to go, if you agree to article one, two, three, and not knowing what article 53 and 27 will be looking like. So I think we should take that into account.

So I doubt whether approach 1 and the part in approach 2 that refers to approach 1 is actually going to work apart from the fact that it may take us 500 years if we take two articles to review between each GAC meeting.

So I would rather go with something that is maybe closer to what Switzerland and Spain and others have said.

I think we have three elements. One -- The first two elements, I think you could identify them if you make it, let's call it a first reading of all the paragraphs, one after one, but a reading and identify -- start putting brackets in. Like where do people want -- where would anybody like to change something. And they same time, when you go through them, you identify which of them are purely administrative, we have no issues on substance, but this, we need to change this because we want to introduce electronic voting, or these elements that everybody agrees but it's purely administrative. Then you could single out these and give them to ACIG.

And with the other ones, you would see where do you have no brackets, that means nobody wants to change it so they probably will remain, where you have brackets. And then when you start discussing them, you see this may be very controversial, this is probably less controversial, so you get an understanding and you do that more or less quickly, get an

understanding of the whole text and see which ones will be the hot items. It's like we do on any drafting negotiation.

And then the other thing is, what you could do in parallel or later, you could actually see how the implementation of the accountability innovations start and have a second or third thread where you would look, see, okay, what are the mechanisms that we need to develop? How are we going to participate in this? Maybe identify the steps in accordance to this new empowered mechanism.

Then you try to think about are the current -- maybe you need to have gone through at least a first reading of all the operating principles. Maybe there are some things that you can just use the operating principles for some elements of the community empowerment mechanism. Maybe you need additional elements, and you identify what these additional elements will be used for, and then you start framing this.

So this is at least how I understand that you may think of framing the whole thing.

But taking one article, try agree on this, or two, and then taking the next two and trying to agree on this, I don't think that will work.

Thank you very much.

HENRI KASSEN: Thank you, Thomas. We back at further comment. It's getting too many now, but my hope is that it will basically -- some of the comments that we are making will basically answer some of the other comments. So then we shorten the list of comments.

The U.S., and then Sweden.

Sweden?

Denmark. Sorry. Thank you.

UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. And this is a very useful conversation, but I think with all due respect to our Chair, if we followed the approach that you are all proposing, then we're talking 2019. So again, I thought we had started the meeting with a very practical approach. And quite candidly, if you all look at the document itself, it's not that long. There are certain articles -- for example, article 10, conduct of business. There is absolutely nothing in there about working groups, working methods for the GAC in engaging with cross-community working groups. And then the third would be under the new structure going forward, the community empowerment mechanism, how does the GAC interact.

So there are several portions that could be tackled right now because, quite candidly, we have working groups. We have participated in cross-community working groups. There is nothing in our operating principles that appropriately talks about working methods.

One of our current vice chairs did lead an effort several years ago on GAC working methods. So we have a foundation to build on.

There is another section, I can't recall the article, about meetings, publicity of meetings. It strikes me that just yesterday we decided that all meetings would be open. This is a relatively easy article to amend. Publicity of meetings should be open. It's a very straightforward amendment.

So I actually do think -- I strongly, strongly support what Michelle has proposed. We do a quick review. You give this working group a timeline to propose those articles that need to be addressed immediately. We can identify those that can be deferred.

But the document in toto is not impossible to keep track of. It is not that long. It is also not a treaty negotiation. It's operating principles for the GAC. And I think we do need guidance for some of our current work.

So we are working at moment in a variety of ways with no guidance in the operating principles. So I do think we should tackle some -- this is just very practical. And then we can identify those sections that can be deferred, because we don't need to tackle them at the moment.

So that's a very strong suggestion for some kind of practical amalgamation of all of these ideas but we have to actually get started.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. I think you are saying exactly what I, at least, was trying to say. I called it first reading, you called it quick reading, but the rest is the same. Just to clarify this.

Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN:

That's what I was talking about, that we agree already that our comments has been (indiscernible). Thank you very much, Suzanne.

We have Denmark, Egypt and Sweden -- and Switzerland.

Denmark.

DENMARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

A couple of days ago we agree or express our willingness to participate in the new empowered community structure. And as far as I can see on the timetable, it will be up and running within six months' time.

So my question will be the procedures, how we are going to be involved and our working methods there. How do that fit into -- to this work? I'm a little unsure when we are going to discuss how we participate. So that is only a question.

Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN: Thank you, Denmark.

Egypt.

EGYPT: Thank you, Chair, and, again, we are all saying the same thing. I think we have two approaches, basically. Either we go sequential, one by one, or we go parallel. And I think we have already excluded the sequential approach, so we now are opting for the parallel approach.

Then on substance, again, I can see four categories of articles, either things that is going to remain as-is or things that the ACIG is going to take care of or things, articles that the GAC needs to review, or even articles that may need to be added based on what's going on.

And at the end, everything should be reviewed in view of or in light of what's going to happen with the IANA transition.

So thank you.

>>HENRI KASSEN: Thank you. It's also becoming clear to me. Thank you. Amongst the maze of comments so far.

Switzerland.

>>SWITZERLAND: Thank you, and sorry for coming back.

I think that Manal made an excellent job in laying out how we could proceed. I just would add that a quick consultation to the working group members would help in identifying where they think that the different elements are. And on the fourth element of the new things we need and the new environment, perhaps some briefing material from ACIG would be very welcome so that we are sure what are the requirements, because we also have all

those working groups coming from the CWG Stewardship, the Customer Standing Committee, the review committee, so many committees. And perhaps we, as also Suzanne said before, we need some kind of basis in the operating principles for that, and some first framing of that in a brief where this is laid out in a descriptive manner would certainly help.

Thank you.

>>HENRI KASSEN: Thank you very much. The -- The round of comments seem to be exhausted. Let's endeavor to address the issues.

-- I think on the technical arrangement, I think Michelle looks very concerned now. She will probably not know where to start. But let's go -- let's go through the issues that you can remember technical, and then I have made some notes. I will then jump in.

Thank you.

>>MICHELLE SCOTT-TUCKER: I think we're all in furious agreement. And we need to remember that slides don't replace briefings. And so the slides probably aren't as accurate as the briefing paper is.

Approach 2 was never going to replicate approach 1, and I shouldn't have let the slide say that.

What we're going to do is work through the priority parts of the operating principles. But given our discussion today, here's what I think the next steps will be, and you can tell me if I've captured this appropriately. That today, I'd like a brief -- before the end of this session, a brief sense what have you think the priority areas of the existing operating principles would be, which do you think would be the controversial or the important things that need change so I get a sense of where your priorities are, just with the existing ones, given we know things will change with the IANA transition, but a brief sense of where you're at. And then I'll take that information, and ACIG will produce this, what we are calling an administrative view, and that's where we'll provide the working group with an overview of the operating principles pretty much in the framework that Manal suggested, I think, that we say here's the operating principles -- here are all the operating principles. Here are the ones that don't need to change. Here are the simple admin fixes that need to be completed. Here are the ones that do need review, particularly given your statements today. And in light of the IANA -- Here's some that need to be added about working groups and working methods and other things that have come up over the last few meetings. And then in light of the IANA transition, as that becomes clearer, we will be able to tweak things and possibly add things in as we go.

The operating principles are a living document. It's not just change them once and then we're done. If something comes up in the IANA transition further down the track, we can make an additional change then as well. So it doesn't have to be just once, done, carved in stone forever.

So as the IANA transition progresses and changes things, we'll take those into account in this review, overall review of the operating principles that we're doing.

So I think as a first step, we will get your views today. ACIG will then go away and produce it, this administrative review. Take it back the working group, and the review will include a plan of here's our proposed next steps, and the working group can decide then what to do taking that forward. But we will get things moving as quickly as we can.

>>HENRI KASSEN: Thank you, Michelle. Yes, I agree. I think I've noted in a the -- it is not one of the three approaches. It is a hybrid approach.

The details thereof I think will become clear when -- more clearer when we get the summary and we get a discussion within the working group, as Switzerland suggested. And then the ACIG, of course they need to -- they have just given us our marching orders for the terms of reference being approved. So

what happen from here on will basically be a constant report back to the GAC in terms of where do we stand, what do we need to do, what is required. And of course I think the comments generally for me, when I listen to them, is excellent guidelines and guides in terms of what should be in our action plan.

It's very valuable, most valuable suggestions, which we really think should -- will be in our action plan.

The committee, I think, at this point needs your guidance in terms of the direction for -- in terms of a sense, as Michelle said, a sense of what are the issues of importance, what do we need to look at first. But we will, of course, have to put it in an action plan so that we can -- we can work into -- on the most important issues.

So New Zealand has indicated that we will start with -- it's good to prioritize. And then, of course, Egypt supported that we should have several parallel approach, one and two and even three so that we can include the elements of one and two mainly, but issues of three that's important.

The clarification between one and two, I think as Michelle has indicated, it's -- it should be clearer in terms of how it will work. But it will also be an issue for the working group to clarify and to ensure that there is no undue delay in continuing to review in our review process. And, of course, it is then agreed that it's a

good approach, that, as Egypt highlighted, the parallel approach prioritized. And then, eventually, at the end we will have to look at it again since it is a living document that is subject to review in terms of the principles as it stands.

Then Pakistan also give us a time -- sort of a process based on approach 2 so that we can prioritize. And then we go further in terms of the review. And then we can combine elements of approach 3.

Of course, I agree 100% with the sentiment expressed by the U.S. that we need to start now.

I was hoping that the past three meetings, two meetings I was hoping that we would get approval for the terms of reference. Now it's approved. And in a pragmatic approach, that's the starting point. You have given us that mandate, so we need to start now and with your guidance to get through.

Spain gave us a guideline or some suggestion that we should identify the areas. Then we look at the principles, go through them. That is part of the general suggestion that we get a direction from GAC, a sense of what we need to change and what is the priorities.

And then I think, in terms of the empowered community structure as highlighted by Denmark, it's very optimistic, the

sense that Denmark got that it will be in six months. And I share that.

So, by that time, I think we would have, basically, put one sentence -- one sentence on the paper. This is the principle that we have changed, perhaps. But by that time, I'm sure we will be in the process. We will be -- we'll just be warming up in terms of our review process. So that would then give us the clarity that is needed so that we know where we fit in. I think we have a sense, generally, where we fit in.

But the clear indication will then be more clearer for us. The clear indication will then come.

So I trust that, with your indulgence then, I think the approach will be a hybrid. We will want to start now. And we can go into an identification of important areas and then look at the principles and then perhaps get priorities.

With those many -- my boss used to say with those many remarks but few words, can we then look at or sort of follow the hybrid approach, start now, and then allow the committee, perhaps, to look at the process later once you have identified the areas for us?

And we go to the next slide and look at the areas. Thank you.

So it's -- it covers, I think, as they said, it's not a long document. It just covers the main areas that is in the operating principles. And, of course, within those areas there are the different principles. It's not reflected here on election two or three principles under so and so. On the powers of the chair, there are two or three principles.

But those are the areas. And going by this -- by the idea that you give us a sense of what is -- what direction to take, what is -- what area's important. And then, perhaps, time allowing, we can maybe then give the committee the task to then look into the specific principles. Thank you very much.

Comments, views, guidance, advice. Thank you.

Maybe Michelle can kick off just to explain one or two that gives a sense of what we expect or what we are looking for. Thank you.

MICHELLE SCOTT-TUCKER: I think we got a sense over the last few meetings of which are likely to be the operating principles which will create the most conversation. And I can include a sense of that in the ACIG review, if you like. But some of the ones that are top of mind are consensus, potentially, although that seems to have gone off the table a little bit.

It's about GAC membership and who can be a GAC member. It's about voting and voting processes and who is eligible to vote and who is not. These are all the controversial ones, I think.

There might -- in the past there's been some about the role of the chair. And that's been open for discussion as well.

As has been said today, there are some missing about working methods and working groups and those sorts of things.

Now, we've tried to fill those gaps with guidelines. There are certainly guidelines for working groups and how they should operate. And one of the things we might need to discuss within the operating principles is to what extent do you want things in the operating principles? And to what extent do you want the operating principles to refer to policy guidelines that also exist within the GAC? Policy guidelines are easier to change on the fly than the operating principles are.

So you might want to think about having a hierarchy of frameworks within which the GAC operates. I'm just putting this up for suggestion.

That's why we originally produced the working group guidelines, because they're just guidelines. It has no status.

So they're the sorts of things we'll talk about. But, if you don't want to talk about it today -- and we're sort of running out of

time -- in the review that ACIG does, I can certainly, in that section where I say here are the principles that we're probably going to need to discuss, I can give a fuller briefing about those principles, if you like. Happy to do that.

HENRI KASSEN:

Thank you, Michelle, yes. As with many things in GAC, we need another week to go through this. We have, basically, made history that we have been discussing.

I was just commenting the accountability issue, the report and so on, and the process we have been -- we have started two years ago to in all earnest. So now we have two years of consultations, and we need to make a decision in two days. So two years, two days. So we had one hour to discuss this. And we need to make, you know, to get direction now in one minute.

One hour, one minute.

So because the next, of course, the next session starts at 10:00 now. It's a review structure. But Michelle suggested that, due to time limit, we will get -- I think we can get briefings. As far as the committee is concerned, we can then -- we can work out some minor and some basic administrative arrangements amongst us. But then we can open this area up for GAC for you to think about it, get the brief, think about it, and then make suggestions on the

mailing list perhaps intersessionally. And then we can then, as a committee, we can then receive that, review that. And then we can continue to engage on the direction. But, in terms of the actual reviews and so on, the committee will continue and then make a formal report to the GAC, perhaps at the next face-to-face.

We have -- I have the U.S. and Switzerland. Thank you.

The U.S.

UNITED STATES:

Thank you, Chair. If I may, I think you captured the essence, as has Michelle from ACIG. If I can make a suggestion so that we use our time wisely between now and the June meeting, that you assign us a deadline -- obviously, ACIG is going to come out with a briefing with sort of an identification of different actions that could be taken. This working group provides feedback and identifies those articles that we think could be amended now. And, by the way, we have actually amended the operating principles several times in the past without reviewing the entirety of the document. So it is entirely possible to take a crack at discrete sections and to amend them.

So I think what we probably should do is -- just a suggestion. We identify a priority set. And then, once that has been agreed by

the working group, I would like to think that we could then go ahead and start working on draft text that then goes to the GAC prior to the June meeting so we have buy-in from the entirety of the GAC so that by June we will actually have edited and amended the provisions that this group signed off by the GAC think need to be amended in the near term. And then we just keep tackling, progressively, the additional ones that need to be addressed. Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN: Thank you. Switzerland.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Chair. I think that that is a very valuable suggestion. And also the process you laid out in your last remarks is valuable. I would like to kindly request the secretariat that, when drafting this preliminary briefing, they would consider making a first guess on the categorization of the different principles to be reviewed according to the categories that were proposed by Manal, which are very valuable.

In our feedback from the working group members, we would perhaps have a different opinion on that categorization. But it would certainly help to have a first try on that. Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN: Thank you, Switzerland. Thank you, U.S. I think that is the direction that is sensible now under our time constraints.

I have my colleague, the distinguished colleague from Malaysia.

INDONESIA: Thank you for the --

HENRI KASSEN: Indonesia. Sorry.

INDONESIA: No problem, Henri.

HENRI KASSEN: I'm learning.

INDONESIA: It's 10 minutes flight from Indonesia to Malaysia. And thanks for your hard work to make some sort of hard working group work. I just stress the importance of this method in your activities now to find the principles how the working group should work and so on.

Because, in the proposal of the CCWG, it was mentioned clearly that, when GAC make an advice to the Board, it has to be

complete with the rationale, with the background, and so on and so on.

Now, it means that in the future -- in the near future, with the development of Internet so fast, most likely we'll have more working groups and more hard work working groups because we have to prepare the rationale for the GAC advice to the Board.

So I think we need to have your principles of working group and so on should be made finalized before, say, -- before the transformation, the transfer of IANA. Then we have the new GAC later with the new system.

Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN:

Thank you, Indonesia. Short flight to Singapore from -- thank you.

I think we probably need to quickly look at the deadline before the chair blows into my neck here. But he's coming. He started - - at a low tone this morning. So I see him smiling even. So that's what we call you are pushing your luck. So I'm pushing my luck a bit.

The U.S. was suggesting that we get a sort of reasonable deadline. So, in terms of opening up the advice, guidelines, guidance, suggestions for -- from the GAC-wide to the committee, perhaps by the end of March, then I think we can then shake ourselves up as a committee, look at it and then start sort of working on suggestions.

Then, of course -- then I don't know the ACIG sort of making us a summary for the committee or for GAC wide? I'm not sure now. You make a summary for the committee after the -- after GAC members by the end of March have indicated their preferences , their areas so that we can get towards a prioritized -- a priority set that we can work on., of course, upon which we then report back at the next face-to-face but then also bring in the other methods that, you know, the new things and so on that has come up in the meantime.

So I don't know. I have end of March as a suggestion. Maybe it's too late. Too early. It's, basically, for GAC an open -- sort of an open invitation for GAC members to give us their areas of priority so that we can as a committee then, beginning of April, have a guideline in terms of priorities and then start work on that.

Is that in order? Going once, going twice. And Michelle is preventing us from going thrice. Michelle, please.

MICHELLE SCOTT-TUCKER: I'll send an email to the working group with the request and a deadline. And I'll look at my calendar and work out a sensible deadline for what that request might be and do a timeline when I'm not quite so jetlagged, if that's all right.

But we'll certainly take the message that we need to push things along, and we'll push them through as fast as we can and as fast as is sensible.

A question has come in from someone participating remotely and the question is what can be the mechanism of decision-making in the absence of consensus?

That's a good question, and that's one of the -- probably principles that we'll need to look at closely and that we'll have a longer conversation and consultation about.

We don't have an answer for that right now because the GAC does work on a consensus basis, and that's what the operating principles tells us to do.

So the principle that deals with consensus is likely to be one of those in the list of principles that needs to be looked at and considered by the GAC more closely. So I can't answer the question, but I can say that that's where that question will go.

Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN:

Thank you, Michelle. Thank you, colleagues.

On that understanding, we can then hand back to the chair so that we can proceed with the rest of the agenda.

I thank you very much and look forward to not fail your trust that you have given us now to the approval of the -- of the terms of reference.

I just want to again highlight that India has indicated an interest to be vice chair for the committee, and I suppose with your silence, I -- I pray that you agree with that. That will, of course, assist the committee to gain momentum and continue.

So with that understanding also, I invite all other members, any other member of GAC to send a note to Michelle to or to Julia, mainly, to become members of this committee so that we can then have a broad-based representation in the committee.

Thank you very much, and over to you, Thomas.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Henri, for this very nice and good conducting this meeting.

So if there are no more questions or comments, I think we also, looking at the time, should move over to the next issue so it is fairly clear what we have to do in the next few weeks, and then we see where we are, I guess.

The next one is something that we've touched on already a few times. It's the meeting structure, which is, I think, high time that we get some clarity about where we are and how we plan to organize our next meeting, which is this first -- the first of the so-called B meetings.

You may have seen that Olof circulated on Tuesday an email with the four days with the plans of all the SO/ACs put one next to the other, which is what I've asked him to do. That's actually fairly telling. And I don't know whether we have received an answer from the Board that would give us more clarity about four days or five days or whatever. Does anybody have any information about how many days do we now have?

Maybe, Olof, you have some more insights on that one, and then we'll start the discussion.

OLOF NORDLING:

Thank you, Chair. Absolutely no idea, just to make that clear. But --

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: That's a clear answer.

OLOF NORDLING: Yeah, the answer was clear, at least.

But there is an invitation for you and other SO/AC chairs to have a call in the coming week in order to settle things.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yes, I've seen that, but that doesn't help us now, but, yeah, yeah. Okay.

Is that a question on the days? Yes, thank you, U.S. To my recollection just a question for clarification whether my notes from the GAC-Board session are accurate. I thought I understood one board member, Chris Disspain, to actually offer to have a conference call with different representatives from SO/ACs, which I'm sure he didn't intend to be duplicative of whatever it is the SO/AC people do on a regular basis. Of course, and you represent us on that.

But pending Ana's overview, then perhaps we can figure out if that would be helpful, certainly we can find one or two GAC volunteers to contribute.

Thanks.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. That may be the same thing, yeah. So -- it's not that I would have a problem with anybody else participating if that's possible. So we can check this out.

So I think -- I would say let's start with the idea of four, but assume that if we want to use the Sunday before, it's fairly likely that we will have that Sunday. So we don't know. That will be decided later. It's not decided yet. But looking at what the others are requesting, it seems that most of them are requesting that they will need the Sunday in addition.

So with that, I'll stop here and hand over to Michelle and Ana who have been following this, actually, more closely in the coming years. In past years, actually, not just months.

Thank you.

ANA NEVES: Thank you very much. So I and Suzanne, we have been working on this with ACIG.

So meeting A, it's this one where we are now. Any difference?

I think there was a difference but we didn't notice that we were here, closed. But two public forum. So we are at end of Meeting A.

So Meeting B, at the end of June. It will be our first meeting, and here, in Marrakech, I think that our work is either endorse Meeting B and C or only B, and then we'll continue to discuss what and how Meeting C should be.

So for the time being, what we are working on, and so there are different possibilities, of course, we are assuming that Meeting B has four days. Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday. And on Monday, day one, we were thinking that perhaps it would make sense to have capacity-building session activities and outreach. These outreach activities could be done with the host and can be -- we can think on these meetings on Meeting B or C.

And then all this Meeting B, the purpose, as you -- I think you know, is really to have a very good work between and among the different SOs and ACs. So it's really an informal work, and with the different and several meetings, but amongst us.

So on day one, we are proposing to have outreach activities, GAC working groups meeting face to face, and attend GNSO open house sessions.

So this is a possibility.

And day two. So half-day meetings with key SOs and ACs on particular topics and PDPs that are important for the GAC. And on this day, we will not have GAC sessions.

Day three, the proposal is to continue to have half-day meetings, informal meetings, but we expect deep discussions here with key SOs and ACs again. The possibility to have a meeting with the ICANN Board or some members. No GAC-only sessions.

And eventually day four, Thursday. GAC plenary sessions, the single-day only. All consensus discussions held. And then we have the output document that has -- that we should have from this Meeting B.

Here is the discussion of whether we should have a communique or if we should have an official report, minutes, a consensus statement, something that can be considered an output from this Meeting B.

So again, let me just stress the possibility in day one to have outreach activities with the host region on Internet policy. So some engagement activities with them, and capacity-building activities as well.

So this is for discussion now, I think.

I don't know, Michelle, if you want....

Suzanne? I don't know.

UNITED STATES:

Thank you, Ana. You have done a very good overview of what our options are, and we have been on phone calls together with meeting staff.

I do think we have a bit of a challenge. I have just gone to look at the PowerPoint that Olof circulated, and that's a very dense schedule that the meeting staff is now juggling, and I think perhaps -- let me ask a question. Would it make sense for us to propose some tweaks to this very dense schedule and raise some questions that might trigger the subsequent discussions between SO and AC chairs or volunteers? Because I do think we're going to need to rationalize the very dense schedule or we will find ourselves talking to ourselves again, which is not our intention. I mean Ana has signaled very clearly, the GAC sees the Meeting B as engaging with the SOs and ACs, and yet they're perhaps not seeing it the same way. So we probably want to start now.

So thank you for flagging that.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. Actually, it may be useful to maybe quickly show the slides that are coming up, which actually are not identical. The

GAC -- the GAC column that you see here is not identical to what he have in the document that you've just seen, so there's another inconsistency there.

And apparently Nick Tomasso and the meetings team are coming over to us in the next few minutes, if I understand that right, and that may be useful, also, to get maybe the latest development from them.

What I would suggest is before we've had that coordination call with the others, it doesn't make any sense to fix when we are going to do what because that will depend on the others. I think we all agree that when we do intercommunity work, the community should agree on the day, about you we may agree on the elements of what we would like to do.

Sorry, there's something small distracting me. Please go to Suzanne.

[Laughter]

So if we agree on the elements that we have, that we would like to have engagement with the others, we would like to have maybe bilaterals in addition to multilaterals or we would like to have no bilaterals, we would like to have two days work for us on some particular key work stream, or one day, one and a half day, and then the question of the outcome. We may give some

form of advice. We may be expected to give some form advice. It doesn't need to be in the form of a communique. We could identify the issues that we would work on and give advice in the form of a letter. But let's try and identify some elements that we can agree of what we want to do and move these to the right place in the time schedule once we know the time schedule of the others or we know the elements of the others.

That would be my reaction to this. Thank you.

Back to Ana and Michelle.

I have -- unfortunately, you are not sitting at the same spot where you were before. Ah, yes, now I remember you, of course. We have somebody from the ALAC, I think, that was on the meetings team. So maybe it's good to get some input from. So it's Beran. Thank you. Hi. The floor is yours.

BERAN GILLEN:

Thank you. This is Beran Gillen. I am a former ALAC member but currently of the meeting strategy group within At Large. I just wanted to sort of share my own experience with how we came up with our schedule for the four-day meeting.

So what we did, we did a lot of one-on-one meetings with the meetings team, especially Tanzania, because we were completely lost in the beginning.

So basically what we could understand from the four days is the first day would be on outreach and engagement. And then the second and the third day would be intra-community work, that would be within your own silos. So basically any -- if the GNSO would be doing policy work within the GNSO, those would be the days that they would do it. If ALAC wants to do policy work within ALAC, those second and third days would be the days that they would do it. And then the fourth day we would have the cross-community work. This was the breakdown that the meeting teams shared with us, and that's what we based our schedule on.

And as you can see up there, we do have outreach and engagement on Monday. Tuesday and Wednesday we have policy work. And then Thursday we have cross-community work.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. So that is quite the opposite of what we have. We have the interaction in the middle days and not in the first and last day. So, yeah. So there's definitely a need for coordination.

I think the U.S. wanted to add something to that.

Thank you.

UNITED STATES:

Thank you, Chair. Just a question -- And thank you to our ALAC colleague for flagging that for us. It could be good if we could, maybe, all of us revisit. But I know that when we met with Tanzi King, our idea was, as you pointed out, we would engage with the community and then sort of come together as GAC to assess and compare notes as to what it is we heard where there are certain priorities we should focus on. But I'm sure we can sort that later.

I have a question for colleagues in this room, for the GAC. On day one, we get to define whatever it is we want that day to be and how we want to spend the day. So capacity building is something that might be something we think about as not necessarily on a regional basis, but for the membership of the GAC so that we can, you know, embrace new members or fairly new members and get to know one another a bit better. I know I sound like the only thing I'm interested in is social activities, but, on the other hand, I have proposed it many times. To my recollection, almost the entire room has agreed that the GAC as the GAC really would benefit from more face time with each other. This new table structure really doesn't permit us easily to engage. So I do think that if we could schedule that day just for ourselves with some support from ICANN, as in funding a lunch or something like that, they do it for other parts of the

community, I think that would be very useful for us to consider does that make sense, does the membership want to do that. And then we can sort out that day and move on to the next.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Spain.

SPAIN: I certainly concur with the suggestion, but I also suggest that part of the day can be used to invite people from the host country to get to know the GAC and get to know ICANN. Maybe not in every B meeting. It might end up that we have ICANN meetings in a country where the multistakeholder model is not very well-developed.

Maybe we could seize the opportunity to invite them to present not only GAC work but also ICANN and try to stir up a little bit that multistakeholder model in that country.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Before giving the floor to Nick Tomasso -- I'm never able to pronounce -- it's not Tanzania the country, but something similar.

TANZANICA KING: Tanzanica.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Tanzanica. Just two comments. I think we shouldn't really talk about what we do on day one, what we do on day two. Let's go for the elements of what we want to do. Actually, there may be something that Sebastien Bachollet brought up. We may think of, as we may have different ideas of what outreach means, what social aspects means, his idea of having work in the mornings or until somewhere early afternoon in the silos every day and having some interaction with the other constituencies or with the outside world every day in the afternoon starting at some point may allow us having two or three different -- or four different versions of interaction within your constituency and two or three different things. Because there's some ideas of going to universities where you are or getting people in so there are many differences. So this is something that would actually, I think, leave us more room than just one day doing the same thing and the next day doing the same thing. But let me give the floor -- as you see, we're trying to figure out -- we realize we can't really plan the days because it's not clear on what day what is going to happen. So we're trying to identify the elements of what we would like to do and then move the elements according

to the coordination with the others. That's at least the plan for the time being. But maybe you can give us some insights about I'm sure -- the discussions that I'm sure you have been having since Friday. So maybe we know a little bit more in what direction the whole thing is going. Thank you.

NICK TOMASSO:

Thank you, Thomas. And good morning, everyone.

We have had an ongoing conversation about meeting B since it was first published and certainly here in Marrakech.

What does it mean? How do we fit everything we need to do into four days? What is outreach? And, conversely, what is in-reach? And how do you define the two?

And most of the discussions are leading towards the meeting strategy working group worked for two years to develop this meeting strategy. They are the ones that proposed the four-day schedule. And perhaps it's wise for us to stick with that four-day schedule at least for the first time. Because, if we haven't tried it, how do we know it doesn't work?

That said, I think Helsinki gives us a unique opportunity. Because outreach was scheduled for half a day on Monday and because, realistically, what's probably more realistic for Helsinki is some sort of in-reach program where we bring people in to

integrate into the SOs and ACs and their meetings and don't split out any special time for outreach but rather integrate them into the program. And the SOs and ACs do business as usual.

So the last discussions have been should it be four days? And I think many agree with that for the reasons I mentioned.

But also should it be five days with a day devoted to PDPs? And in this case, that would be -- workshops, excuse me. And in this case this would be the preceding Sunday.

So Tanzania has worked with almost all the SOs and ACs in developing a schedule which is on a community wiki that you can all look at, comment on, and change as you need to.

And Chris Disspain yesterday proposed that we schedule a teleconference in the coming days for all of the SO/AC representatives to get together and look at what has been provided.

Now, frankly, the reason you're all confused and we're all confused is because what's been provided has been provided in silos. So this group wants to do this, and this group wants to do that. But we really need to coalesce around a structure. And perhaps, to Thomas's point, some topic-driven sessions. I think the GNSO also agreed with you on that, Thomas.

So let's look at the schedule as it exists today, get a group together to figure out where the synergies are and figure out where the real problems are, the conflicts, and put it all together. Let's ask -- let's define how we would like the Board to interact with the SOs and ACs. And what you'll see on the community wiki is that is the more typical the meeting with the GAC, the meeting with the GNSO, et~cetera, in those silos. But perhaps there's a better model for that.

The good news is that the facility we've selected in Helsinki gives us the ability to bring everybody together in one big room. That was not really the design for meeting B, but perhaps that's the reality that -- of what we need moving forward.

So with that I'll stop and --

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. Just one question. Could you help us -- where do we find this wiki? Is there somewhere a link to this? Or is it easily to be found on the Web site, if you haven't set it up yourself? So, if you could just communicate the link to us by email, I think that would be very useful or just quickly tell us where to find it.

TANZANICA KING:

So you can find it right now. If you go to the meetings Web site and click on "meeting strategy," there's a link on the right side of

the page that says 2016 meeting planning, schedule planning. Also we're going to send a formal invitation out, so you'll have that link in an email shortly today.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. Thank you.

And thank you both for providing us with this information. I think that sounds logical. I was the first one to ask it on the Friday meeting why don't we at least try it once? And I'm quite happy that -- and also knowing the Finlandia hall where things will take place, I think that should actually work that we'd have a chance to meet all together. Your views on what you just have seen or heard. Sorry?

Yes, Indonesia.

INDONESIA: Yes. Thank you for the information about how we are going to do the meeting, like Nick mentioned, and also the previous information about the outreach in the future session and so on and so on.

But, Tom, I just want to have short comment. Despite the meetings, one thing I think is important is how member of the

GAC can find acceptable solution for any problem and to response it on the right time.

I think it's important that any problems, any differences between member states can be finalized in the GAC meeting or GAC community. Because, if there are differences, which is not soft in the GAC meeting or in this meeting, it can be center capitol. And we don't -- and things will be more and more difficult. If it is the capitol that has to solve those differences. So I think the differences have to be solved here at a meeting. And so we don't have to go out and must come to any other higher level. Thank you, Tom.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. I think, if I understand you correctly, what you're trying to say is we should make sure that we have somehow enough time to work on issues where we may not have an agreement, that we can negotiate face-to-face until we have an agreement on some issues, if I get you right. I think that's fully clear and understandable. We will have to maybe plan what is the advice that we would like to give in the next -- or until the next meeting. Instead of just reserving time for a communique, try to have a different approach. Say, okay. We would like to give some initial advice on the reviews or on the next round -- or I don't know what -- WHOIS. And then plan that work and so

that we can actually conclude and agree on an advice where we may have different views in the beginning.

So, if I understand you correctly.

Other views. Let's try to give some signals to the meeting strategy team about the elements that we would like to see. Of course, we would like to have work in our own silo. I assume that we would like to have a multi-silo or an all-silo space. Do we also want to have bilateral meetings? And, if so, with whom? Do we have clear ideas, or do we not want to have -- do we only want to have everybody together or just us? Or do we want to have the three layers -- just us, bilateral meetings, and everybody together? I think this may help the meetings team to see where the GAC is. So yes, Mark. U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Yes, thanks. Good morning, everybody. Thanks, Nick and Tanzania, for coming to help us. It is quite a challenge, but the whole project is a huge challenge. We're well aware of that.

It's a matter of trying to avoid drifting back into the conventional approach to meetings. I think that's the consensus that we want to avoid that. But you do have to balance the work that needs to be done. This is a point that's just been made, I think. And, of course, we can't really say at this moment exactly what work we

need to do in Helsinki and how much time we need to provision for it.

But that seems to be the start point, isn't it? You have to anticipate what work you need to do and the extent to which you need to interact bilaterally to help you achieve that objective for the meeting. There may be a specific issue that we need to talk through with the GNSO.

And then the other SOs and ACs are probably also trying to work out what they -- what their priorities for actual work that they need to pass at the next meeting. And then how do you relate that to the new activities that we all agree we need to do, the outreach and the more sort of town hall-type thematic interaction?

And you're dealing with a four-day -- provisionally, kind of a four-day schedule, although you mentioned an additional day.

So I guess our approach would be to sort of try and sort of build out from the work we anticipate we need to do at meeting B and build around that in terms of the outreach and interaction thematically with other members of the community.

And then, of course, the additional complication this year is the Work Stream 2 of the CCWG. That puts another pressure point on everybody, I assume. The Work Stream 2.

So I guess what I'm saying is not very helpful. But I just see this sort of -- you know, some conflicts here and constraints, if you like, on being truly innovative, which is what we need to do.

But I think intersessionally at some point, going back to the initial sort of core of the GAC's approach to meeting B, which is the work we need to pass and undertake face-to-face in Helsinki. I guess intersessionally, there will be a point of, well, it's starting to sort of become clearer what exactly we have to do.

And maybe at that point we then have a GAC conference call saying this is how things are shaping up in terms of work we have to do and our objectives to build on the program, the outreach, and thematic interaction. Thanks.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Mark. Two things: I think we asked the Board, the community, to prioritize given the workload in a communique.

I think we have to do the same for us, because working intersessionally is fine. But, when you call for a meeting, the numbers may not necessarily rise because people have other -- realize that they have lots of other work to do when they get back to their offices and so on.

So we may need to -- and we can use the last session, which is the preparation for the next meeting, to try and prioritize at least

our work streams for the next meeting. And that's an internal thing. But that gives us a view about how many days or how we try to organize these works in order to, as I said before, maybe come to an agreement on some kind of advice or some kind of output by the end of the Helsinki meeting. I think we can now call it that way.

But --

UNITED KINGDOM: Let me jump in. But at some intersessional point we'll be able to fine tune that.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yes, course. The closer we get, the more we'll know how much work and what element and where the others are on the same issues.

But I think let's really try and focus on the elements. What do we want to have? What do we want to do? We may not yet know how much of what we want to do. But what do you want to have? Do you want to have bilateral meetings? Yes or no? It's a fairly simple question. Do you want to have a multilateral everybody together in the room meetings? Yes or no? It's clear that we will have silo meetings. But let's try and make it simple. What do you want? What do you not want? Do you want to have

a bilateral meeting with the Board, or do you want to have everybody meeting the Board? Things like this. Like, what are the elements that you would like to see? The more we see clear on the elements, that's at least a start. And then we can start prioritizing and see how much time would we need for silo work? Like, two days maybe over the whole four days; or do we need 3 1/2 days or just one day? What is it that you absolutely want to have? What is it you think we don't need in the B meeting? That will be my question.

The U.S., Switzerland, and then U.K.

UNITED STATES:

Thank you, Chair. And thank you to Nick and Tanzie for coming in and flagging things.

Nick, I think you highlighted something very important that the U.K. has picked up on.

Arguably, the four days should be issue-driven. And that should, hopefully, guide the type of interaction. So you are not the vehicle for this, but perhaps what we need to do is to have the GAC secretariat and particularly ICANN staff coordinate with other ICANN staff supporting the other SOs and ACs. What is their work plan? Are there PDPs that require decisions? So at what point in that spectrum -- because PDPs have very strict

timelines and deadlines. So that we can target whether there will be approvals needed at the June meeting or a work in progress or a public comment period. So that would drive -- that would help guide us as to whether we need to have a GAC position or whether we use the opportunity for a face-to-face to talk to each other rather than past each other by putting things in writing. That would be a face-to-face on -- I don't know -- you name it. Issue X.

But, frankly, I do think -- and I'm glad you reminded us. You know, our communique flags very, very explicitly that there is a huge concern among governments with limited resources of the workload. And it's our understanding that other parts of the community are concerned as well. Maybe for different reasons. But there is just an enormous amount of work that the smallish community is struggling with. And maybe that's a good opportunity to, certainly at least between the GAC and the Board, focus on that. How do we rationalize the work streams? And maybe it would also help if, engaging with the GNSO -- because I don't know that the ccNSO has a PDP in process. I don't know quite what's on their plate. But, if we knew, if we could tell what's on other SO/ACs plates, I think it's primarily the GNSO. And, if there was maybe a face-to-face, it would help us -- and I'm going to defer to Manal here. We do have a GAC-GNSO Consultation Group that has been trying very hard to set up

mechanisms for the GAC and the GNSO to -- you know, to facilitate earlier engagement. And we've made great progress, on the other hand, if I may say an observation, they're still agreeing to issue preliminary issue reports and to embark on PDPs, multiple PDPs. And maybe this is an opportunity for us to sort of explain -- for us to try to juggle GAC input on multiple PDPs while we are still dealing with CCWG Work Stream 2.

I mean, I think we need to actually -- the data has to be presented so we can walk through and people get a sense of the enormity.

My take-away from some discussions with the Board, they're not entirely aware of the breadth and the scope of the work streams. Maybe this is an opportunity for a -- how did we put it the other day? Some things may need to hit the pause button.

So perhaps part of this B meeting can be focused on very practical things. Workload, priorities.

We understand that the Board does not run ICANN; right? They defer to the community. But if the community isn't aware of the implications of initiating work for the rest of the community, maybe this is an opportunity.

So maybe we should have a practical element to the B meeting, which is where the different SOs and ACs actually compare notes

as to what it is you're working on. GAC, probably like ALAC, almost feels compelled that we have to track just about every issue you can think of. And that's clearly not manageable.

So I would like to put in a bid for that and a bid for carving out more time than we typically spend with the Board face to face, and permit both sides to actually develop some issues, either issue driven or questions, so that there can be a more candid exchange. Everything is pretty much formal and feels very stiff. And I think if the B meeting is going to be helpful, it needs to be just more working based and informal. And obviously that does affect the meetings team because obviously you need to figure out how to structure meetings rooms and permit us to not be so, you know, rigid.

So I did want to flag that.

One question I also had, I don't know whether, Nick or Tanzi, you might know this, I don't see any reference to CCWG here. And I'm assuming with Work Stream 2, they may be seeking a face-to-face meeting? So that's a question.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Quick answer to that last question, please.

NICK TOMASSO: As far as the CCWG is concerned, the ICANN management team has asked me to look at holding two days somewhere right around the meeting in Helsinki to make sure that if there is a need for a CCWG working group, that there is time to do it.

More importantly, if there's a need for the SOs and ACs to be involved with that working group, that we have it backed up right against the meeting so that we don't ask you to travel twice.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So that means it's a six-day meeting for those who....

[Laughter]

But I mean, we've had CCWG meetings before, so let's not....

We need to somehow wrap this up. I have Turkey, Beran, Switzerland and the U.K. But just let me make one point. Who drives this whole institution? Who drives the timeline? It's the GNSO and it's the ccNSO, actually. It's not the others that much, for us, at least. So actually helping us prioritize is just look at what they are doing, their PDPs, and probably there's more work currently on the GNSO side, as you say. So that actually helps us. And probably the ALAC is in a similar situation, that they

would want to be part of this or react to this. So that may actually help that we look at the driving forces and then organize the things around it.

I'll stop here because we really have to start the coffee break.

So please be very brief: Turkey, Beran, Switzerland, and U.K., and Morocco. And then I'll stop the list.

TURKEY:

Thank you, Chair. I was a little bit late, but what I understand, the first, starting from Monday, that will go through Thursday; right? For the B meetings?

Just people like me who are working quite heavily during the weekdays, I would like to -- it would make sense to utilize the weekend as much as possible. Maybe Saturdays -- Friday, Saturday, Sunday, so at least some days on that following week would be left free so that we can get back and do some work at back offices. Because there's no difference for me for B structure and A structure because you'll be gone for the whole week anyhow.

If the meeting ends on Thursday, you're flying back on Friday, so the whole week is gone anyhow.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. That's noted.

Beran.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you, Chair. This is Beran from the At Large.

I just make a quick suggestion. During our meetings, our final meetings towards the Meeting A, it was suggested within our community that perhaps what ALAC would do within our policy sessions is invite individuals from the Board that actually have to do with the policy sessions that we're running on day two and three. So maybe the GAC would also be interested in possibly giving us individuals that are working within their silo on those matters or issues that we would be discussing sort of in line with what U.S.A. was suggesting.

Another thing I wanted to ask Nick was the 75-minute slots, which are quite new to this session, are you going to keep them or is this something that's going to be debated as well in the sessions we'll have in the Cross-Community Working Group?

Thank you.

NICK TOMASSO: I'm sorry. Would you repeat that question?

BERAN GILLEN: The 75 minutes slots, the sessions are now 75 minutes, which is new. Is this debatable or is this fixed during the cross-community working session we will be having?

NICK TOMASSO: The reason we're trying to implement the 75-minute rule is to provide some level of standardization so that as we look at sessions and at session conflicts, if you're running a two and a half hour session that doesn't fit the 75-minute time block, it's hard for us, then, to say what can go up against it.

So it's for two reasons. It's for standardization of the schedule, to make it easier to schedule -- and it's not just for us; it's for the community -- and it's also to allow time for some interaction between sessions that would otherwise be lost should we not have that 15 minutes of coffee time between the two. So that's the reason for it.

What we will maintain or not is really going to be dependent upon what you need and what you want, although we would highly recommend it.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Nick.

Switzerland.

SWITZERLAND:

Thank you, Chair. Very briefly. I very much agree with the suggestions made by the U.S. before that we look into what are the high-interest topics for the different constituencies in this meeting. And perhaps if we map those high-interest topics, we will see where there is more overlap, and on some issues we may need a trilateral or quadrilateral meeting. On others it's more convenient to have a bilateral meeting.

For instance, if we look at our communique, which we agreed yesterday, we see that future gTLDs and public interest safeguards appeared implicitly or explicitly in our interactions with ALAC and the GNSO. That would certainly give one very important topic for a common meeting with all these three other actors. And perhaps we could do that job, that analysis in planning for the June meeting.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. Yeah, that repeats, if we do it issue driven, it gets clear who is interested, who is part, and I think that makes a lot of accepts.

We have to close this list. I have U.K., Morocco, and Egypt, because we're way too -- please be very short.

U.K., Mark. Please be short.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Yeah, sure. Thanks, yeah.

Just to your question about bilateral meetings, I would argue not to have them in the B meeting. They're time consuming. Whole chunks of people have to move around, and sometimes we have to sort of -- God, what are we going to talk about? You know?

The way to work it I think is from the issues, the priority issues of work. Do we need to know if the GNSO has a question on this? You know, can we get an answer from the GNSO on this? And just bring one or two people over from the GNSO. I went over to the IP constituency the other day just to explain what we're doing on human rights and international law, just as one of the co-chairs. We have people that we can also provide to the other SOs and ACs to report on what the GAC is doing. The vice chairs and the chairs of working groups, and so on.

That's an idea. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much, Mark, for this useful point.

Morocco.

MOROCCO: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair, for this presentation. I agree to a certain point with words mentioned by the representatives of the U.K. and the U.S. I think the most important issues for GAC to interact with other representatives were clearly expressed. I think we know which are our hot topics and the issues we want to devote more time.

So if we base our focus on an agenda, it should be reflected in this new format. The format should be then related to a silo, bilateral, whatever type of meeting. I think that GAC should decide by itself the best way to interact, the best way to engage, the best way to improve our interaction with other constituencies.

Thirdly, I think this new format needs our support. So we will improve it in the future as the time goes by, but we have to make this attempt in June, next June, and then find out the difficulties, the weaknesses, the strength, so as to improve the format for future rounds.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Egypt has the floor.

EGYPT:my colleagues, I think it should be issue based. We should have a common agenda that we work on. Maybe SOs and ACs chairs can get together, agree on a topic, decide agenda. And then if we are going to work silos, we are working on the same topics, and at the end when we meet, we're discussing the same thing.

So basically, it's to progress or advance a certain issue across all constituencies.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Manal.

I think we -- Let's conclude here.

It's actually more clear than maybe we thought in the beginning. If we do it issue driven, that actually solves a lot of problems because that follows -- if you agree on the issues, much of it follows in terms of who should be involved, how.

Ana, and is it Olof? Okay.

OLOF NORDLING: Oh, thank you, Chair. Well, I just thought, since Nick Tomasso and his team is available right here, you should be aware that they have magical powers. They make food bags appear here in the middle of the night, and they produce buses out of nowhere exactly when you need them, not to mention that they manage to rearrange the GAC room to accommodate twice as many people as we planned for the high-level meeting.

So I just think you should know that they are really behind a lot of the good support that you get.

Thanks.

[Applause]

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Good point, Olof.

Ana, is there something you want to say to conclude? Go ahead, and then we will conclude.

ANA NEVES: Only two things. Not to be forgotten that this Meeting B was thought what for? To better engage, to have cross-community work. So that's why we thought that we should have only four days, no exhibition, nothing else but our work and to learn from

the others and from the other groups. This is the essence of the Meeting B.

And we cannot change it because it was already adopted by the Board.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. I think we all agree on this. And that's the end of this session.

Thank you very much again for coming here, and we hope that we get some more clarity. And this is the coffee break.

Thank you.

And thank you, Ana and Michelle, for following this for us.

Coffee break until half past. So 20 minutes, not more.

[Coffee break]

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Please take your seats. Slightly, only 45 minutes. So we have to immediately resume, and I immediately give the floor to our colleague from Australia, Anneliese, who will start introducing the next item.

ANNELIESE WILLIAMS: Thank you, Chair. We wanted to talk to you today about some of the issues and barriers that GAC representatives in the Asia Pacific region face in participating in ICANN and GAC activities. I'd like to ask that we as a GAC consider some of the ways we can be more flexible and more accommodating to work around some of these challenges. ICANN's decisions apply globally, whether you participated in the discussion about these decisions or not. And that's why it's so important to make sure that all GAC members are able to participate in the discussions and the formulation of GAC advice to the Board. We can't assume that because members don't physically attend meetings or don't participate in the phone calls that they're not interested in these issues.

So have we got our slides?

Yes?

As you can see from the slides, the Asia Pacific region is a large, very diverse region. It covers almost half the globe. Such a

diverse region has diverse challenges. Some of these challenges might also be familiar to other regions, too.

I'm just going to mention a few that I'm aware of, and then we'll invite some of our Asia Pacific colleagues to speak about their experiences and then invite discussion from everyone.

When you look at countries in our region, there are many that don't have U.N. languages as a primary language. And this makes the process of considering and responding to documents more difficult and more time consuming.

Resourcing is a challenge for many governments, and those in the Asia Pacific region are no different. But, in addition to budget pressures, there are many governments in our region -- many countries in our regions that have very small populations. So, while many GAC members have more than one representative attending ICANN meetings and some have even more staff at home that are across the issues and can share the workload, many GAC members from our region are the sole person in their government working on GAC issues. And they may have other responsibilities in addition to their GAC role.

Sometimes this means they can't be spared from their other duties to participate in ICANN meetings. Participating in person also presents difficulties, too. Travel to Marrakech from our region was quite a journey. And even attending meetings in the

Asia Pacific region can involve significant travel times. And some countries don't have flights every day. Nicola is going to speak to the slides.

NICOLA TREOLA:

Thanks, Anneliese. If you can move to the next slide, please.

This is the Asia Pacific region. This is a map that doesn't perfectly map to the ICANN areas. But the space you see that looks like it has no countries in it has quite a few, actually.

Next slide, please.

So there are around 20,000 to 30,000 islands in the Pacific Ocean. As you can see from the map, many countries consist of groupings of islands. This means for us travel is one of the biggest challenges we face. I certainly don't want to spend this session in some kind of travel competition to see who has had the longest flight, but we want to give you an idea of what these challenges look like.

Many countries require multiple hops to get to a flight hub before traveling to meetings. As Anneliese mentioned, some countries only have one or two flights a week or need to travel by boat to the closest airport. So the times that you see on the next slide represent minimum times it takes us to travel to ICANN meetings.

Next slide, please.

So the meetings that are highlighted here in blue are the travel that takes more than one day to get to our meetings. This is a variety of countries in the Asia Pacific. Some that are quite large, some that are small.

As an example, the Kiribati times are based on hitting the weekly flight that goes out to Fiji and assuming that you'll meet up with your next international connection perfectly. So some of these are really ideal times.

Travel in our region can also present budget challenges. For those of us funded by our ministries, we have to answer to our taxpayers.

For Marrakech it cost me about 3,000 Euro to travel here in economy class and 6,500 Euro to travel business class to Marrakech. So for me there's a tradeoff to be made. I can go to one meeting in business class flights; or I can go to two, possibly three, if I take economy. For those who can access ICANN funding, the travel policy requires the lowest fare to be selected. This means all the fares, regardless of the length of your trip, are economy class and may not be of the most efficient route. This is not a criticism of the funding structure, but it might explain why you often find us at the coffee kiosk in the first few days. Finally, we're also vulnerable to extreme weather. When you

consider this in light of some of the more adventurous travel itineraries we take, this means that poor weather can cancel your trip or mean that we are three or four days late for a meeting.

So I hope I haven't put you off visiting us. We really do have a beautiful country. I'm not just being patriotic. Once you get there, it is beautiful. It just takes a while. Thank you.

ANNELIESE WILLIAMS: Thank you, Nicola. With that in mind, you might be asking why these members don't just participate remotely. Remote participation for GAC members in this region is not necessarily a solution. In fact, it presents problems of another kind.

Home Internet connections in some countries are very expensive, and sometimes Internet quality can be poor. For some members this means they can only participate in Adobe room meeting -- Adobe room meetings during their normal working hours. But then for other members, they can't participate during working hours because of bandwidth issues. And I'll now pass over to our colleague from the Cook Islands to speak.

TEPUA HUNTER: Good morning, everyone. Amongst all the useful and wide ranging issues that we have considered and discussed over the past few days, the word "participation" continued to reverberate throughout this meeting room. We all know that without participation, whether in realtime or not, the sharing of ideas, views, concepts, proposals, and the like would not have grown and developed into what we are today. Frankly speaking, without full and effective participation, our commitments and efforts would be both futile and unsustainable.

And should participation be largely confined to those who are able to do so as opposed to those who wish to but simply are unable to as a result of resource or capacity constraints, then we run a real risk of alienating ourselves between those who can and those who cannot.

To draw attention and detail to the challenges we face following Australia's opening remarks and the slides presented by New Zealand, we have situations where traveling to and from meeting destinations is dependent on the frequency of domestic and international air and sea transportation.

For example, if I make reference to my attendance at this meeting, the travel time from my country, Cook Islands, to beautiful Morocco took a whopping 54 hours. However, my so-called whopping 54 hours pales in comparison to the time it

would take for my fellow country members to reach meeting destinations whereby transportation from their home island to an international airport is by boat, which operates once every two weeks.

This translates to absence from their home island for periods of up to or more than a month.

Another country's limited to one international flight a week. So it would be fully understandable if GAC representatives from these countries from my region will never attend GAC meetings in person.

Further, we are small populations with very narrow economic basis. Population as small as 1,000 where government revenue is extremely tight.

Australia made reference to challenges that this presents where staffing is severely limited, limited in some countries to a couple of staff only who are largely responsible for taking care of a lot of government's functions and responsibilities. And, as a result, participating or even attendance to meetings is always difficult to justify in terms of obtaining the necessary support and clearances required.

Furthermore, despite the wealth of useful and important information furnished to ourselves from GAC and ICANN as a whole, we are unable to respond to or participate effectively.

And, finally, there are still many rural areas within our region that have no access to Internet services. As a result, costly travel to urban centers would have to be undertaken in order to acquire access to participate in GAC meetings or any other ICANN meetings. And, to make matters worse, many of the Internet services provided in urban centers are unreliable, have low bandwidth, and are costly. And even for those areas that have Internet access, electricity is not always available 24 hours.

I am hopeful that GAC members, in particular, those that are better resourced have a deeper understanding and better appreciation of the multitude of constraints faced by us when it comes to meeting arrangements, which, in turn, will, hopefully, lead to policy initiatives being developed within existing policies by both GAC and ICANN that will focus on those less resourced members in order for them to maintain an equal footing for their voices to be heard.

In concluding, perhaps a visit to or the holding of a meeting on our side of the globe or the world will enable members from outside our region to better appreciate in person the challenges that we face. Thank you.

ANNELIESE WILLIAMS: Thanks, Tepua. I'd like now to invite now any of our Asia Pacific colleagues, anyone who would like to speak, speak now. And then we'll open it up for broader discussion. Thanks.

Thailand. Thanks.

THAILAND: Thank you, Chairs, and the team that shared the challenges for the country to attend the conference. But, regarding on the -- how can I say it -- to overcome those kinds of things, regarding some of the traveling, this might be the problems. And bandwidth that you mentioned might be another critical barrier to prevent the country to join the GAC meeting.

I would like to seek some options that you might be having in your mind to propose set up the thing or even you might be to discuss with the GAC's members from this region to come up on the strategy and propose for the next round or the meeting because this might be -- it might be the good opportunity for the Asia Pacific countries to sit down together and think about how can we help each other to be able to participate on the ICANN meeting or face-to-face meeting. Because I'm not sure whether the other countries beyond our regions might be able to share as a good opportunity.

This might be helped ask the secretariat to set up the mailing list for us and might be to start a communications and might be come up to the solutions and propose for the next round of meetings at Helsinki as might be -- this is my thoughts right now. Thank you.

ANNELIESE WILLIAMS: Indonesia, thanks.

INDONESIA: Thank you for the presentation by the Pacific Islands and regions of the Asia Pacific. So only it is not in the map. That's only the eastern part that is included. We actually have the middle and western part that should be included as well.

What I want to know more is, given your presentation about the problems when the island's country would like to come to the ICANN meeting, do you have the same problem for the other meetings, too? Like ITU, for example.

APT, for example, used to be carried out in many Pacific Islands. And it is quite common to have ATP meeting in -- you know, in Asia Pacific Island countries. And it's okay for the meetings.

Now, I just want to know how it can be then related to the possibility sort of ICANN meeting or working group meeting. So

part of the ICANN meeting. We have ICANN hub in Singapore, if I'm not mistaken. Yeah. We have -- ICANN have -- you know, one also in Kenya. But perhaps similarities can be drawn. We can then easily include activities for the Asia Pacific island countries.

Now, secondly, I think this is -- is for Tom to think about. Because, as the chairman of the GAC, he must be thinking of all the 162 countries members of the GAC. I'll just -- if I read that -- you know, the mailing list, many of the problems are for the visa when people have to go to another country very, very far away to get the visa only. And perhaps this is kind of thing that we can discuss later. Because I just read that, to get the visa, you have to travel to the embassy, particular embassy. You cannot do it by mail. Not even by what you call it? Email.

So this kind of thing that perhaps Tom has to consider when we are talking about get meeting anywhere. Thank you.

ANNELIESE WILLIAMS: Okay. Thanks. We'll address it all at the end. I think now U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes. Thank you, Anneliese. And thank you -- and, Nicola, for stressing the enormous challenges for effective and continuous participation in GAC meetings for many administrations in the

Asia Pacific region. I fully understand it's an enormous challenge.

I get a taste of it, because I have overseas territories of the U.K. I have to coordinate with in very remote locations, again, similar challenges of very small administrative resources.

And what you said about remote participation is very true. Internet access, electricity supply, and so on. These all inhibit remote participation.

I just have one point on that. I don't know if it's been considered previously whether during a GAC meeting there might be some fixed opportunity to report back to a network of island GAC representatives. This is how the meeting's going, sort of, you know, this is -- what's happening? What's coming up? What issues are still being worked on, so on? Is that an idea through a hub in the Pacific that will link out to the small island states? Is that one idea to explore? Or maybe, if it has already been explored, be interested to know why it doesn't -- won't help in some way. It's not a perfect solution. I'm not suggesting that. But it's a way of sort of keeping contact with the meeting as it progresses.

My other thought was, whether there is a forum -- for example, the Asia Pacific regional IGF that will provide some kind of platform for GAC representatives to convene to prepare inputs

into the GAC schedule, into the work of the GAC, whether there is some sort of forum that would facilitate some degree of connectivity with the work. Is that one -- something you've already explored that might overcome and mitigate the risk of just not being able to engage and keep in step with the work of the GAC on the whole range of issues?

So I just mention that as -- I'd be interested to know if you've explored that and found anywhere.

But I know the Asia Pacific regional IGF is a well-established Internet Governance Forum. And maybe that could facilitate something for the ICANN process. Thanks.

ANNELIESE WILLIAMS: Thank you, U.K. I have Iran, Japan, Namibia. Who's that? The CTU and Argentina. And then I think we're going to close the list. So Iran, thank you.

IRAN: Thank you, madam. We have limited time available. But let us not to widen the situation talking about other meeting and so on. Let's concentrate on ICANN meeting. We can't resolve all the issues at this meeting. The problem is that, first of all, GAC must recognize and emphasize the difficulty that you have mentioned, which is not only for Asia Pacific but also maybe

some other area, Latin American countries, African countries, and so on and so forth. So that is the first recognition of problem.

Second, asking ICANN to look for ways and means how to dissolve the matters. The number of meeting decisions cannot be reduced to two, cannot be increased to four, and doesn't solve the problem.

The problem is that how fellowship could be provided to those countries who have difficulties for traveling, for financing traveling, and so on and so forth. And in what way we could increase the level of participation. The issue is not that the report of the GAC be distributed. That is absolute. We want to make it possible that they participate. For instance, CCWG was an important -- or CWG or ICG. There was little opportunity for many developing countries or remote island to participate because of the reasons that you have given.

Now, what we can do and what is possible to do, that should be emphasized. And ways and means should be found how to resolve the matter.

In the case of Asia-Pacific, yes, but Latin American and African.

So maybe we should start that thing giving more opportunity to least developed countries and remove areas or island, so on and

so forth, at the first category among those asking for the fellowships, and so on.

I don't want to put example of ITU here, but in ITU, fellowship first will be given to the least developed country according to the United Nation list. I'm not saying take it as an exact example, but at least it is something. We should put emphasis to the least developed countries and; remote areas, remote island, and so on and so forth, provide most of the fellowship to those and provide them. Any increasing awareness, building capacity, or in other part of the ICANN that also should be worked out how we increase the capacity of the people, how you increase their awareness, how we provide some resume of something. That is a situation.

But the problem that you mentioned that is connection problem is one of the basic problems.

I was in charge of the Asia-Pacific for ICG, and I send more than 100 message. I receive only two reply, and then I was disappointed and said, okay, (indiscernible), why those people could not reply? Lack of resources, lack of time, lack of connections, and lack of decision-making, and many other issues. So let us concentrate how we could increase the participation in the ICANN, not only Asia-Pacific but also for other areas that have similar problems.

Thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thank you. I agree.

Japan next, please.

JAPAN: Thank you, chairs. We have so much sympathy of the issue to promote participation from Asia-Pacific region.

So concerning the (indiscernible) of Internet, so it is important to use conference call and email list, but for Asia-Pacific regions, it is difficult to attend conference calls which are held after midnight when everybody is sleeping. And the email list is , for example, concerning CCWG issue, at that times we have lot of emailing list coming from everywhere. So it is very complex for the beginner.

So we like to suggest that we think about the more useful Internet use and the way to not fix that conference call, conference call time. For example, on the two (indiscernible), information by different email list which identifies its (indiscernible) importance.

In the ITU, the (indiscernible) of the system is user used, such to provide information -- input the information. So such use for Internet way should be taken into account.

Thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thank you, Japan.

Next we have Namibia.

NAMIBIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. I thought I -- Africa -- from Africa we are a bit far from these meetings, and the different times are so challenging. But seeing this is even more than the legally allowed weekly hours in some of our countries that you are flying, you have my sympathies.

And definitely what the U.K. and Iran said is actually what I wanted to raise. True to the GAC operating principles that we don't repeat, I'll end here.

Thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thank you. Next we have CTO?

CTU: CTU, Caribbean Telecommunications Union, Bernadette Lewis.

Thank you very much, Chair.

While the Caribbean may not have the challenges in terms of the hours to get to a meeting, we have a number of countries that are severely financially constrained. And when you consider that you may have a government minister with six or seven portfolios, including ICTs, it is -- and maybe one or two technical people in that ministry, the capacity to respond becomes -- is very difficult.

I'm looking at the fellowship program. The fellowship program is an excellent program. A number of Caribbean countries are members of the GAC, but where are they? I think we have two Caribbean countries here. And it's not a reflection of the disinterest but the lack of the capacity to embrace the opportunity of the fellowship.

So I would like to -- One of the things that I am certainly looking at coming from the Caribbean Telecommunications Union is the -- to create the opportunities so that we could collaborate and come to some consensus so that who comes -- whoever comes to the GAC is bringing the concerns of the other countries. That is something I certainly will be working on.

The other thing that I think it would be helpful if we find some mechanism by which ICANN could make use of existing Caribbean fora. For example, we have the Caribbean IGF. I know ICANN has been involved. But perhaps we need to look a little more closely at how we could use that forum to engage with the GAC members in the Caribbean.

And finally, I just wanted to perhaps suggest that the working group on underserved regions, there may be a nexus and some synergies for them to also address this issue of the small island developing states and the challenges they experience.

Thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thank you. I think there are some other streams going on. This is sort of more awareness raising, but this certainly does fit into some other work areas as well.

Next I have Argentina.

Thanks.

ARGENTINA: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would like to concur with my colleague from United Kingdom, Iran and CTU have stated, so I won't repeat about the hours, in spite of Buenos Aires, for us, is

exactly the same problem with the hours of traveling. So I agree with Iran that the challenge of hours is also for other regions.

I see a challenge in the email list. I think the secretariat does a great job, but it's up to us at home to keep this email list updated because sometimes people rotate among the roles, they go to other parts of the administration, and the list is not updated and I find myself trying to reach someone and they are not there anymore. So we should go home and try to see if the email list is updated not only for the GAC full list but also for the working group list.

About what our colleague from U.K. was mentioning about kind of a platform, I think that will be very useful. During the accountability process, at the beginning I tried to give some updates in our Web site. It was difficult. I think it didn't work. But my intention was to have a place, a repository of documents.

What happens, for example, with working groups? There are several documents on process. But I have to send them by email. People sometimes, they don't see the email. Email goes, perhaps, as it's a list, goes to other places in the email repository.

So having kind of a Wiki, could be open, could be closed, and also would give us some opportunity to make comments if its

original focus could be in other languages. Language is a big barrier for written documents which are complex.

Of course, connectivity is an issue. But I think it's the -- what my colleague from CTU said, it's understanding the relevant. What are we talking about? Understanding the usuals and kind of understanding the documents that we work with.

Also, there is a thing I would like to bring again. I have said this several times. I think other constituencies or groups within ICANN receive more funding for traveling than the GAC. I think we are growing in members. We have more than 160, and we would like to grow more. So we should have at least the same amount of travel support that other parts of ICANN have.

I raise this issue with ICANN CEO, like, two years ago, and he said that he would commit to that, but it didn't happen.

So at least we should have, like, 50 slots for travel spot. We're 163 countries. That would help other regions.

Thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thank you. We have a session coming up shortly on the Web site which will address some of the other issues we have been

discussing today. We are running very behind time so I would like to ask you to keep your interventions short.

Next we have Pakistan, please.

PAKISTAN:

We are also facing the same issues. We have some financial concerns to participate in the ICANN meetings. We have the long traveling issue.

Like we take our example. Our population is about 185 million, and about a hundred peoples are interacting with the ICANN and participating in the ICANN meetings.

This is the big question and the challenge, for the ICANN to create -- on-board the community, at least maybe at this stage maybe 20 to 25%.

(Indiscernible) suggested that ICANN may increase the fellowship program to keep the other communities, like particularly from the underserved countries, so their government and academia and SMEs, particularly, participate in the forthcoming ICANN meeting.

Thank you very much.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thank you.

Next we have Morocco.

MOROCCO:

Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I have three brief comments.

First of all, when we talk about participation, there are two specific topics that run first. As remember by Argentina, there may be financial concerns. Many countries, not only coming from the Caribbean or the Asia-Pacific region as well as Africa may have financial concerns. So there is a problem there. How can we ensure their engagement, their participation by providing financing by ICANN.

ICANN in general provides financing to 30 participants, but in this case, the Marrakech meeting, we had 30 additional members who received support. 30 for the High-Level Governmental Meeting and 30 for the GAC.

So there was a great effort, and we agree with Argentina that we have to increase even more this financial support provided by ICANN for the underserved regions first.

Secondly, with respect to engagement and interaction, I have mentioned this several times before. It is not necessary to participate in person but we have to be active in our participation. Whether it is in a presentation or in a meeting that

we have with the chair and the co-chairs of the CCWG, there were lots of responses from developing countries. There was a 7% response from African country. That meant that a large number of people could not participate.

So we have to raise awareness in those countries so they may actively participate in these meetings. I think this is the key.

Thirdly, with respect to visas, and thank you very much for having mentioned this topic. During the Marrakech meeting, I would say that there has been a lot of help in that respect. And this practice should be kept for next meeting.

We received some 700, 800 visa applications, so we created a small cell so that it could work in that, and they treated them in two levels. One, the governments -- the visas provided by the Moroccan government, but also we facilitated a way of providing visa by stamping the same at the airport, so the number of systems was bigger as well.

And I congratulate our colleagues that came from very far away and flew many hours: the Cook Islands, the Caribbean region, and all of them.

The GAC had requested in the Dublin communique to the Board that we had to improve the visa service. There was an

improvement in Morocco and we should keep on working on that.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: I have China, the African Union Commission, Viet Nam, U.S.A., Turkey, and then the speaker's list is closed. Thank you. Oh, and our chair. Sorry, Thomas.

China, please.

CHINA: Thank you, Chair. I will speak in Chinese.

As a member of the Asia-Pacific region, we felt the need and the difficulties of attending the GAC conference. We talked about this among our colleagues in the Asia-Pacific region.

We support the Japanese colleague that we need to take advantage of the emails or email list to promote the participation of related countries, and also we can explore more ways, such as a mobile platform or mobile app to involve more people, to make things more convenient for people to participate into the ICANN activities.

Also, we support the U.K. colleague. For instance, I could see that all the GAC representatives, a lot of them are attending IGF forums and ITU activities and other international organizations'

activities. So we can actually combine all of these activities and we can take advantage of other activities to communicate so that GAC representatives can have like a very flexible, informal discussion to talk about GAC/ICANN issues.

So as a Chinese member, we would love to cooperate with Asia-Pacific colleagues to promote our participation in ICANN.

Thank you so much.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thank you, China.

Next we have the African Union Commission.

AFRICAN UNION COMMISSION: Thank you very much, Chair, and thank you for that presentation. And as mentioned by my colleague from Namibia, we sympathize with all the challenges that you mentioned. We may not be traveling that long, but we do sympathize with most of the challenges, from access to the Internet to electricity and all of that.

One of the things that has been very, very helpful is, you know, the African Union has been working very, very closely with ACIG, the secretariat, especially taking into consideration, I'm acknowledging I think what my CTU colleagues mentioned, the

challenges of understanding some of these very technical aspects of ICANN work. And ACIG has been very helpful in trying to distill that into policy briefs that are relevant to our region. And we share a lot of that with members of our own African member states.

Obviously, the challenge is coming to this meeting and physically being able to meaningfully participate and engage in some of these processes because as we mentioned earlier, the workload is actually quite a bit, and so many working groups and too much work anyway.

So I think one of the areas would be with the Underserved Working Group we were discussing is I think to build on that. I think we may need to plan to have capacity-building sessions that are put -- some of those are put on the Web site for members to be able to access some of this material in a way that is helpful to them and they're able to participate, if not on teleconferences and Adobe Connect, perhaps on the mailing list and also being able to understand some of these policy issues that are presented.

And then concurring with the U.K. colleague, we do, actually, discuss a lot of the ICANN issues at the African IGF, and some of these challenges participating in GAC have been mentioned and discussed several times during our ministerial conferences. So

that is something perhaps that the Asia-Pacific region may want to go back to perhaps the IGF or any other opportunity to perhaps come up with positions on some of the issues. And those who are able to participate in GAC physically are able to present those positions.

Thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thank you. Next we have -- I'm sorry, I don't normally face this direction so I'm not sure, is that Korea?

REPUBLIC OF KOREA: Yes, this is Korea. Thank you, chairs. This is very encouraging to have a session dedicated to the AP region at the GAC meeting.

I would like to take this opportunity to share Korea's plan for capacity building for the AP region in this year. Korea is planning to hold an Asia-Pacific Internet governance academy as a joint project with ICANN for the capacity building of AP region. This program will be held in Seoul, Korea in coming August, and target audience will be undergraduate and graduate student level. The academy will be a four- to five-day workshop on Internet governance and related to PIC, including an ICANN academic day, parallel Internet governance workshop featuring noted speakers from the region and beyond, as well as

innovative positions such as mock ICANN conference. The draft program is currently under development.

If you are interested in participating as a speaker of the sessions or want to send a student from your region, please contact me. We are planning to provide some fellowship.

We welcome partners to co-create and co-organize this program.

Thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thank you.

Next we have the United States.

UNITED STATES: Thank you very much. And I'm terribly sorry to take the microphone but I want to thank you all for this presentation, and colleagues in this room, you have made just an extremely strong case for the GAC to pay more attention to capacity-building issues. The GAC is the GAC.

So if we are in agreement, which I understand we tentatively are pretty much, for the June meeting to have an entire day on this issue, I think it would be useful to sort of pick up on Bernadette's suggestion that we -- and I understood the African Union

Commission to be receptive to this, to perhaps add an element to the Underserved Regions Working Group, and to draw on ICANN's engagement staff and maybe offer insight to them to guide, if you will, some of their programs. So I would end with simply a request that, if you could all help populate the agenda for the capacity building meeting and, basically, help us focus on what -- not only what challenges, I think -- it's useful to enumerate. But what changes would you like to see made either in our working methods or the GAC Web site, what tools can we be thinking about. Because I think this is clearly a very, very high priority focus for the GAC. So thank you all.

ANNELIESE WILLIAMS: Thank you, United States. And now we have Turkey.

TURKEY: Thank you, Chair. I sympathize with countries that -- who are underserved by -- in the remote areas of the world and they have difficulty to attend GAC meetings and ICANN meetings over all. Just an idea. Maybe GAC can establish a specific working group or a committee to work on these issues. And, even if somehow there are -- I mean, they all have some kind of problem. Either visa, finance, or transportation issues.

Maybe GAC can dedicate itself and sort of once in a year, maybe, have regional meetings, regional meetings in the underserved areas so that even small workshops dedicated to obtain their input of the underserved regions, that would help the capacity building activities in those regions. Thank you.

ANNELIESE WILLIAMS: Thank you. I think a lot of these issues fit into existing working groups. So we'll try and sort of push them out to those groups.

Finally, I'm going to pass to our chair, Thomas. Thanks.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Anneliese. And thank you for that session. I think that was very useful to be a little bit more concrete about what that means to some who are in a different situation than others. And I guess we're also aware that there's not just one situation. There are many different situations. Some are maybe geographically closer and have other challenges and so on and so forth.

I think -- and I think awareness is one thing. Trying to find actual solution, concrete action that may help overcome these challenges is maybe not as trivial or -- let's put it that way. You would need to have a package of elements for such a solution

where some elements are actually, probably more difficult. But others may actually be rather simple.

To give you one example, the time zone, which is one of the challenges. For the GAC agenda setting meetings, we are having two agenda setting calls to get rid of the time zone problem, so there's not -- and night for some and day for the others.

On the western hemisphere call normally have something like between 20 and 30 participants, not including the staff and myself and so on. In the eastern hemisphere you have something between three and seven participants. So, even if the time zone is the right one, there's still a problem in participation.

So that shows to me that the problem is more complex. The time zone is one element we need to consider. And the other is probably the question of workload and connectivity and so on and so forth. But that's a phone call. That's just a phone call. It's not even the connectivity either, not the electricity only. So it is complex. And I think we can try -- if you say we need to create a new mailing list or a new working group, I'm not sure whether that solves the problem. Because, if you receive 200 emails but you have 15 international organizations on your plate, that does not help. So we should try to come up with measures that they try -- they don't actually even create another burden. We should try to simplify things.

And the only ways or the key ways, I think, to simplify through using the secretariat -- and then again that needs to be funded -- to provide for briefing papers, things that actually save you the time of going through 15 documents trying to find out which one is relevant, if you have a convention of issues that allows -- gives easier access to prioritize, because it's about prioritization, that's one key element.

And we're glad that we have the secretariat that actually does a tremendous job, not just for everybody, where you have more or less resources, these documents help you to prioritize, help you to get easy access.

And the second thing is -- and I strongly support what China has said. Others, too; but China, I think, was very clear. The only way to do this is to get together, group together and share the burden, whether this is among countries in a region or it's countries based on development levels and so on. You have to -- all of us we have to share the burden. We have to trust each other. If you see how we work in the U.N. or the ITU and in other groups, there are regional coordination groups. There's the APT. There's the CPT. Where also in Europe, Lichtenstein has 30,000 people. They may have a lot of money, but they have very little people. So they need to rely on others. They need to group together and say trust other to say okay. Give me a five-minute update on this issue, because I have 50 more issues that I can't

cover. So we need to find groups of trusted people that share the burden and then, basically, maybe even represent some other countries. This is something we have to think about. Not 10 people come to a meeting, but one that may speak for the 10. This is just thinking out loud. So the sharing of the burden, either geographically or on other issues like -- you have the G77 because I'm not sure whether every island state is able to go to U.N. meetings. But you need to think about better representation, better coordination, sharing the burden, trusting each other. But that goes for all regions, not just for one. And only then we will be more inclusive, no matter what technical tools we introduce. Thank you.

ANNELIESE WILLIAMS: Thank you. I think we'll leave it there. We've got some ideas that we can probably hold over for the next session, because on the Web site it might solve some of these problems. But thank you all for coming and for listening. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. We are running slightly late. But I think we have discussed a few important things that merit the time because we never have the time. So sometimes we just need to take the time.

Okay. The next one is about the GAC Web site. We'll get an update. I think Michelle and a few others. Please start.

MICHELLE SCOTT-TUCKER: There's been a team working on updating the GAC Web site. And when I say "updating," I mean completely overhauling and revamping.

Tracey Hind from the ACIG GAC secretariat has been leading it from our side. She's been working very closely with Julia and Karine from the ICANN site. We've had some GAC members working with us on that as well. That's why Pru (phonetic) is staying up here, because she's been on that team and working hard on that. You didn't know how good Pru was until this meeting, did you? But she's been working really hard behind the scenes.

And we've been working hard with the ICANN I.T. people as well who have been fabulously helpful. They're going to do a presentation for you now on what the new GAC site might look like. Two of them have been online in the chatroom for about the last hour. And it's about 3:00 or 4:00 a.m. in the morning for them. I really appreciate them waiting, and I appreciate the work that they've been doing. So I'd just like to say thank you to them.

And I'll hand over to Laura Bengford from the ICANN I.T. team who will introduce her team and introduce you to the new vision for the GAC Web site. Thanks.

LAURA BENGFORD: Yes, hello, everyone. Thank you, Michelle.

My name is Laura Bengford. I'm on ICANN staff. I work for digital services. I'm joined here with Chris Gift. And my colleagues that are remotely participating, Steve Allison and Jeff Salem, who are -- Jeff is going to walk us through a couple mockups.

So I just want to go through a couple slides here. I know the agenda is a little bit behind, so we'll try to be brief and talk about the work that we're doing and what we're trying to accomplish and help the GAC with their initiatives.

Next slide.

So just, real quickly, it wasn't too long ago on 2011 that the first GAC Web site was created. It was created on a platform called "Confluence," which is a wiki platform. That's one of the reasons that we're struggling a little bit. It's not truly a web platform. In 2014 the ACIG conducted a review on behalf of GAC. And that had some very important findings that we've been using to kind of guide our efforts on the Web site.

In 2015 we did get the conclusions from those reports, and we -- the key finding was that it just wasn't really adequately supporting what the GAC needed to do for their processes.

So just going backwards to last June in Buenos Aires, ICANN 53, we started the -- we appointed the Technology Task Force. So they were going to be leading the development effort.

This is a community-driven effort. And it will be really helped in some of the items that were mentioned in the previous section about how a Web site can really help engage the far regions and some of the suggestions. It's going to be very important for us to reach out and get some help on that Technology Task Force to get us where we need to go and to really help with these efforts.

So let's go to the next slide. Just a quick summary of what we're trying to solve with the current Web site.

It's not a very good user experience. Part of that, as I mentioned is because it is on an outdated technology platform.

We're hoping to solve some of the organizational elements of that to make it easier to find the information that you need or at least link out to where that should be. And we'll show you that in a few minutes.

And, lastly, we really want to make sure that we understand the business processes and how you work. So how you're providing

the advice today, how you prepare for those meetings, how you work within the working groups in building consensus and working on your documents and communicate so that we can present that work, that important work in an interesting and compelling way.

Next slide.

The outcomes that are -- we want to support for GAC are as follows: Firstly, the GAC advice that's provided to the Board and providing and delivering that in a way that's easy to read, easy to follow, and to also look at the impact of that important work and what was the end result of that. We also want to make sure, as was discussed in detail in the prior session, that we enable the remote GAC members around the world to contribute in an equal way and to help those discussions with tools and information that can help some of these barriers that we have. We also want to support the work of the working groups and be able to highlight and show you the work that comes out of those in an open and transparent way.

Finally, we want to make sure -- as there's many meetings and working groups and task force working, that we're highlighting those activities not only within GAC but how they fit in the overall ICANN ecosystem as well. So we want to build a platform

that will allow us to evolve and continue to provide that information to you.

So real quickly on the last -- the next slide. Then we're going to go in and share some mockups for you.

I just want to kind of go through really quick some of the work that's been done since Dublin. Probably the most important accomplishment that's been made working with the task force is and ICANN staff in Los Angeles is that we have selected a new web platform that we'll be using. It's an open source platform, and it's going to accelerate our ability to deliver Web sites quicker.

We just finished launching the at-large Web site. That was a long effort. It was very successful. And we're hoping to build upon that and just do it a little bit faster.

We want to also make sure we understand the business processes. So we've done some work at looking at how the business processes and working with the TTF and ACIG are conducted. And then we'll be doing some work with those teams to look at what the to-be processes are, knowing that processes are always evolving. We've done some site maps and put together some templates. And, in interest of time, I'd like to jump right into the mockups.

And I'm going to turn it over to my colleague Jeff Salem. And just keep in mind, as Jeff walks us through some of these initial mockups that we have, there are pages -- a couple of pages for news and advice. And, just keep in mind that they are mockups, not the real Web site yet. The data isn't necessarily real. And they're a work in progress. So, at this point, I'd like to turn it over to my colleague, Jeff Salem.

JEFF SALEM: Thank you, Laura. Can you hear me?

LAURA BENGFORD: Yes, we can. Thank you.

JEFF SALEM: I hear the echo of myself. Thank you.

Okay. So, as Laura said, we just want to show a typical Web site experience just to provide a preview of some of the design work that we've completed to date.

And I just wanted to reiterate that, while the experience we're looking at is kind of a real world experience, the data is a mix of both fiction and historic content from a previous meeting. So please disregard the specific data elements on the pages.

That being said, we can look at the first screen.

And, as you zoom in or zoom out of the page, I'll just briefly introduce the concept. And that is that we are following a user -- Tracy Hackshaw, in this instance, is one of the key members of the TTF right now -- as he goes through a typical ICANN meeting experience.

So in this fictional experience he's starting in the meeting now. And what he wishes to do is plan the rest of his day and be sure he's prepared to contribute to the communique drafting session later this afternoon.

So, to that end, he logs into the system and navigates to the GAC meetings and records page, which we're currently looking at. On the page he immediately notices that there are recordings available from this morning's session on CCWG session on country territory naming of TLDs.

Excellent. He had hoped to revisit this session. And now he can make plans to revisit the recording later tonight.

He then sees that a session is scheduled for this afternoon regarding the use of three-letter country codes as gTLDs.

This is a session that he's been looking forward to attending.

So he clicks on the meeting and goes to the next page.

Next slide, please.

On this page he sees an expanded view of the meeting where he has access to briefing materials and presentation materials, so he's truly prepared to prepare for the meeting later this afternoon.

Knowing that he's prepared for the meeting, he's now free to check what's going on in the rest of the GAC world. So he goes to the news index page to see -- to find the latest news.

Next slide, please.

As he peruses the news, he sees in the second element there that a final draft of the ICANN 55 communique has been published.

He's now able to look at the draft of the communique in realtime, so he clicks on that communique. And here we see a draft version of the communique before it's available to the general public. It is available for GAC members with special features that include in the red bar at the top an alert notifying them that this is a draft and the ability to download a Word version of the document and provide feedback to the secretariat directly. This way some editing can happen before the actual communique drafting session and all members can work on the latest document from the very beginning of that session.

So this, basically, wraps up the demo. We wanted to keep it brief and just talk about an experience that's very familiar to you

guys. This being you have been attending a meeting and drafting the communique. But we're building upon these designs to cover, basically, all of the work flows that the GAC follows to produce its advice. That being said, I'll pass it back to Laura and the team in Marrakech. Thank you.

LAURA BENGFORD:

Okay. Thank you very much, Jeff. I know that was a very quick preview. I just want to make a couple comments. And I put a note in the chatroom.

What's really going to help us make this Web site work better and help solve some of the problems that you have today is your help with giving us feedback. We can take any questions right now. But I also wanted to make sure, if we go to the next slide, that you have an opportunity to reach out to us and where you can go to give us feedback and find out more about the Web site.

So we do have in the materials a link out to an area on the existing Web site that we will keep you posted and be posting any mockups that you have so you can give us feedback. It is very helpful, we found in the last experience at the last Web site, that we got a lot of feedback from within the regions and around the world . And that really helped us. We are looking -- the TTF is looking for 10 to 15 volunteers to just help us be kind of an

advisory and make sure we're on the right track to build a new Web site for you.

Thank you very much. And I'll hand it back over to Michelle.

MICHELLE SCOTT-TUCKER: Thank you. If you want to volunteer to be one of the Web site testers, really, you get to have your say and play with it and tell us what's working and what's not. Just send an email to any one of the secretariat members, either to Julia or to me or probably to Tracey at acig.com.au. And we'll make sure we round you up and get you into that process. But the more volunteers the better and better the Web site will be.

Does anyone have any questions for ICANN's team while we've got them here?

New Zealand.

NEW ZEALAND: Thank you, Michelle. Not a question but more of a comment. I just wanted to say that I think this looks fantastic, to be honest, and well done to the team.

Thank you.

MICHELLE SCOTT-TUCKER: Any other questions?

Indonesia.

INDONESIA:

Just a short question. Yesterday, I think, when we are talking about gTLD, about Namibia, for example, one of the comment is after the news is (indiscernible) for 60 days, it will be processed, something like that.

Now, is it possible for the Web sites or the email to make something like -- what you call it? -- (indiscernible) wake-up call, something like that? That's for example. I don't know. The kind of things of your response is an emergency and we need your response now. Things like that.

And it can be passed through emails, it can be passed through WhatsApp or, I don't know, telephone line or SMS or something like that. How can we mix it together so we don't have problems? As Tom mentioned, workload is so much sometimes, 15 organizations, and tomorrow frequency has been allocated. What can we do?

Thank you.

MICHELLE SCOTT-TUCKER: Okay. So we've had a request that if it's possible to build some alerts into the Web site. The I.T. people will take that on notice and see what they can do.

Palestine.

PALESTINE: I prefer to talk in Arabic, please.

Ladies and gentlemen, good afternoon. As you have seen, they have presented the new Web site here for IGF, but as a newcomer for GAC, I have confronted a lot of problems and challenges to navigate through this Web site.

I think, please, find a solution for the acronyms and the abbreviations because I really mix between them.

In addition to if you can put the plan or the map how to put the links together or how I can access them so I would avoid all these kind of challenges to navigate GAC Web site.

Thank you.

MICHELLE SCOTT-TUCKER: Thanks, Palestine. Noted. Definitely.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, thank you for that. I just want to make a couple comments on not only the acronym and glossaries. We actually have a new librarian slash information scientist on board that's going to help us with our acronyms and glossaries. And it's also very important for us to have the translations of those and a translated experience.

So what we did, for just a quick example, on At Large, we have our language services team. They're part of the Web team. They're helping us in many, many ways with providing information to translation tools on Web sites as well as translating content that is important.

So just wanted to mention that real quick.

Thank you.

MICHELLE SCOTT-TUCKER: Yes, Palestine.

PALESTINE: When I talked about the provisions, I did not talk about translation. GAC, it is related to the government advisory council. Everybody should -- you should not write GAC. You should write actually Government Advisory Committee. I don't want the translation.

You just put acronyms and abbreviations. I just want you to write the whole name in English, in a full language. And I would like to have some briefing about what they are doing, their entity. Maybe just put like sometimes I navigate in 13 link -- 13 link or Web sites just to find what does the acronym GAC means or ACs means. Just I want you to put a brief idea about it on your Web site.

Thank you.

MICHELLE SCOTT-TUCKER: Thank you. Noted. We'll try to do that, Palestine.

U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you. Nick Shorey here.

I think the Web site looks great, so well done. I know it's an iterative thing, but it's certainly well done on the first efforts. One thing I wondered for quite a while, and I just spoke to Ryan here, and it picks up on a comment that the U.S. made in one of the earlier sessions about finding -- sort of getting to know the GAC better. And one thing I thought might support that was actually having, you know, a photograph, a section within -- where the last of Guinea Conakry GAC members is, where you

can have a photograph, an image of your GAC representative would really, really help that if you have the ability to put that in, and sort of the facility for GAC reps when they're uploading their information to have a link to their LinkedIn page. Things like that that would help socialize it a bit more.

Thank you.

MICHELLE SCOTT-TUCKER: I know Egypt asked me to put that on earlier today, too, and I passed it on to Tracey Hind who is following this conversation. And her response was easy, done, we will have a photo booth at Meeting C. Now she's probably going to smack me for saying that out loud.

If we don't have any other questions, I think we'll close this session and move on and thank very much everyone who has been involved in this: Tracy Hackshaw, Tepua, Choon-Sai from Singapore has been great, the ICANN IT team have been so helpful, and the ICANN GAC support team have been really good. It's a real joint effort.

Thank you.

Thanks all of those you named and whoever else was, in one way or another, involved in this. I think that it looks like we will

have a tool that will help us also be more efficient and give easier access.

And just to what our colleague from, I think, Palestine has said, the whole issue of trying to be inclusive, and so on, it starts when you use your silo language with all the abbreviations and all these things, where you write documents and you don't put the date on it, you don't put your name on it, you don't put on it to whom it is addressed to or which process to which this belongs. I keep repeating this over and over again, but it definite makes a difference if -- on the Web site it's called usability. If you help people find out quicker or less quick what this is about, who is behind it, and so on and so forth. I stop there, but this is something that really sets me up that this is in many fora, but also here, is not taken serious enough how important it is. It looks like a tiny detail but it actually makes a difference.

With this, I think we have one last thing to go. I know that we are slightly late, but the public forum only starts at 1:30, and since we all don't need to eat because we've eaten already too much during this week, so I think we can easily take a few more minutes and actually not start the planning, because we think we have elements -- we have elements that had elements throughout the day and even before that, but I think we should get to some understanding on how we prepare for the next

meeting. I don't know whether you want to show your beautiful timeline, so we wait for this, the slides to come up.

Of course this is very much linked on practical terms on the B meeting structure discussion, but I think in terms of substance and priorities and also on some issues regarding working methods, and so on, which is not necessarily needs to be done in the -- in the operating principles. Things like how we deal with working groups, is and so on. I think there is a need for clarification that we can do before the work of the operating principle.

There's one thing maybe we can start with while we wait for the slide.

As we know, the CCWG work is not over. There's one important step that has been accomplished this week. Work will continue. And there was a -- this is why some people were absent this morning. There was a CCWG meeting going on in parallel to our work, where some GAC members have been participating to that. And that raised, and it was already communicated before in email, it raised the question of renewing or continuing the membership in the CCWG for Work Stream 2. We cannot make this too long because we have no time, and I will give the floor to whoever wants from those who were in that meeting.

The key is the GAC will at some point in time, rather soon probably, need to decide who will represent the GAC in Work Stream 2, and whatever, the follow-up work in the CCWG. From what I hear, there's a preference for having people continue. But as we have seen, that the workload is immense on those who seriously participate.

I think we also need to discuss the expectations of members that are members of the GAC that will be members of the CCWG.

So it may be useful to have a very quick discussion about this right now that we understand what we expect from those that participate will continue or will newly participate in the CCWG in terms of work that they would be willing to do. And if -- and that everybody would make an honest assessment about what their resources are and to what extent it may be useful to continue or not continue with this.

I stop here from my side, and would just like to invite one or two, maybe, interventions from those who participated and to report and help us make a decision.

Pakistan and Argentina.

PAKISTAN: I'm will go to participate and volunteer in the CCWG.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Let's not ask for who is willing to volunteer. Let's ask first what it means for those who -- and also whether the current ones would like to continue or not. Maybe some indications about this. But first of all, what does this mean? After the experience of the past to participate.

Thank you. Argentina.

ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. Me and other GAC colleagues were in the accountability meeting this morning. Apart from the fact that the chartering organizations should really review who is participating, there was a very strong call for diversity. So the idea is to have more participation not only from members but also from other participants.

The exchange of -- in the email list and in the calls, really there was not much difference in between former participants and other members in the group. So I would encourage those GAC members that want to join the discussion.

It is extremely time consuming for us. I know Pedro and some others in the region had to wake up at 3:00 or 2:00 a.m. in the

morning. My husband usually asked me why I should do that and I said it's accountability, and he said that's strange, but that happened. The other two times were quite okay. So it's extremely time consuming.

The speed of comments and the speed of changes in the email list is extremely challenging, because you have to follow them almost minute by minute.

So -- At the same time, it's a fantastic learning experience, and I feel very grateful for being appointed to that. And whether you may have been in align with some ideas I had or not, I had really devoted an important amount of time, and I would like to express my desire of continuing to participate in the group.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I have I don't remember, Iran, U.K. Please not be brief. Please not more than a minute each.

Ireland, thank you.

IRELAND: Thank you, Chair, and thank you for the colleagues, from Olga previously.

Obviously it's very useful to know that the participation of all is encouraged as we go forward, and I'm certainly hoping to participate if and when I can.

I wonder if I can just ask -- and forgive me for not knowing this off the top of my head, could there be some kind of clarification as to what it means to be a GAC representative representing the GAC as a whole in taking part in the group?

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you for that question. There's no such thing as a GAC representative. Nobody represents the GAC in any of these groups because you would have to have a consolidated GAC position in order to represent the GAC. You represent yourself as a GAC member in order to bring in views from the GAC, but not a GAC view. That is something completely different.

So you cannot speak on behalf of the GAC. You can only speak on behalf of your country. Like all the others are not representatives of -- they don't represent the GNSO, the ccNSO. They speak of themselves, but with the background that they come from, the GNSO or wherever that may be.

I hope that clarifies.

And just to support what Olga said, the difference between a member and a participant is almost zero. The straw polls, if they go to vote, it's normally like informal votes where everybody that is on the call can participate, whether you're a member or not. It's only the formal votes they would take, like issuing a minority statement is something you can only do as a member, not as a participant. But apart from that, there's really no difference.

Thank you. Iran, U.K., and Denmark.

IRAN:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As you mentioned, there's no limit to the participation. Anyone can participate so I don't think we need to volunteer ourselves to participate. It is open to almost everybody, and so on and so forth.

It was mentioned it might be preferable those people who have been already there as a member to continue, unless the chartering organizations advise otherwise. So I don't think there is major differences.

As Olga mentioned, this is considerable amount of work people should do. Sometimes maybe hours per day, during the month, so on, so forth. So just encouragement to participate, with night sessions sometimes, so on, so forth.

If you allow us some time, I just brief you something happen between now and the 15th of July.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. No, there is another difference between a member and a participant. The member gets travel support, the hotel funded and so on and so forth. The participant doesn't get it. That may be a difference for some, just so we are aware of it.

Okay. U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Yes, thank you. I am a participant, and I'll expect I will continue. I will certainly affirm I continue. As a participant you have to provide a Statement of Interest. So you can't just sort of join a call. You have to join and provide a Statement of Interest setting out who you are, who you represent, and so on, constituency and whatever.

There are occasional physical meetings. I don't know if Work Stream envisages that, outside of the ICANN meeting framework. For CCWG there were three: Santa Monica and Frankfurt and Paris, was it, we all went to?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Istanbul and --

UNITED KINGDOM: Istanbul, sorry.

And so -- And it is -- prepare for your inbox to be completely exploded. You can't just sort of take part and sort of drop out for a while and then rejoin. It really means you have to commit. I can't say I joined every call. Few could claim that. But it is a major commitment. It's just as Olga said, an incredible experience. You get to interact with a wide range of people and hear different perspectives that perhaps you hadn't even envisaged. So anyway, that's my addition. I will continue to be a participant.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Denmark.

DENMARK: Thank you very much. Yes, as other colleagues have said, this has been -- there has been a lot of work here, and I think it's very welcome if more colleagues will participate, and we are very grateful for actually all the help that we've got and all the

participants from other governments in this work. This is very important.

We are willing to continue to be the member. And when I, in a couple of months, will go on maternity leave, Finn could take over. However, we also open if other people from the European region would like to be the member, we would also be open to that, of course.

My understanding of this, or what I have tried to do along these 14 months, has been to inform the European countries about what has been going on. And I think that has been -- and there has been exchange of views, as well.

So, yeah. This is what we have been trying to do to our best ability.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Germany and the U.S. And Morocco.

GERMANY: Thank you very much. First of all, I wanted to thank Julia and Finn, but especially Julia for the work you have done, informing us, as well, the representative of the European region.

As I understood this morning, I'm not sure if you can back me up on this, we don't necessarily have to decide about the members now.

It is, of course, a good moment to reflect, and like if somebody says, oh, no, my social life is obliterated, I cannot do this anymore or I have other work commitments or so, this is, of course, a very good moment to reflect and maybe reshuffle, but as a chartering organization, the GAC would also be free to just exchange a specific member or a number of them if we so choose.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

U.S.

UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. I know we're running quite late. I just wanted to comment on the question raised by Ireland. And I appreciate Rory's question.

I do think we need to be absolutely crystal clear to ourselves and to the broader community that the so-called GAC members are actually unable to represent GAC views until such time that the GAC has a shared GAC position. And that makes it very, very

delicate. So members are -- maybe we need to make this more clear in writing. To the extent there are members participating, it's in their own capacity, representing their own country. To the extent some of you in some regions have a preexisting structure, as our colleagues in Europe do, it's a lot easier to coordinate.

But I do think this is one of our working method issues that we absolutely have to tackle. What are the rules? What are the guidelines?

The quick movement of the work of the CCWG made it impossible for many of us to report back to colleagues in, quote, "our region."

I also think the regional approach is very challenging for the GAC because it, frankly, doesn't work except for those who have the good fortune of having preexisting structures. Most of the rest of us do not and I think it's very challenging for them.

I think we need to be crystal clear. This comes up over and over and over in the ICANN community: Just have a few GAC people and you have a GAC view. So I do think we need to be absolutely clear that that is not, in fact, the case until such time as we have been able to arrive at one.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, U.S. I thought I said the same but perhaps we need to put it in writing because then people can re-read it, not just inside the GAC but also outside the GAC and re-read it so many times until they actually do understand it.

So I'm with you there.

Morocco.

MOROCCO: Thank you, Chair. First of all. I would like to thank all the colleagues that have represented the GAC, quote, unquote, in the CCWG; because this is a very challenging task. So much so that it is almost unfathomable at times. And they did a very good job. They engaged. They updated all the other colleagues and, in that regard, participation is open. So we do have to understand that all the GAC members in that group participate by using all the possible channels. There is a proverb which says that you don't change your winning team. So the GAC members that represented us really performed in an outstanding way. They do have the experience. They do have all the necessary support. And they can continue in this second part of the CCWG tasks. So I would like to express my wish to see these colleagues engaged in this second state. Thank you.

Brazil has the floor.

BRAZIL:

I express that I agree with those that actually will join those who are calling for more active participation of GAC representatives in the CCWG. I think compared to other constituencies, GAC participation hasn't been that high in the group. So I really encourage other colleagues to participate, especially since the group is open.

Although there is not, say, a big difference between members and participants, but I think especially because members get funded and have voting rights, I think there is a special requirement that there is a more active engagement of members compared to participants.

So I would really call for those who are members at the moment of the GAC in that group to make an honest assessment of their participation and their capability of participation in the future and really see whether it would be the case to probably leave others who want to have a more active participation to join as a member in the group. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Brazil. And I think you make a valid point. I think there has been an active participation from GAC representatives. But many were not the actual members, but they were

participants. And there has been some discussion also on the GAC e-mailing list about expectations of those who are members in the CCWG that come from the GAC that they should be -- whoever is a member will continue to be, will be a new member that there is an expectation that they would more actively -- some of them do, but not all of them have done it so far -- they would more actively participate in the discussions and/or take efforts to report to the GAC on what is going on, help the other GAC members who are not members or not participants catch up, help us with providing for first-hand information so that I can only support what Brazil and some others have said.

Those five, if the number will remain, who will be the formal members, I think they have a special duty that goes with that voting right and with the funding of their travels that they actually are willing to take up a minimal amount of work through participating in meetings, through being active, to the extent they can. But also -- and this is not to be underestimated -- through reporting, keeping the GAC informed, guiding the GAC about the discussions. And I would also urge on Brazil -- I'm urging everybody to make a sincere assessment if everybody thinks that this is feasible for them or not and if maybe it is difficult and think about giving the place to somebody else who has a higher chance to live up to that expectation.

I think we have to conclude here. We don't -- we don't have to go into details. And -- yeah. Okay. Thank you. Argentina.

ARGENTINA: Thank you. Just a clarification. And, for the record, those very active -- there was -- I'm a member. And I was very active. It's not that I'm an observer to the group. Just want to keep that in the record. Because what you said is that members from the GAC were active only that -- only observers were active. That's not the case.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: That's not what I said.

ARGENTINA: That's what I understood. So my apologies, if I understood you wrong.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. That is noted. We will have to stop here. We don't have to decide today. But we have to decide rather soon. Let's put it that way. We will be notified about the deadlines and so on. We have to move on to the next -- to the slide see that you see on the screen. And I immediately give the floor to our secretariat. Thank you.

TOM DALE:

Thank you, Thomas. This will be very brief. Because the slide you see before you, I think, is already out of date in terms of its concepts and structure, if not the dates.

In light of the discussions that have taken place over the last week and, indeed, in the GAC this morning concerning the meeting in June this year, the so-called B meeting. So I'll go -- I'll run through the dates quickly. But I have to emphasize that what we're taking away from the discussions here in the GAC and from the discussions that are likely to take place across ICANN from the Board level down about the B meeting are that we will not be preparing just the traditional GAC agenda. If the GAC is just having one day of a meeting, well, we can prepare a one-day agenda and get you feedback on that. But the rest of the meeting is a GAC schedule, if you like. And a GAC schedule of a sort that hasn't been planned for before in relation to the whole community. So that's challenging. But we like a challenge, and that's what we paid for.

So, with that qualification, let me just quickly note some of the key dates leading into the production of the GAC schedule and the briefing. And the briefing also will need to be rethought, depending on who the GAC is meeting with and how and when.

So, having said that all, we will be circulating the draft minutes of the Marrakech meeting by the 18th of March or thereabouts.

We certainly intend to have them finalized by the end of this month, if at all possible.

The intention is to have a draft schedule available to you for discussion on a GAC call in mid April.

Now, that's dependent on a lot of factors, some of them outside the GAC's control. But you're already aware of that through the discussions this morning. That's the intention. The intention, certainly, is to have the traditional agenda setting or schedule setting calls. We will provide -- we will build in the normal time to prepare appropriate supporting documentation and have them available within the time frames you see on the slide.

However, I have to stress again that we are preparing something quite different. That is not a traditional GAC meeting. It is a new format. That's a good thing. Because the community and the GAC, indeed, are asking for that. And we are certainly hoping to be responsive to what the GAC requires. But it is going to be different. Please remember that. Please bear with us if we have to experiment a bit and get your feedback. Okay?

And there will have to be considerable amount of coordination across ICANN with ICANN staff, with SO/AC members, and, indeed, at the Board level, as you heard.

I think the only other point I'd make is that, in terms of substantive work at this stage, my own assessment having listened to this meeting this week and got your feedback, is that the substantive issues on which the GAC would need to make some progress and perhaps to make some decisions in process, if you like, focus around the major PDP work, that is the one dealing with subsequent rounds or future rounds of new gTLDs. The privacy and proxy services EE issue, which you heard about this week. And one that has been flagged but which you have not discussed in detail and that concerns the PDP on rights protection mechanisms, which has a lot of significant issues for public policy.

Working group EE issues will be progressed, as you've noted. The CCWG Work Stream 2 work will also be an issue. And all I can say is we will be addressing that slide and starting to put something that is in more than one dimension, quite frankly, for the process there. So I'll leave it there. Thank you. My colleague may wish to add.

MICHELLE SCOTT-TUCKER: I'd like to bring to the attention of the working group, chairs and co-chairs, that 20 May date, which is where the papers, any papers from your working group that need to be distributed to the GAC for them to consider at that meeting, either for endorsement for the decision making, or any of those things, all those sorts of documents need to be finalized by the working group before they come to the AC GAC secretariat for distribution by 20 May.

So I know tomorrow you're all going to go away and start working on your work plans. The date you want to put in red is 20 May, because anything that needs to go to the June meeting for distribution or discussion needs to be finalized by the working group by 20 May and then sent to ACIG so that we can make it look pretty. Thanks.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Questions or comments on the timeline? I think we don't have the time to go into any further big discussions.

But I think the priorities in terms of issues have emerged, at least to some extent. So that gives us some guidance on what we will expect in terms of key issues for Helsinki. I think we can name it.

And the rest we'll sort out on the fly, including the CCWG follow-up actions. So questions and comments, and then we'll conclude. Thank you.

Everything clear? Everything so unclear that it's not worth -- ah, thank you. Japan, thanks.

JAPAN:

Thank you. We appreciate the executive very much for the patience in the GAC this transition. Urge the GAC to pass this proposal that comes from your leadership. So very much thank you at this moment. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. For the statement. Olof.

OLOF NORDLING:

Very briefly, since -- thank you, Chair.

Since the matter of travel support was brought up earlier, two things. First of all, it's very short time until the next meeting. So please be aware and pay attention to an email that will be sent out very shortly.

The deadline will be short for requesting travel support.

And, well, just to set the record straight, there are 30 plus 5 GAC members, five predetermined observers for each -- supported for each GAC meeting right now. And we requested an increase to 54 the next year.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Yes, that actually refers to --

OLOF NORDLING: And priority is, indeed, given to least developed countries and small island developing states in the allocation of that travel funding. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: And that, actually, refers to what Olga has mentioned previously. In one of her first discussions with Fadi with the new leadership team, we actually raised this issue. And he promised to do everything so that we get this increase. So we'll see whether he was -- will have been successful. Maybe those who are before -- before he's leaving, don't feel afraid to ask him where ICANN is with the increase from 30 to 50. It's never a shame to ask for something that has been promised or at least outlined to do everything they can. I'll stop here. I think we should definitely once more thank the interpreters for their excellent service.

[Applause]

And all the other people like I.T. staff, the logistics team, and so on and so forth who take care of us that we have a table and chair, microphone, Internet connection, and whatever we need. And, of course, again, to our hybrid secretariat, Julia, Olof, and whoever else is there, Karine and others from ICANN, and Tracey is not here. But -- what's his name? Tom. And Michelle. And whoever else is working behind the scenes also in ACIG.

Thank you all very much. And, of course, thanks to you for this very constructive atmosphere in which we have been able to achieve quite a few bits that I think are remarkable. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

And, if you have not had enough of ICANN, the public forum starts in three minutes.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]