

---

MARRAKECH – GAC Sunday Afternoon Sessions  
Sunday, March 06, 2016 – 14:00 to 18:00 WET  
ICANN55 | Marrakech, Morocco

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: We are resuming our meeting. Today we have in our agenda a topic that is very important for consumers, particularly for the countries we are representing here. So I will give the floor -- we have -- we are starting the meeting a few minutes late.

But I'm going to give the floor to Kapin and Megan. They are the members of the CCT review team -- competition, consumer choice, and consumer trust review team. And they will tell us how they started their work with this team in this very first months of the years, which are the steps ahead and the future stages. Megan and Laureen, you have the floor, please.

MEGAN RICHARDS: I'm tempted to continue in French, but I think I'd better continue in English.

So, first of all, Thomas, thank you for inviting both of us here.

The competition, consumer choice, and consumer trust review team is one that was established and foreseen under the Affirmation of Commitments as you know. And there were a

---

*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.*

---

number of volunteers identified to participate on the team. And Thomas and Fadi Chehade got together to decide on the outcome of that group. And I am representing the GAC on the group. And Laureen is representing Thomas because Thomas is an ex officio member of the team.

So what we thought we would do very briefly is give you an idea of how far the work has gone now and where we plan to go next and see what kind of input or questions you might have. I wanted to tell you, too, that there is a public open meeting on Wednesday at 5:15 where the chair of the review team will make a presentation in much more detail than we're going to do and also have contributions from the whole community. So you will have another chance to make any contributions that you might like to do.

So, as I said, there's a group of representatives from different parts of the community working on this review team. The work started in January this year with a couple of telephone conference calls, which were relatively brief but quite useful to develop the terms of reference to develop a program of work.

Then we had our first face-to-face meeting in Los Angeles at the end of February, two full days, quite intense and very useful. I must say -- but I will let Laureen have her opinion on this, too. From my perspective, the participants in the group all well-

---

qualified. They all bring particular strengths to the group. And I think it's a very nice team and a very good group that has been brought together to do this work.

So we're doing, as I said, competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice in the context of the review of the current -- the new gTLDs, I should say, not the current gTLDs.

And we have a lot of data that's already been developed by previous groups or in the context of the ccTLD reviews or in the overall review of progress under the current round, et cetera.

And the group has divided into two. One to look after safeguards and consumer protection, which Laureen is chair of, and another group that is looking at competition issues and consumer choice.

As I said, Jonathan Zuck is the chair of the overall group. All the documents are available online, so you can access them any time you like.

And we agreed also that we would have observers who are freely able to participate in any online discussions and any online meetings. They have to identify themselves. They can't be anonymous. And they're more than welcome to participate, but not to participate in the discussions initially. They can send questions. They can ask questions, et cetera, in writing. And

---

they will be responded to. But we thought, in the interests of efficiency and just because we have a very short period of time, if we opened it up to discussion, full oral discussion on every single topic, we wouldn't make much progress.

So that's all I wanted to say. And, Laureen, I pass it to you.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Thank you, Megan.

Well, I heartily concur with Megan's assessment. It's a very good group. It's a diverse group. And I think, most importantly, it's a practical group that really wants to get the work done and come up with recommendations that actually can be implemented. So I'm very excited and very optimistic about the group. And we're all looking forward to rolling up our sleeves and getting to work.

I'm going to be focusing on the consumer protection and safeguards issues. And, broadly, we're going to be looking at a couple of different issues that we've identified thus far. This isn't a comprehensive list. We're going to get public input, and things may change.

But, just to give you a sort of preview of some of the broad issues we're going to focus on, here they are.

---

One is can the public safely navigate to and use new gTLDs? That would include folks being able to reach their intended destination. And that destination is a safe one.

We're also going to be looking at, two, the impact of the public interest commitments and the safeguards. We're particularly interested in whether the public interest commitments are being enforced and the public interest commitments for gTLDs in highly regulated sectors. Of course, this has been an issue of ongoing GAC advice the last issue.

Three: The risk of confusion and domain name system abuse. Particularly, the risk of confusion between -- for users between similarly named gTLDs. And, of course, risks associated with botnets, pharming, phishing, malware, et cetera.

Three: We're very interested in developing countries and the fairness of the new gTLD process, application process as it relates to developing countries and whether there's been sufficient access to assistance.

And also, lastly, trademark issues. Pricing models, the absence of restrictions on prices and rights protection mechanisms.

I'm just making sure I haven't skipped anything.

So, basically, that's sort of a broad overview. And, as I said, we're looking forward to getting to work. And there's also going

---

to be a public session where we're going to be giving a brief overview and soliciting feedback from the public. And I think, with that, we're happy to take any questions.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Megan and Laureen. Questions or comments from the members and observers of the GAC? Argentina.

ARGENTINA: Thank you much for the presentation. I'm here.

I've been quite absorbed by other processes within the GAC and just a question about, if this group is starting -- as a cross-community working group, it's starting to work and if others can join into the list. This is the first question.

And then, if you could give us some more detail about the number three of the list that you mentioned, the participation of developing countries in the new gTLD process.

As you may know, there were very few applications from Latin America and Africa, although there were efforts made in order to reach out to the communities. But there were some perhaps not deeply understanding the complexity or the purpose or some other details. If you could give us some more details about that point.

---

Thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Thanks for your questions, Olga. First of all, the review team, is -  
- as Megan said, it's open to observers. And I think one of my  
colleagues, Eleeza Agopian, who is going to stand up now, I  
think, is in the audience and can give you precise and specific  
information about that, because I don't want to get it wrong.  
But, yes, there is a way for you to be able to participate. And it  
looks like Eleeza is going to take the mic.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Thank you, Laureen. This is Eleeza Agopian from ICANN.

So the review team is open to observers. The way they can  
participate, first, the email list is closed to the members. But the  
archives are public, so you are welcome to read those. And,  
when I get back to my seat, I'll put in the wiki address in the  
Adobe Connect room so you'll have access to that. In terms of  
actually listening to meetings we do have an Adobe Connect  
room that is open to observers. So you'll be able to hear and  
watch the slides, although the chat function isn't available to  
interact with the members. But it will be a live session, so you'll  
be hearing the conversation as it's going.

---

LAUREEN KAPIN: And then, second, Olga, to answer your question about developing countries, that's an important topic that's already been identified as something we want to focus on. We're continuing to develop details in that respect. But, as I said, what we're really concerned with is asking the question has the new gTLD program, including the application process, has that been sufficient to allow participation by developing countries? And, if not, perhaps what recommendations we can make on that issue. So we definitely are very aware of that issue.

MEGAN RICHARDS: If I can add to what Laureen said very quickly, another aspect of our work, which I didn't mention because it's going to come in a little bit later, relates to the current review that's already been carried out on the gTLDs of which the application procedures, the reconsideration procedures, and appeals procedures are also looked at. And we want to look at that in the particular context of the CCT review. So that gives an additional help. And there are, of course, a number of developing country members of the team.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I have Iran and then Spain.



---

IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Thank you very much for the very good report.

I have two comments.

One: The issue under discussion has been extensively discussed in CCWG, and there is a lot of material on this issue. I wonder whether you have taken or will take note of all those things either from the report, call, transcription, or from the result of that that very, very important element of that and would contribute to what you're doing. Second: You referred to the member and you referred to the closed list. My experience at CCWG that they have 25 members and 140 participants. The richness is coming from the participants who are not members. So I think it is better we should not make it limited to the members and so on. Allow more participation and not closing list, opening list, and so on and so forth. I think efficiency should not be compromised because of the number of participants and vice versa. So I would like that to get the benefit of this richness of the participants' views that may not be members. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yes, please.

---

MEGAN RICHARDS: Just to clarify, there's absolutely no limit. We can have as many observers as want to observe. There's absolutely no problem. They can make their comments in writing. They can send as many comments as they like. They can contribute. They can provide documents. There's no limit whatsoever.

The limitation is in terms of speaking during the chats. That's the only limitation. And that's only a question of efficiency, because we have very little time and we very few meetings. We're not proposing to have the same intensity and complexity that the CWG or the CCWG had. First of all, we can't afford it. And we don't have the time. That's one aspect.

And, of course, related to all the CCWG material, to the extent there's aspects relating to competition, consumer choice, and consumer protection, those are all going to be brought into consideration as well.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Spain.

SPAIN: Thank you. I would like to ask if the team is going to review potential confusion in new gTLDs when a two-character name is used before the top-level domain as much with the ccTLD of

---

some country or a confusion when the name of a country is used before the TLD. Thank you very much.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you. So confusion is absolutely an issue that we've identified already. Since we are just in the beginning of our process, we haven't gotten down to that level of detail as to exactly the issues we're going to be grappling with in terms of confusion. But I appreciate you identifying that so that's something we can be aware of.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. And thank you, Megan and Lauren, for providing an update. I'm very much in catchup mode -- I have to admit -- with this important review process. And so the information you provided is a great help for me. I had three questions to ask.

First is the economic study. Maybe I missed it. But has that actually -- is that available now? Or what is the progress for that to hear?

---

My second question was with regard to community-based applications. As you recall, the GAC has been well-seized of problems that applicants, which are community-based, have experienced and particularly with the community prioritization evaluation, CPE, process and how the evidence appears to be that that has not worked to the satisfaction or expectation, certainly, of the applications -- of the applicants. And some have ended up in very difficult auction processes because they were not deemed to be communities.

So is this on the roster of issues for the CCT review? And -- which I hope so.

My third question was on the trademark issues, the rights protection mechanisms, and so on, which is the subject of a PDP. You mentioned that. And how does this review process intersect with the PDP on rights protection mechanisms was a question I have. Sorry if it's quite a lot to get through. But be very helpful if you could comment on each of those three items. Thank you.

MEGAN RICHARDS:

Okay. Well, on the economic study, I didn't bring my CCT study. It's about that big for one thing. But Eleeza Agopian, I'm sure, can give us the exact title and reference to the current review that's already been carried out. Anyway, Eleeza will give us the

---

exact details in a second and the exact reference and perhaps make it available to Tom Dale, who will put it on the GAC list. So that's something we're going to look at in more detail to review in further detail the results of that study. Then, on community-based applications, this is, of course, something that is going to be looked at, in part, as I said, relating to the whole application process, the aspects relating to competition. Has it been sufficiently adequate to have a separate group of community-based applicants versus all those who are not community-based? Have the restrictions and limitations on the community-based applications been appropriate, necessary, useful, et cetera? And to what extent have those furthered, encouraged, and developed competition, consumer choice, and, to a certain extent, consumer protection? Because in some cases those community-based applications had to have a series of safeguards or other provisions included in their applications. So that's, certainly, something we're going to be looking at.

And then with respect to the PDP one of the participants on the group, maybe two but certainly one, is one of the experts in trademark resolutions and trademark dispute resolution and looking at the interaction and interface between trademarks and the TLDs. And this is clearly an area that the competition and consumer choice group is going to look at in more detail.

---

But as I said in the beginning too, we're just beginning. We haven't gotten any of the answers yet. We're looking at the areas where we should really focus attention. But those are certain aspects we're going to look at. And Eleeza, would you mind giving the specific reference? Thanks.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Happy to. This is Eleeza Agopian again from ICANN. The phase one study was published last spring, and I just put a link to it in the Adobe Connect chat as well. The full title is quite long. It's the Phase One Assessment of the Competitive Effects Associated with the New GTLD Program. And the second phase study is really meant as a one-year follow-up to see whether certain metrics that were included in the first report have changed at all, if the needle has moved, so to speak. And we're expecting to publish that probably in the third quarter of this year. We're still working on their scope of work.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you very much. Anyone? We can take one last question. Yes, sir, Pakistan.

PAKISTAN:

This is Iftikhar Shah from Pakistan. I appreciate the working group efforts to mitigate the confusion regarding the

---

introduction of the new gTLD. I have some question regarding their work.

My first question is, what is the expected year for the new application program, and second is, whether ICANN will review or amend the DAG document regarding the new gTLD program for future.

And the last one is that, as my colleague said, awareness, particularly awareness for the new gTLD is very important, particularly in the developing countries. What is the roadmap for the awareness because it reduce -- it is one of the major factor components which will reduce all the program confusions regarding the Internet issues. Thank you very much.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Thanks for your questions. I hope I am understanding them correctly. I'll start with the last one. As we said, the issues regarding developing countries are very important to us. We're still beginning, as Megan has emphasized and I'll emphasize as well, so we don't have a precise roadmap.

I think I heard you ask about the timing of our work, which right now is scheduled to take place within a year period. It may take a little longer, but at least at this point we're aiming to come up with our recommendations within a year. And then I'm sorry, I

---

apologize, but I didn't quite understand your second question. Perhaps you could --

MEGAN RICHARDS:

I think, while it may not be, my interpretation of your second question was, what are the implications for any future gTLD rounds, that's how I interpreted it. And nothing is in this study prohibits or limits any new gTLD round. Of course, we are expecting that the results of this will be determining factor in any new gTLD round. That's clear. Because we can't go to another round without knowing how the current round went. So that's one aspect.

And just to add to what Lauren said about the developing country aspect, one thing -- and from my perspective this is a particularly important aspect -- is the role and influence of Internationalized Domain Names and also multilingualism. So different scripts in different languages are really very much an important factor, both for consumer choice. Also for competition. And that's one of the things that we are looking at as well.

Also, and this is something that's perhaps of interest and use for many of you who are associated with or participating actively in your national ccTLDs. One thing that we're also looking at is the impact of the ccTLDs vis-a-vis the gTLD market and whether they



---

are comparative, to what extent do they overlap, is there competition between them, et cetera. So these are some of the aspects, also, that we're looking at.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Any further questions or comments? If that is not the case, then I'd like to say thank you to representatives in the CCT review team, and we look forward to hear from you more in a fully substantial report of our work, I guess at the next meeting, if the GAC wishes to have that report. So wish you all the energy and the luck to -- for this important work. Thank you very much. Take the floor.

MEGAN RICHARDS: To recall again, if you change your mind or you think of something between now and Wednesday afternoon, there is the full public meeting at 5:15 on Wednesday afternoon. So you can come back and ask a new and different question.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So in case the communique will be done by 5:15, we'll all come over, don't worry. With a drink in our hand. Maybe, maybe not. We'll see. Thank you very much.

---

So this was item number 10 in the agenda that was circulated but there has been a change in our schedule due to the African ministerial meeting that will be taking place in the afternoon, together with our Moroccan colleague who has to attend that meeting. Therefore, we will discuss the preparations of the high-level ministerial meeting that will be taking place tomorrow.

So with that, I will give the floor to my colleague from the government of Morocco. Thank you very much.

MOROCCO:

Thank you, Chair, for this introduction. First of all, my apologies for requesting this change in the agenda so as to discuss this significant item, that is, our preparations for the high-level governmental meeting and all the logistics and organizational aspects for tomorrow, our work methodology, et cetera.

So first of all, I would like to welcome all the attendees. Welcome to ICANN 55. But also welcome to the third high-level governmental meeting taking place here in Marrakech. In a few days' time we will be welcoming spring. Spring is just around the corner. So for those of us who are not acquainted with us or know very little about us and are not fully acquainted with this meeting, governmental meeting, we are going to explain a little bit about the background. Or give you a little bit of background.

---

The first ministerial meeting took place in ICANN 45 in Toronto in October 2012 and Mr. Martin Morgan from Canada was the host in that case. The second ministerial meeting was held in London in June in 2014 and Ed Vaizey from the U.K. was the host on that occasion. I believe many of you attended that meeting. This first -- sorry, third meeting is part of that process.

I would like to remind you that these are normally called high-level governmental meetings and they stem from a recommendation by the ATRT1 team, Accountability and Transparency Review Team 1, normally known as ATRT1. The ICANN Board should increase efforts to boost support of governments and also the ICANN Board should seek for further ways in which ICANN can engage with high-level governmental representatives to engage in discussions that have to do with public policy as it relates to the Internet.

So in view of this recommendation we have these high-level governmental meetings that are separate from GAC's usual activities. But they're still an ongoing initiative and are a testament to ICANN's accountability. Especially as it relates to our work within the GAC. So we are here in Marrakech to honor these positions. This high-level governmental meeting will be presided by His Excellency Minister Moulay Hafid Elalamy from Morocco, and he is highly committed to Internet governance in his capacity as a public official.

So if I may, I would like to share the schedule for this meeting. I would like to post it on the screen. You may recall that we had discussed this preliminary agenda when we last met in Dublin in October. And we had agreed on having or holding a very enriching governmental meeting in view of GAC advice. I would like to thank all colleagues for their constructive input, especially our chair and our vice chairs who helped me conclude or bring this project to a close after several email exchanges and conference calls. This program has to do then with the high-level governmental meeting and deals with strategic initiatives within ICANN and especially within the GAC as they pertain to the IANA transition. As you can see, the first two sessions in the morning will be focusing on that topic that is of interest to all of us, that is the IANA stewardship transition outcomes and also enhancing ICANN accountability within this new ICANN framework.

During the first session, Mr. Thomas Schneider will be one of the speakers, together with Mr. Fadi Chehade, ICANN CEO, and also Mr. Larry Strickling, Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information and Administration of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration of the United States Government. Then there will be a second session focusing on the enhancement of ICANN accountability. Our chair, Thomas Schneider, will be one of the speakers, and he will

---

address the role of governments in the ICANN -- in ICANN and the importance of the contribution of public policy to ICANN policy development processes. After that, Dr. Steve Crocker, ICANN Board Chair, will also give a presentation and we will also listen to a presentation by the CCWG co-chairs who honored us with their presence yesterday.

After the lunch break we will focus on public policy and gTLDs. Mr. Akram Atallah, chair of ICANN's global domains division, will be the keynote speaker. He will speak about the new gTLD program implementation and the new gTLD round.

After that, there will be a session on domain names in developing countries. As you may recall, several delegations highlighted the importance of this topic. Mr. Tarek Kamel, whom you all know, will be a speaker during this session and he will be addressing or speaking about what ICANN is doing in order to overcome barriers to participation and also he will be dealing with ICANN efforts in terms of awareness raising and capacity building within -- or as they pertain to ICANN issues.

Following that there will be a joint presentation by the underserved regions working group co-chairs. And finally, we will have a closing session, a summary, and there will be a report on the meeting. The report will be Mr. Elalamy's responsibility and it will be circulated in the following days. Tom and his

---

colleagues will be of -- or will make an invaluable contribution in drafting or helping to draft this report. The report will not be a negotiable document. It will be -- it will summarize and present the highlights of the high-level governmental meeting, and it will be published under the sole responsibility of the chair.

As we mentioned in Dublin, the Moroccan delegation had insisted on holding a free and interactive discussion on the different topics and issues. However, we can also have or hold a session for ministers to express their views on different topics of interest. Every delegation will have three minutes, will hold the floor for three minutes. And Olaf will be taking his bell, ringing his bell to remind people of the allocated timeline. We have a list of ministers and participants, and we have allocated time so that everybody will have an opportunity to take the floor.

In terms of logistics, since we are a little bit restrained in terms of space, we will allocate a seat per delegation plus an additional seat. That is two seats per delegation. Other delegation members may have -- or may find room, additional room, as where there will be further seats for other delegations on the left-hand side and on the right-hand side of the room. I do not have the exact number of seats, but maybe Olaf can help me. But we believe that we will have 185 representatives from more than 90 governments. And we will have 35 ministers, plus 22 NGOs, 4 of which are non-GAC members. These are the

---

efforts by Morocco in order to organize these session and in order to make sure that participants can engage in this meeting. We will also be hosting ambassadors who will be joining their ministers in the meeting. There will be plenty of attendees, and the only restriction then has to do with the seats allocated to every delegation and to the time allocated for every delegation to hold the floor. So please, let us see how we can make sure that everybody has a seat and can hold the floor. And if I may, Mr. Chair, I would like to add two more comments about the high-level governmental meeting. It will be starting at 10:00 a.m, after ICANN 55 opening ceremony which formally starts the ICANN meeting. The opening ceremony will be held at 8:30 a.m. and we will have to move from one room to the other. The ministers will be holding front row seats. We will have name tents indicating delegations names, and we have followed GAC procedures as used in prior governmental meetings.

So my suggestion is please, look for your delegation member, show up early to make it easier for ministers to access the room. Ministers will be holding -- or will have a lapel pin and a badge. And may I please ask my colleagues to contact the GAC secretariat to retrieve information and their lapel pins.

Mr. Elalamy will be holding or hosting a lunch for the delegations. I believe Julia gave out the invitations yesterday. And there will be a dinner hosted by Mr. Elalamy as well. We will

---

have two shuttle buses leaving the hotel at 19:15 this evening. And I do not have any further information in that regard.

With that, I believe this is the complete update on the meeting, unless Olaf or Tom have any further information.

After the minister's introduction we will be holding or hosting Canada's vice minister who hosted the first high-level governmental meeting in Toronto and then we will also be hosting Mr. Ed Vaizey who hosted the high-level governmental meeting in London. I am counting on all delegations' flexibility so that this will be a successful meeting, not only for the GAC but also for Minister Elalamy tomorrow. Thank you so much for your attention.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER:

So before Olaf takes the floor, I would like to congratulate and to thank the government of Morocco for its commitment and the efforts that have been made to organize and hold this meeting. It is clear for us all that this is a major challenge. It is a major challenge to organize such a meeting. And, of course, everything discussed here is of the utmost importance. So we know that there's a lot of work behind and there are lots of logistics involved because of the number of ministers, the number of participants, the number of members, lots of challenges that perhaps you do not see at the very beginning but when you get



---

closer to the meeting, you realize there are lots of things that should be sorted out. And I would like to thank and congratulate the representative of Morocco for the cooperation and the work that has been done with the ACAG people, with the ICANN staff, with the chairs, vice chairs, and all people involved in the organization.

OLOF NORDLING:

I would like to say something to the GAC members. Tomorrow morning we will have a kind of bottleneck at the entrance door because there will be lots of people coming. We would make our best to help you, but I would like to ask you for patience, for understanding, and perhaps ask you for some help as well so that everybody can get in in proper order. There will be lots of us. It would be pretty crowded, but I'm counting on your help to sort this out. Thank you very much for your understanding.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you very much. I know that there will be some questions. We have to help everybody with the logistics, we know that, and thank you very much.

INDONESIA:

I just want to clarify who -- what is the method you are using for the -- if a country would like to give some sort of information,

---

statements or whatever? Do we have to register first or we can do -- we can just put our hand tomorrow morning in the high-level meeting?

Thank you.

REDOUANE HOUSSAINI: Thank you very much, Indonesia. So I think there is a professional list already here, but the option to open for delegation to intervene is there. But I encourage you to get in touch with the secretariat in order to register so as the minister will have a clear idea how many people will intervene and how to manage time especially, because the concern of time is very important. We have to do that.

We have 93 delegation, and three minutes for each delegation. You can imagine. I'm not sure that we would finish at 6:00. I'm not sure. So this is my message to you. Thank you very much.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Olof.

OLOF NORDLING: There will be, as mentioned initially, tent cards with the family name of the head of delegation which you can raise to indicate your desire to take the floor.

---

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. And just to remind you that the host has actually called out -- or there have been many that have already signaled that they intend to speak in a particular slot, and just to support what Redouane has said, it's fundamental for a as-good-as-it-gets managing of the time that we know as much in advance, and hopefully that we have a little bit of time for not just statements but also interactive debate.

You definitely are not obliged to have a statement per delegation. It's not an obligation. It's a choice that you can make.

Thank you.

Other questions.

Turkey.

TURKEY:

Yes. I have a question for this evening's dinner. I understand the buses will leave here, but the buses will come back here or take the delegation back to their hotels? Any detail on that?

Thank you.

---

REDOUANE HOUSSAINI: I think so, but I have to double-check with the ICANN team. I think that the bus should come back here. Yeah, definitely. But I will double-check and let you know.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Redouane.

Is there any other question? United Kingdom.

UNITED KINGDOM: Just to compliment Redouane and all his team for all the work. As -- we were the previous host, as you said, and it's an enormous amount of work, as you also indicated.

So it's especially appreciated that Morocco has stepped forward to host the third biennial High-Level Governmental Meeting. So I just want to underline our great appreciation, and it serves the community, the whole ICANN process as you've described very effectively to hold this meeting.

So appreciate all the work, and we look forward very much to participation. I speak on behalf of my minister, who is arriving very late tonight so will miss the dinner, but he will be there tomorrow, certainly.

Thank you very much.

---

REDOUANE HOUSSAINI: Thank you, Mark, for your compliments.

I would like also to thank you very much for all the assistance and advices you gave to me in terms of preparation of this meeting.

So the advices of Mark were very useful to me and they assisted me. So I thank you once again for all the advices, and I think it's a good practice to keep here for the next host of the next High-Level Governmental Meeting to liaise with the precedent -- the precedent in order to ensure that the meeting will be a success and to improve this practice within the GAC and ICANN in general.

So thank you once again, Mark. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Chairman.

I thank (indiscernible) and the Moroccan administration or government for taking this very efficient to have this.

---

I think the last meeting or the meeting before that was very, very efficient, and thanks to His Excellency Ed Vaizey who very ably conducted the meeting. And if I remember correctly, in one way or the other, he put the implicit restrictions to the duration of the statement in order to allow the others who wants to make -- as you mentioned, no obligations. Because the first few ones have a longer statement. Then we come to the last, you say you have 20 seconds, so on, so forth.

So it may not be -- I have this experience in some other fora that statements -- perhaps it would be always valuable that the distinguished minister mention that due to the time efficiency and time constraint, perhaps we could agree to have some limitation to the statements. If someone wants more than that, that could be published in the document, and so on and so forth. But a statement made, perhaps in order to make this work for everybody, should be limited to something, and that is the time frame that the distinguished minister could set in order to make it possible for everybody. And perhaps also mentioning that the purpose of this is not the Internet governance, it's not this and this. It should be on the point, and to make it possible, I'm sure that would be as efficient as the other.

But the other, the previous one was very, very efficient. I'm sure that this one will also be as efficient as the other one, if not better.

---

Thank you.

REDOUANE HOUSSAINI: Thank you very much, Iran. Yes, we have this concern of how to manage time.

We intended to start the meeting at 9:00. Unfortunately, the opening ceremony of ICANN 55th was programmed at the same time, so we shifted to 10:00. So it will be a very, very challenge for the minister. The minister insist on that in his opening remarks tomorrow in order to allow all the delegations to take the floor.

But, you know, frankly speaking, it's a sensitive matter to ask minister coming all over the world to Marrakech and to prevent them to express their position. So this is why I am calling for your understanding and trying to -- to inform and to explain to your head delegation that three minutes, it's okay, but we would rather prefer to have some questions directly to the panelists, because we'll have three, four panelists in each session.

So one delegation can ask questions, and we would prefer to have this kind of interactive dialogue between all delegation rather than national statement.

But once again, we cannot prevent minister to take the floor, but we are doing our best to manage time.

---

Thank you very much.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. And just to add to this, we also had discussion about how much time this presentation should be, and we were trying to get this to a minimum time that you can make a reasonable explanation of something. So that won't be half an hour presentations.

And my -- it's an introduction. I won't speak for -- I will speak very short. I will really do an introduction and not more because we want to give time to the high-level representatives to talk, and you don't need -- you hear me all the time so you don't need to hear me during that meeting for too long.

Thank you.

Any more questions?

Ukraine.

UKRAINE:

Hello. Thank you, Morocco for such nice event, for an invitation. Are you sure that all delegation received the invitation for both events?

Thank you.



---

REDOUANE HOUSSAINI: Thank you very much for the question. I think that the invitation were circulated yesterday by Julia, and it will be just for head of delegation. So it's really one person from each delegation. So this is my reply.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Maybe if not everybody has received an invitation for whatever reasons, Julia, we invite them to come to you and that you can check one by one whether there are some shortcomings; some people were not there when you distributed them, so that we make sure that everybody has an invitation.

Thank you for that question.

Any further comments or questions?

So is it all clear? All speeches written? Shortened five times so they are only two and a half minutes long?

[ Laughter ]

And everything well prepared?

If you have any questions that pop up later, of course don't hesitate to ask any of us, whether it's people from the host team

---

or secretariat or myself, whoever, because there will be some surprises about things we haven't been able to anticipate. So we all -- as we all have said, we all have to be flexible. But we're looking forward to a good dialogue tomorrow, which is what it should be. It should be a dialogue that will help us understand and help our high-level representatives understand the issues better, but also help understand each other's views and positions and concerns better. So it should be less of a confrontation but, rather, of a dialogue which is geared towards understanding.

If there are no more questions or comments, then I look on this nice paper to see what is next. I think it's the coffee break, which may be slightly longer than anticipated, because we have the meeting with the GNSO at 4:00. That gives us actually quite a long coffee break, which I think we can all use for breaking for coffee and in particular for talking to each other and trying to find ways to advance on the issue that we've been discussing to quite some extent in the past hours and yesterday.

So this is the coffee break. Thank you very much, Redouane. Thank you very much, everybody.

[ Coffee break ]

---

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Please take your seats. So welcome back to the meeting. And we have a special session now, which is a well-established tradition that we are meeting the colleagues from the GNSO every meeting. And what is new is that we have a new team in the GNSO. So I quickly don't want to spend time. I'll quickly give the floor to James to introduce himself and his team. Thank you.

JAMES BLADEL: Thank you, Thomas. And thank you to the GAC, once again, for welcoming us to visit with you this Sunday. And, Thomas, you're correct. There's a new team now, leadership team for the GNSO since you last met with us in Dublin.

I'm James Bladel. I met some of you, maybe not enough of you over the years. I am coming from the registrar constituency.

We have two vice chairs in the GNSO. One vice chair from the non-contracted party house is down at the end there. I'm sorry. It's Heather Forrest. There. She's raising her hand.

Our other vice chair is from the contracted party house. And that is Donna Austin. And I don't know that -- there she is. Thank you, Donna. You can come up and join us, if you'd like.

---

Or you can politely be quiet. And then, of course, we continue to have Mason Cole as our liaison to the GAC whom you already know and are familiar with.

And I think later on we'll also introduce Jonathan, who hasn't quite been able to escape the GNSO leadership as cleanly as he might have liked. So that's the new leadership team. And we look forward to working with you today and for the remainder of our terms.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you very much. Since you're new, maybe I present to you our team as well. My name is Thomas. I guess you know me a little bit. We know each other a little. And the little is growing, which is good.

Here we have Olga Cavalli from Argentina, one of the vice chairs. On the other side we have Gema Campillos from Spain, another vice chair. And then we have Wanawit from Thailand. He's tall, so he should actually be seen. Yes, he's waving from the back. And Henri, our fourth vice chair from Namibia, is about to arrive this afternoon. He's not yet with us, but he will join us soon. And that's the team that we have currently.

We have a lot of issues, I think, of common interest, maybe not 100% common views, but definitely of common natures and

---

concerns. And we've tried, to the extent possible with the workload, to coordinate a little bit and see what are the issues we're trying to talk about and have a discussion.

You see the agenda, the provisional agenda on the screen. Of course, that's a proposal. We can always be flexible. And so, without losing many words, I think we should go to the status update from the GAC-GNSO consultation group, which is an ongoing work for quite some time, and have a very quick update from Jonathan and/or Manal on where we are with that group.

Now the agenda has disappeared, but that shouldn't prevent us from moving on. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Okay. Thank you, James. Thank you, Thomas. Good afternoon, everyone.

Whilst I am no longer in the position that James now holds as chair of the GNSO Council, I've stayed on as a co-chair of this GAC-GNSO initiative which is the GAC-GNSO consultation group.

The primary purpose of this group is to ensure that we have better enhanced or more effective early engagement of the GAC in the GNSO policy development process. This is something which is both common sense and a response to recommendations of previous accountability, transparency

---

review team. So it's essential we deal with this both on the back of responding to that recommendation. But also it just simply makes sense for us to work together more effectively.

And so, on the slide in front of you, you see how we have dealt with this. We began to look at the early engagement and really divided the work into two tracks -- that which could be undertaken on a day-to-day basis and the actual involvement of the GAC in the GNSO PDP.

To date we've delivered a pilot project whereby we set up a GNSO liaison to the GAC, Mason Cole, who is familiar to many of you and who is on my left there.

And Mason has taken up that role and is in the second annual term of doing that whilst that is a pilot project.

We also set up the so-called quick look mechanism whereby there was a -- at the early stage of policy development process from the GNSO when there was issue scoping, the GAC is given an initial opportunity to look and the opportunity, therefore, to raise public policy concerns or issues.

There are monthly one-page documents highlighting the next opportunity that is coming down the track. And, to the extent that we can find time and opportunity, there have been joint calls between the GAC and the GNSO leadership prior to ICANN

---

meetings in order to prepare and coordinate this type of session. Next slide, please. That's the current status. And, breaking it down into the three key areas we highlighted on the first slide of the GNSO liaison, the quick look mechanism, and the one-pagers, as far as the GNSO liaison to the GAC is concerned, as I said, this was implemented as a pilot project. The consultation group has now systematically reviewed the role and the functioning as was agreed with GAC and GNSO. And it has found that this is an improvement in facilitating the GAC early engagement in the GNSO PDP. And a recommendation has been made and is being made to the GAC and the GNSO that its position be implemented as a permanent position for the future with a couple of modifications that you see there, some proposed modifications, including regular coordination calls between the liaison and the GAC secretariat. There is no proposed term limit; but, essentially, that the role should be reviewed and reconfirmed by the GNSO Council annually and that the role of the liaison is formalized into the GNSO operating procedures.

And, finally, that the liaison is invited to attend GNSO Council as an observer, which has, Mason, if you'll remind me, I think that's been happening in practice in any event. Yes.

So the question really for this group is: Do you agree with the recommendations and findings of the consultation group? Are

---

there any questions or concerns with those? And, if yes, I think there will be a proposal to move forward with the implementation of this liaison as a permanent role.

Thomas, would you like to pause at this point? Or should I go through -- I'm not sure how much time we have for discussion or --

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Jonathan, for that question. Actually, we have a heavily loaded agenda. So I think we should proceed as quickly as we can and -- so yes.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Okay. If you'll forgive me, then I'll work through these slides systematically as an update. And, to the extent there are questions or issues arising from them, we'll have to deal with them separately or later in the session as permits. That's the GNSO liaison to the GAC. In essence, the proposal is this becomes a permanent role. We believe, in the review group that looked at this, that it is an effective mechanism for enhancing relationship and workings between GNSO and GAC. And so that's the proposal. Next slide, please.

As far as the quick look mechanism is concerned, it has been implemented on a trial basis. And we've been running through a



---

minimum of three consecutive GNSO PDPs. And so far the quick look mechanism has been applied in the case of three PDPs. We've identified in reviewing it a number of simplifications that have been identified that could further streamline it.

But we would love some feedback to the questions posed in the orange square on the right. What is the experience of others? Are there improvements that could be made? And does the quick look mechanism adequately facilitate preparation of engagement in the GAC?

The consultation group proposes to review that feedback and modify the proposed simplifications, if needed. So, in general, we think this has been something which is a useful start. It could be streamlined or modified. But -- and we'll leave you with those questions then.

Next slide, please.

As far as the remaining stages of the GNSO PDP is concerned, there are opportunities for additional engagement opportunities in subsequent phase of the PDP, for example, at the point of initiation and participation in the working group. There are some documented recommendations and ideas for further exploration to be put forward to the GAC and the GNSO for input.

---

And so, again, ideally, there will be feedback to the consultation group looking at the recommendations and ideas for early engagement. And such that the consultation group will be able to consider next steps, including which recommendations are then put forward to the two groups for approval.

Next slide, please. Really, I think that covers it for the moment, Thomas. That's a little bit of a whistle stop tour. That gives you a summary of activity. There are a series of areas we'd like to have feedback and ideally in a session like this. But I understand time is pressing. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Just to give you quick feedback. Thank you very much, Jonathan.

This is an important process. And I think it's -- we've made significant progress in developing that process. The only problem that we have with a lot of this is that we are so much overburdened with one particular issue that -- you may guess what it is. It's not the question of whether it's going to rain tomorrow outside this room or not -- that we haven't had the time to go -- to actually think about our experience. And also the second -- you know the quick look mechanism is the first step in the engagement.

---

And, once we identified an issue of public interest, public policy, then we will actually have to somehow increase our participation in the debates and discussions and the work of the GNSO.

And we are simply not there yet where we want to be because of the workload. So we do sincerely hope that, after this meeting, assuming that the whole transition Work Stream 1 will be agreed and hoping that Work Stream 2 and the implementation won't be as intense as what we've experienced in the past two years, that we will -- this is one of our highest priorities from after this meeting.

So it's good to have these questions. And we will look at it in the GAC and come back to you with answers as quickly as possible. So thank you very much for the work and also for the understanding of our situation that we're currently in.

United States?

UNITED STATES:

Thank you, Chair.

I just wanted to put a proposal out publicly, if I could, that none of you should feel obliged to answer at the moment. It was more to plant a seed.

---

As we look at the first mid-year meeting, which is going to be our first experience, I believe, with the new meetings format, I know we in the GAC have not yet formalized our plans and our preparations. I'm putting in a bid from one GAC member -- hopefully, I can convince my colleagues here -- that we might have more of an opportunity to engage more comprehensively, if you will, between the GAC and the GNSO on these issues during that June meeting.

So I don't know how far along the GNSO may be in your planning for that particular four-day meeting. But -- so it's just more of a question. Have you given thought to that? We certainly will. I think there will be some interest. So I just wanted to put that out there, so I didn't miss the opportunity. Thank you.

JAMES BLADEL:

Thank you. I can tell you that our plans and preparations for meeting structure B were well underway. And then we came here. And now we're back to the drawing board and redoing a number of those. Because I think, specifically, we wanted to focus on those types of policy issues and interacting with other SOs and ACs as those policy development efforts get under way. I think the challenge, of course, is fitting it all into the compressed schedule and recognizing that there are other

---

focuses of that meeting, including outreach, that might have to be abbreviated in order to make room for some of these things.

I know that these talks are ongoing. And I think that we should definitely take that. And, if you're putting your marker down, I would say marker accepted. We need to reach out and include the GAC as well as the -- I think we have some specific topics for the ccNSO as well and other SOs and ACs as we start our planning for meeting structure B.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. I will, actually, make a remark on the B meeting, at a later stage of this. It's not on the agenda, but I will bring it up. Iran, do you have a comment on what Jonathan has presented? Okay. Thank you.

IRAN:

Yes. Thank you. Thank you, Jonathan, for the good work that you are doing. And encourage you to continue.

It is something that I want to remind ourselves, GAC. We -- all of us talk when we are sitting in a session of early engagement. But, once the meeting is finished, forget anything and there is no activity from many of us. So we should encourage ourselves and mobilize ourselves with GAC to really continue and contribute

---

and participate in this early engagement and not put everything on the shoulder of one or two.

How we mobilize that we leave it to the chair to mobilize the GAC. There is considerable contributions from the other side, but there is less contribution from our side. So we are criticizing ourselves. That means we need to further enhance and foster and encourage participation of this early engagement in the PDP. That is a subject which was indirectly discussed at the CCWG accountability. I don't want to come to that at this stage. Maybe I do it at the next step. But that is something that, dear Thomas, we would like to remind ourself, how you could mobilize GAC for participations between the two meetings. Very little -- thanks to Manal and a few others that very actively participating. And we should do more homework for ourselves. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you for raising this. And I wouldn't say that we forget about everything and do nothing. I think, in my recollection, we have never had so many intersessional activities than between this meeting and the previous one. We had so many calls on the transition. We've been working on paper. We've exchanged things. That has never, ever happened before. And I have government delegations that come to me and say, "We are not

---

able to follow this." It's not that they don't want. We cannot just like a company invest in a new issue and hire five more people. It's actually the other way around. Governments have budget cuts and have less people to deal with more work.

This is what I was alluding to. We really -- at least I sincerely hope that we will have less work related to transition and accountability. Because, otherwise, we keep postponing other extremely important issues to the future because simply we have no choice or we have to readapt our priorities. That's another discussion. And I'll leave it at that. We will, hopefully, all of you are with us on Thursday when we discuss how to organize ourselves as GAC for the time between and including the next meeting and further. So we're very happy to have that discussion how to make the GAC more efficient but also how to prioritize work because it's simply too much.

Yes, U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Yes, thank you, Chair. And thank you James, Jonathan. And I just wanted to come in first of all, to support the U.S. marker proposal for meeting B.

And then, secondly, just to underline this issue as a challenge for the GAC. This is a step change for the GAC. It intersects with

---

transition and so on in terms of transversal working on policy development.

So it is an issue. And it's a challenge in terms of resourcing at the national level. We all have to consider that. And my plea is to colleagues here in the GAC to take that important point away in terms of resourcing participation intersessionally.

Thanks.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Denmark.

DENMARK: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And thank you, everyone, in the working group for doing this important work for more effective early engagement of the GAC in the GNSO. And I would also like to support what my colleague from the U.S. has said about planting the seed and to, hopefully, be able to use our resources at the next meeting a bit more on the PDPs which are on the way. Thank you very much.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I think, looking at the agenda, we're actually moving into the substance -- from process to substance with the next item on the agenda, which is not the same like what I see on the



---

screen. You changed it. You didn't tell me. Yeah. Yeah. Okay.  
All right. I'm flexible. Okay.

So the next item -- so this is the next item. Okay.

It's on the GAC agenda, it's the other way around. It's a status update, which is also substantial, of course, on the CCWG report.

JAMES BLADEL:

Thank you. And thank you for being flexible with that agenda change. I think the thinking behind it was we might spend a little bit more time on this particular topic. And we wanted to be sure it moved up a little further towards the beginning of the agenda.

So, as a report, I think it would be good to exchange views on what our status is in our consideration and, ultimately, presumably, the approval of the CCWG accountability final report.

I'd like to share with the GAC our progress. And then I think we would be very keen to hear your updates as well.

But I can tell you that, not surprisingly, that we've cleared a number of space in our agenda this weekend to address both the substance of the CCWG report and its recommendations as well as the process of how the GNSO Council will consider and

---

ultimately vote on those recommendations on the final report. The GNSO, as many of you are aware, is a very large and diverse organization within ICANN, and this means there's close coordination with all of the various stakeholder groups and constituencies to socialize the content of the supplemental report within those stakeholder groups and constituencies and get a determination of where each group -- where their position is on these, and then roll that up into the council level where we can consider that as a group and then cast a vote.

I think we are getting very close to having a process defined. We're still polishing the last bits of how we will proceed with a vote, which is scheduled now on our agenda for Wednesday, the public session. It's at the conclusion of that meeting, regardless of the outcome, that we will have our determination on the supplemental report.

In advance of that, we have some discussions today and yesterday as well as a planned prep meeting on Tuesday to identify those recommendations that perhaps are still -- still problematic or still could result in some divergent opinions.

As far as, you know, the ultimate question of whether or not the GNSO will approve the report, I can tell you that some of our groups are ready to go now. Some groups, I believe, would like to do some further work and further discussion among their

---

stakeholders group which is scheduled for Tuesday. And I think that all of this is, again, building to that final crescendo where we can discuss this on the table in our meeting on Wednesday.

I think that we have -- you know, that's my take without getting too presumptive of the outcome. I think we are making progress but there is still work to be done. And I think we have one specific question for the GAC, and I don't know if it's possible to answer. As you consider this and share your process and your progress, one question that has been raised during our consideration of the substance material is whether we expect that the GAC will explicitly declare itself to be a member of the decisional community or whether it will -- it will consider that to be the default position, whether or not an explicit declaration is made. I think that's one element that the -- that I have been tasked to bring out of this room, is if you have any updates on that.

So I'll stop talking now, turn it over to Thomas, and then, of course, anyone who wants to weigh in.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you very much. And of course you are free to ask any question. This is a free and open environment.

---

I -- I guess the situation in the GAC is fairly similar. We are also a very diverse group, probably more in terms of geographical and cultural heritages than in terms of we are all governmental representatives, so this is what we have in common, but there is a lot of diversity also on views and on experience and so on and so forth. And we are working very hard, and have been for quite some time, actually, to try and get to a common understanding and shared view on the several elements of this proposal and also on the package as a whole. And we are still working very hard. And it's not up to me to give you any, let's say, projection of what the outcome is going to be like, but we aim at giving -- we have an agreement that we would like to give a clear and simple answer, if governments are able to do that, but we do our best to follow this, and we are working on it. And our plan is that by Tuesday night -- because tomorrow we'll have our High-Level Governmental Meeting, 35 ministers will be here so that will keep us busy in addition to the few things we have to do anyway. But at the latest, or the plan is to Tuesday night not leave this room before we are able to provide an answer to the -- to the CCWG co-chairs.

With regard to your last -- And feel free, GAC members and others, to step in on this one.

With regard to your last question, as far as I'm informed, there is no request from the CCWG on any of the chartering

---

organizations to declare at this stage whether they are or are not or are under some circumstances planning to participate. There is the assumption that the five that are in the report as participants, that the model is built on the assumption of these five, and there is no need to make any statement. None of these five has requested to make any statement.

Whether the GAC wishes to make a statement on this particular issue in the communication that we will send hopefully to the CCWG on Tuesday night or Wednesday very early morning, that is still something that we are looking into.

I guess this is all -- I'm afraid this is all I can say for the time being. But my colleagues, please feel free to complement me on this.

Yes, Iran.

IRAN:

Yes, Chairman. I don't want to complement you. That means put any addition what you said. You were very diplomatically mentioned what is intended, so....

I have a question to James, as a chairman of the Council. You have been very active in the entire process. You are a member of the ICG. You are CCWG, and so on and so forth. How do you envisage on Wednesday the output of the GNSO Council? I have

---

heard that you will vote on the package as total, and if there is any comment on any constituencies that you have mentioned -- contracting, noncontracting, commercial, noncommercial, so on and so forth -- you may also indicate that, or you want to go recommendation by recommendation and vote on each recommendations?

My understanding is that you go to the package, to the global, which may be more easy, and then you would add if there is any comment about any recommendation by any constituency. In what way you present that? You present that as a comment? Present that as a statement?

So we would be very happy if you are in a position to give your (indiscernible) of the situation but not prejudging the decision of the council. That may help us to formulate because we are now starting to talk about how we formulate our proposal, and so on and so forth.

What I said in the other meeting that I don't think GNSO should wait for GAC and GAC should wait for GNSO. We all should contribute to the whole process with positive reply and positive message to the outside.

Thank you.

---

JAMES BLADEL:

So thank you. And I remember that you were in the room when we were discussing this very question. And so -- And as you can probably attest and to share with your colleagues, it was a very lengthy and detailed discussion spanning two days, because we have a very strong desire from some members to give a very simple -- and I think from the CCWG, we just want a simple yes or no, we approve, we reject the entire report, full stop.

Like many complex organizations, and I'm sure the GAC falls under this category, that's probably too simple for our processes. We're going to need, at least in a couple of situations, look at the recommendations individually and allow each of the stakeholder groups and constituency representatives to give the voice from their community on the specifics.

However -- And this is a proposal. This has not been accepted by the Council. This is my proposal, so take that with a grain of salt. But we have positioned the idea that if any of those individual recommendations should fail to achieve majority support that we would then ask for a package consideration of the entire report. And what this means is essentially if all of the -- if all of the recommendations are approved, then no problem. The package is approved. By default if everything in it is approved, you say the package is approved and you communicate that to the CCWG.

---

If there is a single or one or two or three recommendations that fail to achieve that, then what we're asking, a separate question would be do you approve -- even with the rejected recommendations, do you approve this as a compromise package? And we would put that to the Council for a vote.

Again, this is a tentative preliminary process that we intend to use.

Second point, many of our representatives, stakeholders and constituencies have asked for the opportunity to include rationales or statements with their votes. We started off calling these minority statements but it's impossible to know. They could be majority statements, but we want to give them the opportunity to pass them -- to attach these to their vote.

These will be included in the report that we send to the CCWG co-chairs.

So to answer your question as directly as possible, to the CCWG co-chairs we will explain that we either have approved the report or we have rejected the report.

We will communicate each recommendation and the level of support for that recommendation, whether it's unanimous, something short of unanimous, or whether it failed to achieve majority.



---

And then, finally, we will include the statements of rationale, optional, that would be submitted for any of the councillors submitting their vote.

Again, this process is tentative. It still needs to be considered by the councillors. It still needs to be socialized within their stakeholder groups and make sure they approve of this process. But I think it gives all of the voices on the council something that they want, which is the ability to give an up-or-down vote on the entire package but also to give their position on each of the recommendations and also to finally include a rationale.

So I hope that answered your question. A lot can happen between now and Tuesday. It's possible we throw that out and come up with something else, but I got the sense today that with some minor tweaks and some adjustments, I think that we're generally on the right track with this process.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. That sounds like you're writing a very long book and the reader will read a very long book in a very short amount of time.

Just to repeat what I said, we are trying to make our answer as short and clear as possible. That's the aim. To what extent we live up or we manage to fulfill that goal, it will be seen.

---

Thank you for this, but it's a very interesting concept of doing things, and I think it was interesting for us to see what could be a way to do it, and what are the pros and cons of this procedure, of course.

Thank you.

Other questions, comments on this issue? Not just from the GAC. Also if GNSO people have questions or comments, of course I think they have equal rights to talk here than us.

If that's not the case, then I think we go forward or back, depending on the numbering, to -- let's see what the next item on your list is. Aha.

Where have the PDPs gone in your presentation of --

JAMES BLADEL:

Sorry. I think we moved the PDPs which were originally scheduled as item number 3, we moved them to the last part because the concern would be if we ran out of time on accountability, we could deliver those to you via email. But I think we should have time for both.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Okay.

---

JAMES BLADEL:                      So if you don't mind, we can move to number 4?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:                Fine.

JAMES BLADEL:                      Okay.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:                To give you an update on activities, as I said, we have the small problem that all other activities, apart from us working on the transition and working on accountability, had to be slightly deprioritized because of the simple effort and workload of this process and knowing that this is going to be the decisive meeting where we will have to take our decision and feed that into the process. And that is a very intense process, but we are trying to keep up the other work to the extent we can.

And of course the priority in terms of other work, one of the key priorities for us is -- we haven't discussed this in this meeting yet, that's on our table for Tuesday -- or, no, right after -- right later today, actually, because we shifted around again a few things on our agenda. So it's fairly complex. But this is, of course, the assessment of the first round of new gTLDs and preparation of the second round is something that is of key

importance for us, which is also why we are highly interested in your -- the assessments you do in your work, and also your PDPs for preparing the second round. We are interested in the Consumer Choice, Consumer Trust Review Team because, in our view, that's also linked to the assessment and recommendation part. And also there's an analysis made by ICANN, and we are trying to make sure that issues of public interest are well reflected in the assessment of the first round. And then we have to discuss, hopefully, at an early stage with you and everybody else about how to feed the experience of the first round to the second round.

So I won't go into detail. We are not very far advanced, but this is something that is definitely one of the highest priorities that we have. This is one of the elements. And then, of course, our internal -- another pending issue is the review of our internal working methods, including the operating principles, which is something that we are wanting to do for quite some time. But again, there is also something more urgent that comes in, but that is also something we decided to do because the GAC has been growing significantly just in terms of numbers since the last version of the operating principles have been developed. So there are some -- there's a number of housekeeping matters that we need to deliver, which is less of interest for you, but that may take up some time as well. And then there are a number of other

---

issues, WHOIS and -- I guess there's quite a lot that we will hope to be able to spend more time on than what we have been able to do the past few months.

I'll stop here. Maybe if somebody has specific comments from the GAC side or if somebody has specific questions or comments from the GNSO side on our work, of course we are happy to try and answer that.

JAMES BLADEL:

So just a specific comment. And I'm not sure if it is included in Mason's update, but as far as review of structures, the GNSO review and the GNSO working party are also on our docket, and it's something we're considering on Wednesday. And I think very similar to the experience of the GAC, it has taken a back seat to all of these other high-priority issues and will probably require for time for us to review the recommendations that are contained in that work party report before we can consider them as a community.

So same situation. Your internal housekeeping always seems to take a -- always seems to take a back seat to the high-profile issues of the day.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Yes.

---

Iran, please.

IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I have one simple question to make at the end, if you have time, and that was a comparison that was made during the CCWG on the process of PDP, approval by the GNSO, treatment by the Board, rejection by the Board, and further action compared to the advice of the GAC, and so on and so forth.

If there is any time, I would like to ask the question and you can reply me. If there is no time, I will leave it for later stage.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Kavouss, for that question.

Any further? Yes, Spain, please.

SPAIN: Thank you. My question is not related to ongoing PDPs but to the new gTLD program. I don't know if it fits in this meeting, but anyway, I'm going to ask this.

---

As you know, the GAC issued advice regarding new gTLD program, and there were specific elements regarding highly regulated sectors to which some gTLDs were targeting to.

After several rounds with the Board, it seems that the bulk of our advice -- although they say they have accepted it, the GAC doesn't have the same feeling.

They -- even if they have not acknowledged that they have rejected it, the implementation has not been coherent with -- or consistent with our advice.

My guess is that the GNSO shares the Board's view in that respect. And I would like to know firsthand from you what's your view on GAC advice on new gTLDs? Or for what reason do you think the GAC advice is not good or at least not implementable? Thank you.

JAMES BLADEL:

So I want to be careful here, because I don't want to get into a position where I'm commenting from a GNSO perspective on whether or not the Board has correctly applied advice from the GAC. Because I think that's probably dangerous waters for me to wade into. I will say that I am aware of this topic. And I know that it prompted some changes to some TLDs, voluntary changes. But I think that there's a difference of opinion on

---

whether or not this is both practical or possible to implement. And I think that's where the discussions and the differences arose between the GNSO, the GAC, and the Board. I think there are three possible interpretations of this issue.

I do note that, in the context of another round of gTLDs as opposed to the gTLDs that we've already experienced, that this would probably be a good topic to raise in the context of either the subsequent round's PDP, which is currently ongoing, or the consumer trust review team, the CCT review team, which is also just starting.

Both of those groups are examining issues, I think, specifically and contextually related to the issue of the TLDs that were identified. And I think that that would probably be an appropriate place to examine and explore those issues, not only the nature of the concern but also the most practical and effective approach to addressing them.

But, as far as whether or not I want to comment on the Board's implementation of the GAC advice, I think I'm going to probably stay away from that one.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you for this answer. I would probably have said exactly the same thing.



---

JAMES BLADEL:                    You know, Thomas, I barely speak for my own community. I certainly don't want to presume to speak for another. But, I mean, it's a small joke. But it is true that I get into enough trouble from the GNSO councillors as well.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:            I think I do understand.

SPAIN:                            I was interested in GNSO view, not in the Board's view.

JAMES BLADEL:                    Okay. Perhaps I misunderstood the question. I thought the question was whether the GNSO shared the view that the Board had not fully implemented the GAC's advice. And perhaps I misunderstood that.

But I think that our review is, I think, similar to what we saw come out of the Board is that the -- that these strings are probably best served by -- at least the existing strings probably best served by voluntary practices. And, if this is a concern for the next round, that that should be in the guise of the PDP and the consumer trust review team.

---

And I think that we have a question from Carlos as well. I don't know where he is, though. But someone -- Carlos. Is this okay?  
Okay.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: As long as you ask the question in German, Thomas.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Dear Chair Schneider, as you know from your exchange with the chairs of the GNSO and the ccNSO, we have some issues open from the last expansion of the gTLDs on geographic names. And, as you already mentioned, those issues are important to be solved for any other future round or any other type of procedure we choose. We're avoiding the word "round."

So my question to the GAC leadership is at what point the Cross-Community Working Group will learn about the GAC's position on how to proceed on geographic names.

This is one of the decisions we have to take in the subsequent procedures discussion. We gave community feedback to the GAC proposal in December 2014. And we have not heard what the position of the GAC is. Nevertheless, our Cross-Community Working Group recently got very interesting comments from many countries, both ccTLDs and governments. So it is clear to us that many of the GAC members worry about this and they

---

have their positions. And we hope to come very soon to convergence of these working groups. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Olga will answer that question. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Carlos, I will speak in Spanish.

Can you please explain more deeply what you mean by convergence of the working groups? And then I will try and answer your question.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: ccNSO, GNSO working group has made a request to all the whole community to solve the issues of the 2-letter codes, of the 3-letter codes, and the full names of countries and territory names. We have these positions. We have a draft that we will present tomorrow in our Monday session of this working group. But we still have no feedback of what the GAC position is on all the other geographic names.

So my question is: We don't want to go ahead. We cannot go ahead on this important issue without having solved your scope. So my question is when can we have your position?

---

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Carlos. The two working groups, the GAC working group and the cross-community working group where the GAC is a chartering organization as well, have a different focus. So I think they have explained it many times. Many times.

The Cross-Community Working Group is focused on country names and references to names that are included in an official list, recognized official list.

The GAC working group is focused on names that are not included in the list. So the two groups have different focus. Divergent, completely different focuses.

So, when you ask about the position of the group, I may tell you that a working group is working. There have been a public comment period. We have received lots of comments. We are trying to see how we may reply to those comments. We're going to meet with the working group to find out how to move forward with that work. And we have already prepared a set of good practices that we think it would be interesting to bear them in mind for the new round of gTLD.

The text has already been presented as a contribution of some Latin American countries. And we have opened it for comments. I don't remember exactly the name of the document, but it is publicly available.

---

It was publicly available for comment. It is publicly available in the GAC web page in the open space. There is no single position in the GAC. We're working on that because there are different positions. So the GAC working group is working on that.

I would like to add that many times it has been mentioned in this room that several countries are interested in participating in a Cross-Community Working Group that you have mentioned.

The times that I participated in a conference call, I have been the only one. Unfortunately, I've been unable to follow the process because I have also been part of the CCWG and accountability. So it required lots of my time, as you may imagine.

So I know that there is interest of some of the countries to work in this Cross-Community Working Group. So I would ask some of the GAC colleagues to join those calls in addition to me. Thank you very much.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: A very short comment. Norway, is it on this issue? We have to see about the time. So please a very short intervention.

NORWAY: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to complement what Olga said. I think what Carlos is asking the GAC is also something else

---

that Olga was covering. Because I think he's also asking for a formal GAC position on the scope of the current cross-constituency working group on geographic names, which looks into how to -- if or how to use the 2-letter codes, the 3-letter codes, and the country names.

So I think we had a brief discussion at the last GAC meeting in Dublin exchange of views from the different GAC members. And I think they are -- well, different views. And some is in favor of retaining the current protection, which is in the guidebook for the first round. But, of course, what Olga is commenting on is also to add extra protection of a generic geographic names which has not been protected the Applicant Guidebook that was for the first round.

So it's slightly two different issues, I think, as well. Thank you.

JAMES BLADEL:

We'd also like to hear from Heather Forrest who is GNSO vice chair, co-chair of the CCWG on this issue.

HEATHER FORREST:

Thank you very much, James, and Chair Schneider for having us here today. I think my comment follows on very much naturally from those just made by Norway and perhaps clarifies the question from Carlos as well.

---

Thank you very much, representative from Norway, for your clarification.

I think there's two points here. We, as Olga has pointed out, we have two different initiatives with two different scopes. And I think that's been made clear in these meetings in the past.

There are two, perhaps, points to deal with going forward. One is the formal position of the GAC, as it were, as Norway has clarified in the CCWG. And the other is the GAC working group on geographic names. And I think it would be very helpful for the GNSO as a whole, given the ongoing PDP work that we now have in the context of the subsequent round's PDP, to have some understanding of the GAC's utilization of the call for community feedback on its proposal. It would be a very useful time to know how the GAC working group on geographic names is taking account of the feedback that it received from the community on its proposal and when we could have an update on that so that that could be incorporated in our PDP in the spirit of cooperation and collaboration. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. I think we have to move on, because we are running out of time. We will probably run a little bit over.

---

And I want to share with you, before we move to have a very quick update on the PDPs, something that is actually very dear to my heart. Listening to this discussion and to what we heard before about not having enough time to engage or not being organized in a way that the engagement is actually effective, we have this new meeting strategy with the B meeting where one of the proposals of the meeting team of the team was to have a day in the middle of these four days that was called "Town Hall Meeting" where instead -- and this is something we have discussed repeatedly in the GAC -- instead of sitting in your silos and then meeting in bilateral silos that takes up half your time, these bilateral meetings, why not get together all at once? Because, for instance, on a safeguard issue it's not just us. We discussed this bilaterally with the ALAC. We discuss it bilaterally with the Board. Instead of all sitting together and discussing safeguards for gTLDs in an open format, in an interactive format where everybody can listen and try to understand what the other's concerns, hopes, and ideas are, why not get us together all at once in 1 1/2 hours, talk about this, and then have another session on, for instance, protection of names of public interest of what kind of sort or weighing copyright or trademark rights against stakes and so on and so forth, why not do this in an inclusive and open format instead of in bilateral co-silos? Because I think this would be much more efficient for all of us and would actually be the first step of engaging all at once and



---

would help us to understand each other much better, which would probably improve all the efficiency of all our work. And the GAC has actually, in his planning for the B meeting, left the second day free for giving us that opportunity to engage with everybody. We're also constantly hearing that we're locked up in our silos. We're not transparent. We don't talk to the others and so on and so forth. This is another reason why we are very keen on actually engaging with the others, talking to the others, in an efficient way because the resources are very limited. And we had realized Friday with the SO/AC RALO chairs, that, apparently, the coordination on the different ICANN constituencies planning for the B meeting is not necessarily aligned. So I really want to use this opportunity -- and, as you're going to re -- we're all going to have to replan for the B meeting, which is the next meeting. So we need to do this now and here. I really want to urge all of you to think about the merit of sitting together, maybe not a day, maybe half a day, to try out what would be the experience if we reserve a Tuesday afternoon for a cross-community physical exchange over two, three key issues probably linked to the assessment of the first and/or preparation of the second round, and have an exchange all at once in an interactive format which is less confrontational than a public forum. But it's actually more trying to understand each other with the round setting so that we all can work the first day in our silos, prepare things, learn from each other, understand

---

each other better the second day, and then go back to our silos and continue to go back to work with a better understanding of what others are doing and why they are defending their positions and so on and so forth.

This is something I would really urge you to consider to try this out for the next B meeting. Because I'm convinced and the GAC has discussed this earlier that this would be extremely helpful and efficient in terms of use of time and engagement. Thank you.

JAMES BLADEL:

Thank you, Thomas. And I think that we've run out of time. We're going to stick -- stay a little bit longer, a few minutes, if you don't mind.

I think Mason's update on the PDPs will probably be submitted to you after this meeting via email, if that's okay.

Because we have a number of active PDPs that we could go through, just current status of our work.

I wanted to comment on one item that was raised to us over the weekend, a discussion within the GAC regarding the consideration of comments that were submitted by -- I'm changing gears a little bit, but I'm changing gears to the consideration of comments that were submitted by the Public

---

Safety Working Group with regard to the PDP that was set up for the privacy proxy services accreditation, PPSAI.

I think that we spoke with -- we reviewed the transcripts of some of the discussions that were occurring here. And we spoke with the co-chairs of that PDP as well as staff members who were responsible for not only the PDP but some of the reports. And I can report that those comments -- I think the impression was that those comments were not considered.

But I can assure you that the comments were considered. They were very much aligned with some of the comments that were discussed and examined during the course of the working group. Some of them were extensively discussed for a number of months. They were not included in the final reports of the PDP. They did not have consensus support to be included in the final report.

However, I -- they were not ignored. They were not disregarded. It is true that they were submitted a little late. But that didn't matter, because we were able to get them in on time and get them into our work for the final report.

I wanted to put that out to this group, if there were any concerns. We can certainly continue this. We have the co-chairs for that as well as the GNSO liaison, Mason, can connect to the right folks. But public comments or -- regardless of their source,

---

are an important element of the PDP process. In fact, every PDP has a minimum of two public comment periods.

This particular public comment period set a new record with, I believe, over 10,000 responses. So all of those, as you can imagine, weighing and balancing all the various interests involved was a challenge.

And so all those issues were considered.

So I just wanted to bring that back to this group because it was something that was brought to our attention yesterday. And, you know, reassure or maybe, you know, confirm that those comments were received, were considered. They just simply were not reflected in the final report.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you very much. And also thanks to Graham, was it, who came to me. And of course we're happy -- this is why we meet, to clarify this.

Maybe that was just an unprecise language, but I think it's probably less that what was discussed, less that you didn't consider in the sense that you didn't look at it and discuss it, but

---

maybe the outcome is not what the expectation was of the GAC or of the group.

So let me give the floor to Alice, who is keen on talking to you and responding.

ALICE MUNYUA:

Thank you, Chair and Chair. And I would actually like to thank the GNSO very much for having accepted and acknowledged the comments submitted by the GAC, by the Public Safety Working Group, despite the fact that we were pretty late in submitting them.

And we acknowledge that they were considered, though they haven't appeared on the final report.

We are going to be resubmitting them as GAC advice because we have been requested to provide GAC advice on the public-policy issues regarding this final report to the Board. So it's just to let you know that. But to also -- really, thank you for having considered them, even though they didn't make -- they didn't make it to the final report; again, because of your consensus processes.

But also to note that there are quite a number of Public Safety Working Group members that are involved in several of your ongoing PDPs, and so we will continue in that spirit.

---

Thank you.

JAMES BLADEL:

Thank you. And thanks for that indication. And I think primarily we believe -- the Public Safety Working Group I think is a group -- we didn't call it that, but it's something that I think we have wanted to see for quite some time, which is a defined organization to represent those public safety, law enforcement or consumer protection interests and bring those to the PDP so that they can be considered by the working group at an earlier phase.

I'm not going to lie, I guess I'm a little disappointed to hear this is going to be the subject of GAC advice. We'll see. Because I believe these were subject to the proper consideration of the PDP process, but I guess it's not really my place to comment on the GAC advice or what happens to it after that. I guess that probably is an indication to me that we need to redouble our efforts in working through the Public Safety Working Group so that we can get their input into the PDP for future PDPs as well association that we don't have this disconnect at the end of the process.

---

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. And maybe just to make sure that everybody understands that any working groups of the GAC -- and there has been some in clarity in the GAC and also particularly in communication with the outside. Any working group of the GAC is a group on specialists, people with a keen interest on one issue, but the results of the -- the proposal of the working group have to go through the GAC to be validated to become the status of a document that reflects balanced GAC opinion, and of course this takes some time. And this is also why, in the end, everything that comes out of a working group goes through the GAC and may end up to be reflected in a GAC advice or not, or the GAC may decide to send a paper that comes from the working group one-to-one to somebody else as a GAC paper, then. So there are different ways of giving advice, so just to make the procedure clear.

JAMES BLADEL: If I could offer just one more suggestion. The recommendations for that PDP are still open for public comment. So perhaps the Public Safety Working Group can submit those --

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: What is the deadline? 21 March? Or what is it?

---

JAMES BLADEL: I'm looking around the room.

March 16th.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So next Wednesday.

JAMES BLADEL: Maybe we'll work on getting an extension. But March 16th is the current deadline.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yes. Any other remarks on this one?

Yes, U.K. Very briefly, Mark.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thanks. Not on this one but I just wanted briefly to mention another open issue with regard to protection in new gTLDs, and that is permanent protection of Red Cross, Red Crescent and Red Crystal designations and names.

I've sent an aide-memoire about this issue to GAC colleagues.

I don't -- a discussion of the substance of the issue, but I think it would be helpful to know where this sits on the GNSO's current roster of issues and if there is some opportunity for GAC-GNSO



---

interaction on this at an early opportunity. It would be helpful to know that. Sorry; I've sprung it on you, I realize, so if you want to come back to us on that, it would be helpful. But I just wanted to underline, it's still high in our priorities. There's been previous submissions of advice to the Board on this. We're not intending to do that on this occasion, but just highlight the priority and visibility of this open issue.

Thank you.

JAMES BLADEL:

Thank you. I think that that was actually divided into two work units. One was associated with the Red Cross, I believe is complete. There is other work units associated with that request. I will be sure to include those in the written update of the PDP activities on the status report that we'll be sending via Mason, through our liaison. I'll make sure to get that on the list because I'm not sure 100% either. So I want to make sure that I give you the right answer.

So we will take that offline. The status report that we had planned to give, we'll include it in that.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Just a quick clarification, if I am not wrong. If you are alluding to the other process of the protection and rights of the IGOs, these

---

are two -- basically two separate issues, although there are some similarities in the issues, of course, of the protection of institutions that have a public goal. And you're right, the status update was supposed to be in one part. We're happy to receive that. We know there is work going on in this small group that was also delayed. Because of the transition, there was a four-month waiting period. We had a good meeting in Paris in July, but then things got delayed because -- also because the Board and everybody was too busy to take care of this. But we are trying to move this forward.

But if I'm not mistaken, both protections for the IGOs and also for the Red Cross are temporary protections. The permanent protections are not yet in place, which is something that, at some point in time, should probably be work that should be completed. We won't make this today, but it's also one thing that is on our list.

I hope that sums it up correctly.

JAMES BLADEL:                      That captured it.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:                Thank you.

---

I think we have quite used an addition of your time, as well. So one last final point, hopefully. Kavouss.

IRAN:

There's no final point. It's a request for a comment. I asked before if you have time, so I hope you don't forget that. It's very important issue for GAC. We're deciding on the CCWG Accountability. During the discussion it was mentioned differences between the PDP of the GNSO and the GAC advice, the level of the approval, and rejection by the Board. And then it was mentioned that if the level of the threshold increased from simple majority to the 60%, then the carve-out will apply for GAC and not apply for GNSO.

When it was questioned why should be difference, it was mentioned that the PDP recommendation has a built-in mechanism that does not need to have that carve-out. And I think, if I am not mistaken, you referred to all of those built-in mechanism that, the PDP, before going to the Board, is subject to public comments. Is that right?

And if that is right, before going to the Board, is subject to public comment? If there are other built-in mechanisms, we would be very happy because we would like to have a clear understanding why the two should be treated differently.

---

Thank you.

JAMES BLADEL:

So I will try to be brief but still address your concerns.

I think that -- And this is -- you and I have been participating on both of these groups now for almost two years, so I think this is very, very deep into the substance of some of the -- some of the topics that prompted dozens if not hundreds of email messages over the year. So I'm going to summarize that and I'm going to fail but I'm going to try anyway, which is that I think that the view is that there are some built-in accountability mechanisms into the PDP that allow it to be treated differently. I'm not going to comment on the GAC advice, but the PDP specifically, there are two public comment periods, a minimum of two. The working group could request additional comment periods. They are open to anyone to join: GAC members, GNSO members, anyone who wants to -- who has an interest and believes that they can contribute. The only requirement is you have to declare your Statement of Interest at the beginning, at the outset of a PDP, but other than that there's no restrictions on participation or leadership.

And additionally, the PDPs are conducted in a transparent and open manner, which I think is -- look, I'll be blunt, it's not the

---

case for GAC advice. It's a closed process, as it should be, perhaps. But you asked for differences. There's one difference.

And then finally the scope of a PDP is limited, not only constrained by the contracts that may exist between contracted parties but is also reviewed by ICANN legal to ensure that it fits within the consistencies of the bylaws and ICANN's mission.

So all of those checks, I believe, are occurring throughout the process of a PDP as opposed to putting them into one check at the end of the process. You know, I think that some of the GNSO participants and some of the GAC participants may have very different opinions on whether that's appropriate treatment of the differences, but I think your question was do I believe that there are differences? Yes. I believe there are some fundamental differences between the two processes. I think it's an open question of whether or not the CCWG got it right, but I think that they are -- they are (indiscernible) processes.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you very much, James. Actually, that helps us getting rid of the carve-out because we will then decide to open up our Wednesday afternoon to make GAC communicate drafting public, which is the last remaining bit, and we'll introduce public comment periods on our GAC advice, which will delay the whole

---

thing for another half a year, but then I think we fulfilled the conditions to get rid of the carve-out and I can leave.

Okay. Thank you very much for this. I think we have to close our meeting now. It was a very fruitful exchange and we are looking forward to continuing to intensify this exchange with you and everybody else in the GNSO. And thanks for coming. And we make a one-minute break to let them go.

[ Applause ]

JAMES BLADEL: Thank you for having us. Very valuable.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Actually, the meeting was not over. That was just a very long one-minute break. So we have one more session to go, so please take your seats again.

Okay. Please take your seats again. I know that you are discussing very important things, of course, but we are not done yet for tonight.

So I will very soon hand over the floor to Tom, as our extremely valuable support on many substantive issues.

---

As you know, we shifted agenda item 10 and 12, so the last remaining item for tonight is the future -- issue of the future new gTLD rounds, where we were supposed to get an update on some key PDPs, policy development processes that are going on in the GNSO. Unfortunately we didn't have time for that. We will get that in writing very soon and share that with you. So let me give the floor to Tom who will help us gain a quick overview over the quick elements of what is going on in the GNSO but also elsewhere in ICANN with regard to new gTLDs future round.

Thank you very much, Tom.

TOM DALE:

Thank you very much, Thomas.

The briefing that we prepared and circulated -- and I should stress, by the way, when I say "we," this is an ACIG effort, not just me but also myself, Michelle, and Tracey. So it is a corporate input we continue to provide.

The briefing that we circulated, which I'll take you through now, covers the issue of future new gTLD rounds and the policy development around that, but I will touch on briefly some of the other GNSO PDP work, which perhaps we did not have time to discuss in the last session.

---

There is a lot of work being generated within the GNSO PDP structure. There always is. And it is now becoming particularly important for the GAC. So I'll try to explain the reasons for that importance, where those things are up to, as we understand it, and some options that the GAC might want to consider in terms of further engagement.

Basically, there are three broad tracks of work here across ICANN, and, I'm sorry, you have to get your head around three tracks of work, some of which you might not have considered before, but let me try to explain. Those are the reviews that are being conducted of the current round. Why are they important? Because the current round is almost gone; because they will set the scene for the next round, if there is a next round of new gTLDs.

Those reviews -- you've heard of one of the more important once already this afternoon, that's the one on competition, consumer trust and consumer choice. That's an ICANN review. It is not a community review. It is an ICANN review, but there are some others, mainly being conducted by ICANN; okay? So they're not community based. They're ICANN reviews for various reasons.

There is -- The second track of work is developing policies for future rounds. The ICANN commission work does not develop policies. ICANN does not work that way, as many of you know.



---

Those policies are developed within community structures, particularly the GNSO for these purposes. So the policy work on that is -- goes through the policy development processes, the PDPs, of which the most important right now are the GNSO ones.

And the third track of which, which is something we've tried to bring you up-to-date on in the briefing document, is the question of metrics; that is, measuring how gTLDs are working in the market and what impacts they are having. ICANN is developing a range of metrics, and there has been some ongoing discussion and some very important feedback from a public-policy point of view. That feedback has not gone from governments. It has come from Security and Stability Advisory Committee and other technical experts, but we've shared that with you in the brief as well. So three tracks of work: the reviews of the current round, the policy development for future rounds, and the development of metrics. A mixture of ICANN, the community; particularly, the GNSO processes, and all of the people who participate in that.

If that looks a little complicated and untidy as a process for developing policies for the next round of new gTLDs, that's because it is quite untidy and messy, and that's just how it is because ICANN is a mixture of bottom-up policy development work and issues that the Board has to guide in order for the -- some elements of the DNS to keep continuing. So it's a bit

---

untidy, but there is a certain logic to it. Again, we've tried to explain it in the briefing document.

Very quickly on ICANN reviews. The CCT review, you heard Megan and Laureen refer to that earlier this afternoon. There is a document called the Program Implementation Review of the new gTLD round which is a comprehensive document prepared by ICANN staff of how they believed the round went. There is a root stability review, which is being undertaken by ICANN. And finally, there is a review of the trademark clearinghouse, which we have referred to in some previous meetings. That's quite important because ICANN has indicated publicly that that review was requested by the GAC some three years ago. I apologize. Three or four years ago now. And that review of the trademark clearinghouse system is going to come back to the GAC for comment at some point. Just a reminder that you, the GAC, in a corporate sense, requested it, and that's covered in previous briefing as well.

The PDPs, the most important ones at the moment for future policy are the ones on new g -- new gTLD subsequent procedures. That's the term the GNSO has used. And the PDP on rights protection mechanisms.

This is essentially a trade or intellectual property rights for all gTLDs. Now, the briefing and this session was intended to focus

---

mainly on the first one -- that is, new gTLD subsequent procedures -- because that covers the full range of public-policy issues where the GAC has provided the last three years, giving advice to the Board on the current round, and funnily enough, they are there again for future rounds because none of them have been completely resolved, and, therefore, they continue to be of interest to the GAC whenever the next round may occur over the next two or three years.

And finally on metrics, there are a number of points in the brief which I draw your attention to concerning ICANN's continuing efforts to develop what they call a dashboard of key performance indicators on the gTLD marketplace. Some of those are relevant to competition and consumer issues; some of the data is relevant to domain name abuse, safety and security. You might like to have a look at the comments that SSAC made concerning ICANN's first draft of those indicators because they're quite important for measuring public-policy outcomes.

The brief includes a possible way forward for the GAC on these issues. There's a table there which tries to reduce the very long list of issues in the charter for the subsequent procedures, PDP, and that's very long charter, a long list of issues. I have tried to -- sorry. We have tried to frame those in a table which corresponds to public-policy issues, and we've tried to categorize those as threshold issue about getting the metrics right, some strategic

---

policy questions for the GAC starting with the question of whether there should be further gTLD rounds. That's not a settled question. And finally, a range of operational policy issues, including the role of GAC advice because that is flagged for inclusion in the PDP. So the subsequent rounds PDP will be looking at the role the GAC advice played in the current round and what role it should play in the future. So it would be a very good idea for the GAC to be involved in those discussions about how GAC advice is treated. That's only one example; okay?

Finally, in terms of possible ways forward, on managing the issues within the GAC, clearly the CCT review has a reporting stream through the GAC nominated members, as we heard earlier this afternoon. The PDP work is open still to any GAC member individually to volunteer as far as the subsequent rounds PDP work, the very large and comprehensive one that I mentioned.

A number of GAC members, when were you told about it on the GAC list some months ago, a number indicated an interest in participating individually. I don't think everyone has followed through on that. You have to deal directly with the GNSO.

There is at least one GAC affiliated participant in that PDP, and that's myself. I filled out my Statement of Interest and joined. But it's quite painless, and it cost me nothing, and the emails

---

have been quite minimal so far, and there's only been two meetings online.

So please, have a look at what the brief says about that, and if you wish for an update, we can certainly provide that, and there will be further updates through Mason Cole from the GNSO, as Thomas has said, on all of the PDPs.

And very, very finally, the -- you will recall that we called for expressions of interest from GAC members a number of months ago in joining a -- what was intended to be a small Coordination Group within the GAC to focus particularly on managing the work, managing the GAC's interest in the subsequent rounds' PDP, and being a clearinghouse of communication to the GAC about what is going on there, and also where GAC consensus positions need to be developed to try to get those members to work on -- to work with the rest of the GAC in getting that GAC agreed input and putting that back into the PDP process over the next year or so, because that's how long it's going to take.

Quite a number of members indicated an interest, so a small Coordination Group, at the moment, has a list of about 30 or so interested GAC members, which is very good. We need to consider, or the group needs to consider, and I'm at your disposal on this, the way in which that group wants to organize itself, who is particularly interested in taking the lead on issues

---

as per the brief. Maybe the way that those issues are categorized in the table in the brief and it needs to be revised. It was not possible -- unfortunately, despite best efforts, it was not possible to arrange a call of the interested members before this meeting because we all became a little distracted with other matters, as you're aware. And if -- and I did not feel brave enough to send yet another complex email to the GAC and wear out my welcome even more. So the matter is open still in terms of organizing a group of interested members for that future round gTLD policy work. We could organize a meeting here. We could deal with it intersessionally. We could try to have a further discussion before the end of the week.

What I would stress, though, is that it is not the sort of issue that the GAC can defer to the next meeting for two reasons. One is that, as you're probably aware, there is no room in the B meeting for these sort of things. It doesn't work that way anymore. The B meeting in June will not be a forum for further decisions that plug into the system.

Because the system -- The second reason why there will be a problem in leaving it until June is the train has already started to move away from the GNSO station, if you like, and if the GAC wishes to be on it, either individually or collectively, then now is a good time, or certainly well before June is a good time to think about that.

---

I'll leave this there, Thomas.

I'm sorry, that's been a long explanation of what's already a long brief.

But it seems to us that the issue is a very important set of policy issues for the GAC, substantive policy issues which the GAC has indicated it is not completely happy with the outcomes for the first round -- sorry -- for the round that is now finishing. But there's certainly not many opportunities for early GAC intervention or engagement the next round.

And this particular process, as covered in the brief, we believe, is that opportunity. I'll leave it there for now. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Tom. And don't apologize for taking time. I think this, again, shows how extremely valuable your support is. Because you're, more or less, the only one who is actually able to jump in in these fundamentally important issues and have an ear and an eye or two in this while we, most of us can't, actually. So thank you very much for this excellent support that you're providing us with. Just to make that very clear again.

With regard to the substance of this, I think this is -- as we see, it's -- it's an issue of, I guess you agree with me, of very high importance. Those who are in this organization for a few years,

---

they know how much time and energy we spent on working out the modalities for the first new gTLD rounds. That was even more maybe not as intense per month. But it was an even longer a very intense exercise that we went through.

And with -- to some elements that worked out to our satisfaction. Other elements worked out not fully to our satisfaction.

And I think the second round is the moment to try and, if and where we have consensus, adapt work for adaptation of that mechanism. Whatever will be -- whatever will not be adapted -- whatever will be done in the same way in the second round like in the first.

In the third round it will probably be impossible to have an influence on adapting things. So this is really -- and, Tom, you've made this very clear. It is now that the GAC needs to step in if it has a view that some things maybe should be improved or further developed.

Because, otherwise, we will miss that train probably for quite a long time.

So, having said this, I would like to give the floor to you and for comments or questions on this. And, also, we also not just need to discuss the substance. We also need to make sure that we



---

catch this train before the next meeting and organize ourselves in a way that we are able to work on this. And that means we need to have people signing up in one way or another, whether formally or informally, to join Tom in following this process, working on it and informing the whole GAC, preparing positions. And thank you for your tables and your briefing where you try to highlight some elements that we should look into with priority and for giving some proposals. Of course, this decision is on us. I don't have to say this. But it's very helpful to have some proposals about what next steps could be. So the floor is yours to give us our view.

Switzerland, Argentina, and Iran. And Thailand. Thank you. Keep your hands up. But, Switzerland, please start.

SWITZERLAND:

Okay. Thank you, Chairman.

As to the participation in the PDPs, if I understand correctly, that was what we were discussing, by GAC members, I would suggest that we consider the possibility that we make similar arrangements to what we did with the CWG and the CCWG. And we have a number of volunteers coming from the GAC who have, so to say, the main role of reporting back to the GAC and trying to make inputs also into the PDP working group on the main issues which are of concern for the GAC in general. And perhaps

---

that's a way forward. And that wouldn't exclude that other GAC members participate either as observers or also as members, if they wish to apply to do so. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much. Argentina.

ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. Want to support what our colleague from Switzerland said. I think it's a very good idea.

And also I remind the importance of the public comment period. We always give information in our list about public comment periods. Comments could be made by one government, by a group of governments, or by the whole GAC. Perhaps having an opinion from the whole GAC will take more time. But maybe comments can be made by some countries. We have already done that. And in other -- in previous comment periods.

And, Tom, thank you very much for your work. I think it's remarkable. I, personally, had not much time in the last month because of the accountability process. But I would like to engage more in this, which is a very important issue for our country.

---

Could you recap a little bit more what you said about the 30 countries and the possible meeting that we were going to have here? Because I missed that part of your explanation. And I'm sorry for that.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Tom, please.

TOM DALE: Yes, certainly. Thank you, Olga.

The email that was sent out -- and this has all been done online -- followed a discussion of the GAC at the meeting in Dublin. The general intention there was to try to seek expressions of interest from members interested in some form of organizing, coordinating, or whatever GAC involvement in this particular PDP and any relevant ICANN reviews -- not everything. Not all PDPs. That's a bit too much. The exact way of doing it was left open. And, indeed, the advice that we sent around was left open. It just said, really, it's up to you. There are a number of different ways it can be done.

So we do have quite a number of, as I said, about 30 or so expressions of interest. However, that's only a start.

If it's possible for that group to meet physically this week, fine.

---

Well, I'm happy to try to facilitate that, although it could be rather difficult given the uncertainty about our other work over the next few days. But I would be very interested to hear suggestions about using that enthusiasm and interest in the most constructive way.

Switzerland has suggested one way of doing that, which makes sense to me. And there may be others, of course. So that was what I was referring to. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you for that clarification. I have Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. You have very rightly mentioned that more and more acknowledge very helpful work was done by Tom. We really appreciate that. Thank you very much for that.

I think in the previous meeting several times, even with the meeting with the Board, we mentioned that lessons learned from the first round need to be carefully examined. And any shortcoming, deficiencies, problems, difficulties, should be avoided in the second round.

Has it been included in your summary, Tom, please? Thank you.

---

TOM DALE:

Thank you. Yes. There is some material there concerning the key issues that the GAC had identified in the first round. It's not possible to distill it down to lessons learned in the sense that we've got something to take to the GNSO or other bodies, for example. It's a bit -- that takes a bit more work. And what the GAC might think are lessons learned might not be what other people think are lessons learned. So I think the intention is clearly in the PDP process to go through it all again from the start.

But we do have the resource material there. And what we can provide further resource material concerning the GAC's experiences, a lot of those were from advice to and fro between the GAC and the Board on safeguards. And we have some separate briefing on that that was discussed yesterday and which is quite comprehensive. That can be used as the basis.

But I think, given that the GNSO process is now taking control, if you like, of the discussion and how it's framed, for example, on GAC early warning advice, whether -- which is what they mean by reviewing GAC advice, the GAC early warning system, for example, the GAC, if that discussion were not to occur with any GAC contribution, then clearly that would be a problem, I would think.

---

So, while we do have the material here and in other briefings full of the advice and issues over the last three years from the GAC, from Beijing onwards, we have to realize, I'd suggest, that the discussion is going to be framed in terms of not just what the GAC learned but what everybody else thought of the GAC's advice and be prepared to take part in a robust discussion. And that's, I think, going to take place in the PDP process, which we've tried to give a bit of a heads up to.

And I should mention, to, if I may, the PDP working group process is one where the -- where ICANN and the GNSO staff within ICANN regularly offer introductory training sessions and provide assistance in how to participate, which is mostly remotely. They give an idea of how much time commitment may be involved in calls or in looking at Adobe Connect for an hour at a time. And that assistance and training and advice is certainly available to anyone in the GAC who wishes to participate. It is of a very high quality, I should mention. And we can provide some further assistance with ICANN on that. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much. Next I have Thailand.

---

THAILAND:

Thank you, Chair. There are some viewpoints raised already, but I like to raise. One, if you want to look into the GNSO, even the name of the project is different. They do not call like us. They call new gTLDs subsequent procedures.

And we call subsequent round.

That are the first thing that the terms is -- and, if you try to read the charter, it's the most complex PDP ever. And we have one member. What we convey a message to the community is not correct. We should early engage in this process.

If you read every group in the charter, you'll be scary. Because they cover every aspect that we use to discuss and spend the whole night in Beijing until 1:00 in the morning. And this is the time they like to hear from us. And you send only one member.

I wish I could participate. And I try. But we also have another working group that -- anyhow, after this I have to think that how could we prioritize? But it's so important, if you read the charters. It includes name coalition, everything. Even the underserved regions. You name it. Everything you talk about, the domain names, have been specified under these five groups. And we need to really participate. And we have 100 people sitting here. And to be observer and member is different story. And PDP engagement is required a lot of work. You need to make a paper. You need to communicate back to the GAC.

---

And I don't believe that Tom will next round, maybe next meeting, he'll make an update about these working groups if he'll be the only one working.

So I urge that all the GACs have to really start to look to this. And, otherwise, the second round coming, you just issue the GAC early warning. And this might not be worth. Because they give us an opportunity to participate and make, whatever you call, advice, recommendations, or you can document it. Maybe Thailand is participating in translation, transliteration before in the PDP processes. And we think that is worth the time that we spend. Because, in the final report, they note what the recommendation we have been proposed to the working groups. Officially, they're recognized as a GAC recommendation, which is not the same as what the decision made by the GNSO Council. But we reserve our right. We already told them you need to do translation how the address will be a problem if it's a non-Latin-based. Correct or non-ASCII, they call it. So I really urge the members that we need to look.

And, if you read the charter, I think that it's the most important working group or PDP coming out. And we need to really convey the message that GAC liked to participate and work with community. That's the most important thing.



---

Then sit and wait until last minute. And you issue the GAC early warnings, which does not help anything. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Wanawit. And, actually, I support your view that it's not enough to have one member, which is our secretariat, participating in this. So I propose that we'll just count through 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 for all of us. And who gets a 1 will participate in one of the streams. And who gets 2 -- no, joking.

But we need to find ways to get clear engagement from at least a number of us in this. Otherwise, we will have a problem rather sooner probably than later.

So the next is U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Thank you, Chair. And yes. I very much agree with Thailand's comments there and your comments just now.

And, well, first of all, I reaffirm -- hopefully, I registered sometime after Dublin my willingness to participate and to pick up on some elements of the PDP process in particular.

And I agree with what Switzerland had proposed in sort of sharing the load, if you like, the burden.

---

We do identify who might lead on particular topics and then report back and engage in the PDP working group.

And what immediately jumps out to me is, first of all, our community applications. I mean, I've led a lot of work on that, as you all will well recall. So I'm certainly willing to sort of volunteer in that respect of the highlighted issues.

In the GNSO's non-exhaustive list community applications is there and perhaps IGO issues and so on. I'll give further thought to that.

I just want to make one possible addition, well, an addition I would very much like to see added to this GNSO non-exhaustive list. And that is child protection, which was a big issue for the GAC, as you well remember from the first round. And there were specific applications which we identified in the Beijing communique, which were strings that were targeting children and so on and our anxiety that these be the subject of adequate safeguards.

I will mention in this context that our colleagues from Italy and the U.K. have been working with the European NGO Alliance on Child Safety Online just to work up a set of criteria for registration requirements and such domains. We haven't given this any visibility yet in the GAC. We will intend to do that at some stage.

---

But this provides a vehicle for the U.K. and possibly for my colleagues from Italy as well to engage in the PDP process in respect to child protection.

And, come to think of it, I think I should have mentioned it to the CCT review at the CCT review session as well as an important topic.

So great appreciation to Tom for the work on this and collating the relevant documents of a matrix of activities where we need to focus and get into gear. Thank you.

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

SPAIN: Thank you, Thomas.

While I support the call for participation of GAC members in PDPs because maybe we should give a try to this method after our failure to persuade the GAC board to follow advice in relation to new TLDs, that may be due to our late engagement in the process.

Maybe we try another way to try to be more persuasive or to try to come round to our positions. We should not live the same experience again.

---

So I encourage you to participate. But we are very mindful of the workload that we have back at home. And, although we may promise here to pay more attention to GAC issues when we go back home, the reality is that we are overburdened sometimes by other responsibilities back home. Maybe those issues have not enough visibility with our bosses, with our high-level officials. Maybe tomorrow could be a good opportunity to also call the attention of high-level officials of the need that they let their staff devote more time to these issues.

But, as this is not easy to change -- political priorities are not set by us -- I have a couple of suggestions in regards to these working groups that are being formed. As I think they are already 30 people on the list or more than that. And there are several working groups or initiatives to follow here.

I suggest that people choose the one that it's more important for their countries. And there are at least two people for each group, so that they can take turns in attending conference calls.

When I've been participant in some PDPs, they tend to organize calls every week or every two weeks. And sometimes this is not convenient for you, because you have other things to do or it's only because the calls take place at night or something like that. So it could be wise to have at least two people so that they can take turns.

---

Also, if you can't engage people back home, some countries come here with delegations made of two or three people. That means they're not the only ones following GAC issues back home. If they could share the burden among the three or two of them, that could make it more easy to cope with it.

And I have to also say that for non-native speakers, it's difficult to follow not only written documents but especially conference calls. And then, if you have to report back to the GAC in English, it takes more time.

For me it's easier to write in Spanish because I write faster. And I've had to write in English. It takes more time for me.

I don't know if it's feasible or not. But, if there could be a possibility for those that are really active on this group but would like to write in one of the seven languages and then have their messages translated in English, that would be an incentive.

And the last thing I wanted to say is that it is not mentioned here, but there is also another issue that the GAC should pay attention to that is the new gTLD directory registry service, the one who is going to replace WHOIS. I think this is going to be fundamental for the GAC, and the GAC needs absolutely to follow that. Thank you.

---

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yes, thank you. I think your points have been well noted, including the last one as well. Let's not move time and move on. We have New Zealand, and I am not wrong, and Norway on the list, and then we should agree -- quickly agree on the way forward.

Thank you. New Zealand.

NEW ZEALAND: Thank you, Chair.

We definitely support the establishment of a group of people to help us deal with these issues. I've just had a look at Tom's briefing note, and, quite frankly, the volume of work scares me. At the simplest level, I think (indiscernible) what the meetings are discussing and when will be very helpful for the GAC, reporting back on when we need to be inputting and whether there is enough interest to develop a shared GAC position.

One I think I do think we need to consider is working methods. We've known from the CCWG that it can be challenging having representatives who are asked to share the views of GAC. Perhaps we may think about these people as more liaisons than representatives in how they can bring back what's going on so that they can we can then input separately as countries or together as GAC. And to discuss together with those who have

---

volunteered or with the GAC as a whole how we expect this to operate. We are already a busy advisory committee, so I am very happy to see 30 people have volunteered. I think we can share the load to ensure GAC is covering this adequately and be ready before we leave Marrakech. Particularly, I think our first job should be to input into the time frames that have been set up for this so we can be sure the time frames enable the community -- not just guidebook GAC, but everybody -- to manage the vast scope of work that they've identified.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you for these valid points, New Zealand.

I have Norway last.

NORWAY: Yes, thank you, Chair. I also wanted to thank Tom and the secretariat for this comprehensive overview of the GAC safeguard advice and interaction with the Board and all the messages back and forth, because it's very many. And I also just want to underline that all the safeguard advice are addressing the shortcomings of the new gTLD Applicant Guidebook. But I also wanted to point out that also -- we might also see that other issues that are in the existing new gTLD Applicant Guidebook are

---

taken up for second consideration, up for new debate. And as we see current discussion in the Cross-Community Working Group on geographic names, that some wants to have that protection that existed up for new debate. So that might also come in other areas. So we also have to be mindful about that other issues that already -- well, not so -- issues that's been solved in the current Applicant Guidebook are taken up by GNSO -- GNSO for new second consideration.

So just that we also try to pay attention on those issues, if they come up for discussion.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Norway. That's another very valid point that you are making.

I think we have to wrap up. It's already past 6:00 and it has been a long day, since 8:30, and a few minutes, in the morning.

Let's quickly make sure that we agree on -- that we're clear about the follow-up to this, unless somebody urges to make another statement on process.

So basically, we have this -- this proposal that we would use -- divide our energy and create, like, if I get this right, like



---

subteams that would participate in the different streams, using or building on the 30 people that have registered but maybe new people are coming in and not everybody is. So maybe, Tom, if you have a concrete of what you would propose after you have heard, for the next step that we can do as quickly as possible, I guess, so that we're all on the same page.

TOM DALE:

Okay. Thank you, Thomas. Firstly, I noted that Mary Wong from the ICANN policy staff had noted in the Adobe chat that it is the practice of GNSO PDP working groups to ask for input from all groups, which would include the GAC, at an early stage. So there is an early opportunity to -- to cover some of the issues, at least initially, from a whole of GAC perspective. However, as we've learned, it is a question of finding the right people and the right time to even do that and the secretariat is unable to do it by itself.

Listening to the views, I would propose the not very illuminating way forward of me speaking with a number of the representatives who have expressed an interest this afternoon in particular, including Switzerland, the U.K., New Zealand, and some others. If you give me an -- some time over the next few days to speak with those as a small group, and then we'll talk about the small group and the larger group perhaps agreeing on

---

some sort of structure that could perhaps form a liaison role, as New Zealand suggested, rather than a formal representative role, for example; some ways that build on the good parts of the CCWG involvement and perhaps avoid some of the more challenging parts, including too much time for a small number of people at some very strange hours of the day and night.

Those are all practical things, which I'm sure can be overcome with a reasonable number of people.

So please allow me some time to talk to those members, put a few ideas together, and report back at the end of the week when we're in a celebratory mood, of course, having dealt with more important matters.

Thank you, Chair.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I think that's a fair proposal.

U.S.

UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair, and I do apologize for keeping us a little bit later. And thank you again. I want to join the queue in thanking Tom for this extremely helpful paper, which is, in fact, at one

---

level a bit alarming because it shows us the magnitude of this important work.

So I think we also have a few more tasks ourselves. I saw you nodding your head, several people mentioning we need to do a priority ranking of the work we already have on our plates and how we can take advantage of the work we've already started, to sort of redirect it, perhaps, since a lot of the issues that we are addressing in existing working groups, some of them have already been identified in this fairly lengthy list, and that we might reach agreement. If we are going to work as GAC as GAC, then we shoot for that to the extent possible because I think that will certainly have more weight when it is delivered in that fashion.

But I also think we should perhaps try to talk through -- and maybe that's all it is, Tom Dale, a couple of conversations, the GAC-GNSO Consultation Group is meant, in fact, it's got some procedures that maybe we can borrow from, because we need to sort of be able to identify timelines for the specific streams of work so that you can do something comparable to what we did years and years ago when we did the GAC scorecard. I think we had volunteers who put pen to paper, and everything was circulated to the full GAC so that the entire GAC was on board. And that's how we were very well positioned subsequently for fleshing out the safeguard advice.

---

So I do think we may want to rethink what we're currently doing, rationalize it. I think it was Wanawit who said establish some priorities. And then link to timelines so that there's a very clear roadmap.

But again, I did want to thank you for that, and I'm certainly also happy to volunteer to chat with a small group to see what we might do.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Suzanne. And, actually, since you have been very active in that work, collecting items and points in the first round, together with others we count on your memories how we did what and what worked better than others things. But it's definitely true, we will have to prioritize work. There's no other way. We can't -- we won't do otherwise.

And I just urge all of you -- of course Marrakech is a great city, but Thursday morning is the time where we could actually start planning our work into the next intersessional period, plus the next meeting and maybe even beyond.

So as more of you as will stay with us on Thursday morning, this would be probably -- we have some time allocated, if I'm not completely mistaken, to plan the work ahead. So please join

---

that discussion then, because we have to stop now. It's the end of the day, at least of this part of the day where we -- that we spend in this room.

I thank you very much for your cooperation, for your engagement, from early to late hours, and we meet in this framework Tuesday morning at 9:00. We meet in this room in a different setting tomorrow at 10:00. So that's it.

Thank you.

Have a nice evening.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**