HELSINKI – Board-GAC Recommendations Implementation Working Group (BGRI)
Monday, June 27, 2016 – 14:00 to 15:00 EEST
ICANN56 | Helsinki, Finland

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So let's move on right away to the next session, which is led by the Board-GAC Recommendation Implementation Working Group, which is the revival, the resurrection of a zombie that we had earlier in our history. That was the one that was formed to help implement the recommendations in cooperation between the Board and the GAC of the ATRT, the accountability transparency reviews that were made. And we're very happy to have Manal again with us and also Markus to help us try and implement the recommendations or discuss the recommendations that we have to try to make our GAC advice more effective.

So let me hand over the floor to whoever of you two would like to start.

MARKUS KUMMER: It's Markus Kummer speaking. Yes, thank you, Thomas, and good afternoon. It's my pleasure to be here with you, but we have very limited time. We were told to leave the room a little bit in advance because there will be a CCWG. So we have three-

quarters of an hour, and for this reason, let me just jump straight into the matter.

This, obviously, has some history. We will not go too much into the history, but it is our ambition that we would like to come to closure with some of the recommendation today. This is a process. We have a work program, and we hope to have more clarity in something which is not always that clear.

And with that, I hand over to Manal who has a short presentation.

Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Markus. And as you mentioned, we have tight time, so we will try to make a very brief introduction and then get into substance. So can we go to the next slide, please? The next.

So as mentioned earlier, the Board-GAC Recommendations Implementation Working Group was created to implement GAC-related recommendations of ATRT1, and the mandate was extended to implement GAC-related recommendations of the second Accountability and Transparency Review Team and, most recently, reconvened to look into effectiveness of GAC advice.

The current working group from the GAC side, we have the GAC chair, we have Switzerland, U.S., Iran, U.K., and myself from Egypt. And from the Board, Markus, would you.

MARKUS KUMMER: We have -- the following board members are members of this working group: Chris Disspain, Erika Mann, Ram Mohan, Mike Silber, and Lousewies Van der Laan.

MANAL ISMAIL: Sorry. So if we go to the next slide, please.

So in Dublin, the GAC raised the need to periodically review whether and how effective the Board has taken GAC advice into account.

ACIG has helpfully analyzed the issue and prepared a review report. The report was presented -- was referred -- was attached to a letter from the GAC to the Board, and the Board referred the issue to the BGRI working group to analyze and develop their recommendations.

So if we go to the next slide. The following one, please.

The key findings of the report were that in some cases, it is extremely difficult to determine whether or not ICANN Board has accepted GAC advice; and where there is clear evidence that the

advice has been accepted, to what degree it has been implemented; and whether or not the GAC feel the implementation adequately meets GAC's original intent.

So can we go to the next slide, please.

So this is the work plan. We decided to start quickly with the work plan so that you can recognize what's needed from you during this working session when we discuss the specific recommendations in more details.

So, Markus, would you like to talk about the work plan first?

MARKUS KUMMER: As you can see, we have hopefully listed three issues where we hope to come to closure at this meeting.

We have the fourth issue, logging and tracking mechanism, where we will have a presentation I think this coming Wednesday by ICANN staff and then we hope that we can come to closure to two more recommendations by the time we meet again in Hyderabad.

And the trickier one, that's actually how to implement. They will be left until after Hyderabad. But hopefully, let's start with what is easy and pick the low-hanging fruits.

Over to you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Markus.

So if we go to the following slide, please.

So this is the first recommendation from the ACIG report which is review and make clear to all parties what forms of communication from the GAC comprise GAC advice.

And we thought discussion of the different recommendations should target that we have a common understanding of the recommendation and the approach that should be followed; identify the implementation elements or deliverables; the time frame, as Markus had already highlighted, and responsibilities; and finally, how to have this recommendation documented and institutionalized within the overall process.

So I have to mention here that this issue was raised also as early as in the Accountability and Transparency Review Team 1. And a definition has been reached and posted on the GAC website. So if we can have the definition on the screen, I think this may be helpful to refresh colleagues' minds on this.

So the question here is is this not satisfactory or was it satisfactory before but not anymore now in or is it satisfactory but not known to people that this definition already exists.

So I think this should be our starting point here for this recommendation. We can review this definition and see how we can make it visible and known to people that this already exists so that even when time passes and people change, things are handy and accessible.

So do we have any comments now on this existing explanation of what constitutes a GAC advice?

Jorge, please, Switzerland.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you very much, Manal. I think that it comes to me as low-hanging fruit, as Markus said, that perhaps we could insert this as a kind of part of a disclaimer in our communiques or in our communications which are intended to be advice as small print at the end of the document. That would be quite handy. Or a link to this definition.

Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you. I think this is a useful suggestion. So any other reactions? And please also, ACIG, if there is something that needs to be clarified or why this specific recommendation was

put in place, please feel free to chime in anytime. So Iran, please, Mr. Arestah.

IRAN: Thank you, Manal. I think it might be known to everybody, but at least in the CCWG in or in activities, elements also was added to the GAC advice and may be useful to take -- take that into account, what the GAC advice should contain? One element, for instance, was it should contain to have a rationale. This is one thing that it should ensure that it is consistent with the bylaw. It may be self understood but perhaps it has been taken into account in one way or the other. So thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Iran. Another useful suggestion. So we -- we need to edit this description and add to it, what should be included in the GAC advice, like you mentioned, a rationale consistent with the ICANN bylaws and whatever other pieces that we can identify during the discussion. Okay, Iran again.

IRAN: Yes, one more element, perhaps known by colleagues. If the GAC advice is taken by consensus, it should be mentioned. If it is not consensus, it should also be mentioned. Or if you mention that this advice is approved by consensus means that the other

advice has a difference. So it is a very important element. Maybe not exactly now, but as soon as we get into the new area, this is very important to treat that because each of these type of advice has different treatment by the board. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you again, Iran. And if you would like to -- I already took note, but if you would like to share this in writing over email, it would also be very helpful. So yes, Anders, Sweden, please.

SWEDEN: Thank you, Manal. One thing as well that I didn't see in the brief, I was wondering if you had been discussing any way of referencing GAC advice to have a unique reference to each GAC advice so that it's easily traced and easily found. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you. So you mean this should be also here listed somewhere in the description of what constitutes GAC advice or generally speaking that whenever we're logging GAC advice we have a unique reference?

SWEDEN: I don't know if -- if it would be necessary to list it here or if it should be a part of our own working methods. I don't have an answer for that. I'm just concerned that it's easily identified.

MANAL ISMAIL: So fair point. Let's try to -- to write something and then share it on the mailing list and make sure that it grasps the input we received until now. Yeah, like Markus mentioned, it's going to be already part of the tracking system, how we log the GAC advice and how we retrieve it, sort it, and search it. And that's why I was asking whether we need to write this down or it's already going to be there.

So any further comments? Yes, please, Thomas.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I think there are a few things that we should -- we should note. First of all, I've been checking in the operating principles. There we have an article provision of advice to the board that does not go into too much detail about what advice is. We have the bylaws that are about to be changed that will enter into force at some time. And then we have our own -- and we'll discuss this later -- we have our own process of reviewing the operating principles and we have to get a clear understanding which is the right track for this particular piece of

this work so that we -- we don't work in parallel or we don't go in different directions. So we probably would need some -- some thinking about who does exactly what and when and based on which documents like the bylaws and this. So we don't -- do not necessarily have to have this as part of the operating principles discussion. We can also say that this group will take care of the -- this definition but this is something we will need to consider, I think. And then also in particular, like the key question for now is, is it worth working on this based on the old bylaws or do we have to wait until we have something new so -- until the new bylaws are formally in place. So I think there's a few things that we would need to consider or I'd like to hear your views on.

MARKUS KUMMER: I think Iran's suggestion was very helpful actually, to be explicit, that it has to be consistent with the bylaws and that would then incorporate by reference also the new bylaws. But I note that we do seem to have a consensus on the broad principles, what this GAC -- and the whole process leading up to this was very helpful as we had also phone calls and where we discussed examples. And I think one word is very important, that any explicit advice. Maybe in the past the communication was not always explicit enough saying this is actually GAC advice. But I would -- yes, Kavouss has a question or comment.

IRAN: Yes, just want to confirm what you said. We should be very clear whether we give an advice or whether we give a communication to GAC -- to the board. Sometimes it's mixed up. So board should know really what we are doing, because GAC advice, with capital A, has a very specific connotations and meaning. So we should be very clear with the board what we are doing. So I think that's just something to take into account. I just wanted to confirm what you said. Thank you very much for raising that point.

MANAL ISMAIL: So any further comments on this specific recommendation? If not, then maybe we can go to the following slide on recommendation 2, which states, "Decide and describe the intended public policy outcome of each piece of GAC advice and include this in the statement of advice itself." So again here, this is one element. Like Kavouss mentioned, we need to have a rationale for the advice, also the intended public policy outcome of each piece of advice. So I wondered here whether we need some sort of a template that we can easily fill without overlooking any of the specific parameters we need to fulfill in writing each and every advice. And there were all -- there was also one suggestion that the GAC and the board may have some

sort of an exchange post the communique, meaning that we can have like a conference call with the board or the board can have some review mechanism to the GAC advice, to the communique, similar to the one that's already being conducted by the GNSO, or maybe have both. So, I mean, this is one thing that we can discuss here. So Markus and then Iran.

MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, I was going to say, this is also very much in line what we discussed before. You have to be very explicit in your advice, what you expect to be followed. And what you mentioned on the post contact that's in recommend 3 and we have already scheduled you can call it a pilot project, have a call between the board and the GAC after this meeting just to discuss if there are -- to clarify what was meant, if there's any advice and that we actually have this dialogue that we better understand what was meant with this advice. So there's already something afoot here, but I would be interested, also, hearing from GAC members how they see it. But again, I think you cannot be explicit enough. I think that's the message.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Markus. We have Iran.

IRAN:

Yes. Thank you again. Markus, you mentioned explicit. I understand that the clear language also embodied in that. Unfortunately that is the habit of the government. Whenever we want to have something on consensus, the language is vague. If the language is vague it is difficult to understand or to understand it by the board. So we should try later on from now on to be as clear as possible and avoid any ambiguity. That is one important point.

The element of discussions with the GAC and board is important in area when the board does not agree with our advice at the first instance. Then they will turn into negotiations. So that is important. Still we don't know how these negotiations is done. The negotiations will be face-to-face. The negotiations will be -- maybe the chairman wants to clarify the matter. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. For -- with your answers. Actually the first step -- and we have had some discussions also with the board and in the board. The first step is not whether they agree or not. But the first step is actually very simply do they understand what we mean. And then if they do understand what we mean is actually the feedback loop, are we sure that they do -- that what they think what they understand is what we want them to understand. So I don't want to complicate things too much, but

it's not so trivial. Because this is -- some percentage of the problems is a lack of mutual understanding, what do we want, and it's the way that they intend to follow the advice, is that actually coherent and overlapping. And then, this is the most frequent case actually, the occasions where the board explicitly says no, we will not implement an advice, is a very rather rare occasion. But normally the -- it's less black and white. It's more in the understanding and implementing an expectation on up and so on. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes, thank you, Thomas. Yeah, you partially covered my point. I was going to say that the intention here is to make sure we have a common understanding whether the response is going to be positive or negative later. So this is one point.

Now, referencing the clarity of the language, let me just refresh our minds where the recent misunderstanding came from. We already have a current structure of the communique, we have one section that has the header of GAC advice to the board. The GAC implicitly took it for granted that anything within this section is considered a GAC advice to the board. But then when we drafted the language we mentioned the GAC recommends. So they took it as a recommendation, not as a GAC advice. And I think this was where the misunderstanding came from. So I

think it's wise that we -- now that we know that recommends is problematic, that we stick to some clear language from our side. I think also we need to be clear what we are requesting from the board. I remember one very good example Chris Disspain mentioned on one of our calls that when the GAC says that we need the board to consider something, then they should be considering it and then either taking it on board or not. Then they have been -- I mean accepted the GAC advice. But if we require them to do something in specific, then we have to specify this, not just mention consider. So this is one example of how clear things should be. So Iran.

IRAN: Yes, Manal. You mentioned that we should be careful about what we put in that section. GAC advice should be GAC advice. If we say for consideration is not advice, it's something else. So we could not advise the board please consider this because consideration has a very specific meaning, okay? Thank you very much. I consider it but I don't like -- I don't want to touch it at all. So consideration should not be in GAC advice. To take into account but not consider. Because that is a very -- that is what I said, we should be very clear on the language that we use in the commun -- in the GAC advice.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay, fair enough. I see we are all in agreement, and I see noddings everywhere.

Thailand, please.

THAILAND: Yeah. And regarding on the time frame that you mentioned, I'm trying to seek clarification. When you talk about the time frame for the public comments that you would like the GAC or even the ICANN board to take in considerations, do you mean that both of the party to negotiate is harder to set up a time line rather than we say that this is the time line that we would like to see.

So I'm just thinking about the partnership between us and the ICANN members, set up a time frame what we would like to see at the next step rather than to set we would like to see next three weeks. This might be quite tough for them as well. So giving a room for discussion and then to sit down together draft on the time frame and responsibility. So the advice might be failed partnership between us as well. Is this a recommendation?

MANAL ISMAIL: So thank you, Thailand, for the feedback. Paraguay, please, and then Namibia.

PARAGUAY: Thank you. I remember we discussed this in Marrakech and before that in Dublin regarding the kind of verbs to use as my distinguished colleague from Iran mentioned. One thing is recommend something. Another thing is requires something. And then another thing is -- as he mentioned before consider something. You might consider something and then decide to do this or that or yes or no. That's a different story, right? That's one hand.

On the other hand, that would be ideal -- I mean, that list you have there, common understanding approach, implementation, deliverables, time frame responsibilities, et cetera, et cetera, documentation, that would be ideal in a yes situation, a positive situation.   But what would happen in a negative situation? That's my concern. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Paraguay.

And sorry for confusing people.

Those are discussion points for this recommendation, not for the GAC advice.   So when discussing this recommendation, we should understand it -- have a common understanding of what it is, how we are going to approach implementing this

recommendation. It doesn't have to do with the GAC advice. So, sorry for the confusion.

Namibia.

NAMIBIA: Thank you, Manal. I was just -- I just -- I was just listening to the phrases and comments made in terms of we need to be specific, we need to be clear on what advice we are giving. Now, when I look at the recommendation, I see "decide" and "describe." It's with the "describe" part, I think, where we need to be cautious because it says "intended for public policy outcome." To decide is fine, but to describe will probably lead us into the abyss or the Pandora box of what is public interest, what is policy. To be very clear then, when we describe public policies in the outcomes, we need then to go into the description of what is public interest also. And that egg is still closed. I don't know whether the chicken or the egg was first. But public policy is still under -- or public interest is still under discussion. The definition there may pose some challenges for us should we decide and describe the outcome. Maybe it's clear for other members. But I just wanted to raise that. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: I think it's not describing the outcome per se but rather describing what is the public policy aspect in this advice and this is why we are providing such an advice. So I think it has to do somehow with the rationale. So it's the rationale behind this advice because it's going to address this certain public policy aspect. So it's not easy to say it theoretically. But maybe when we start working with this in mind, we could -- it can better -- it can be understood easily.

So, Switzerland, go ahead.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you so much, Manal.

And you just said more or less what I was intending to suggest. In the end, what we intend is very much the rationale of the advice we give. And I think this will hopefully help the board to interpret the sometimes cryptic -- (laughter) -- wording of the advice if it comes with the rationale so they can better understand where we are aiming at. Perhaps the wording of the advice as such may have some vagueness for reasons of consensus finding but also a vagueness sometimes to let the board and the staff find the best means of implementing something which is on a principle's level.

So I think that the rationale really speaks to this recommendation as you said. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Switzerland. So I think before moving to the following recommendation, the question now is we're almost in agreement on what needs to be fulfilled in a GAC advice, how to make sure that this is fulfilled each time we provide an advice. So should we have some sort of a reference communique or a template that already have a link to the GAC advice in the description, in the footer or something that already have the different parameters that need to be fulfilled in each GAC advice, like clarity rationale, intended public policy, implementable elements, and so on? Or how can we make sure that we stick to what we agree, basically?

So, Switzerland.

SWITZERLAND: Sorry for coming back. Perhaps it's a no-brainer. But I would recommend that we ask our efficient, independent secretariat to make sure that this structure underlies the drafting of our advice. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yeah. I fully agree. But I was talking even longer term, when we change, the secretariat change, anything changes. So we need this somewhere for even everyone to know and to stick to.

But, Thomas.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Just to pick up something that Tom and I have been discussing while listening to you, one thing we could do is we could actually develop -- and I think you mentioned it already. We could develop a template for GAC advice with some elements like one is the rationale. The other one is the actual piece of advice.   Another   one   is   some   expectations   about implementation, maybe also an expected time frame as part of the advice. That would help us preparing pieces of advice for meetings but also if you have a letter, for instance, where we would -- in order to make clear what is in advice, we would have, like, an accompanying letter and then that template as the piece of advice that would go with it.

And if that works, people -- the other side would also get used to that template and to the logic and the understanding. So I think -- because we are getting a new Web site, maybe this could be something that -- I know that those who are dealing with the Web site are listening to this discussion, so that we can have such a template on the Web site as a sheet that explains how

advice is put together with the different elements. I'll stop here. Yes.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Thomas. Yes, I fully agree.

Paraguay.

PARAGUAY: Thank you, Manal. I was going to mention exactly that. If you add that link to the GAC Web page, it would be a very easy way for any GAC member to have access to the rationale and to the template and to -- I think it's a very good idea.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Paraguay.

So, so far we have -- we're going to refine the description of the GAC advice with the help of Iran and whoever else who would like to volunteer.   And we will circulate this reviewed description.

We will work, I think, with the help of the secretariat to develop a template for the GAC communique. I hope this is okay. And there is also a proposal that we have a pilot for GAC board call post the communique to make sure we have a common

understanding of whatever we have provided of advice in the communique.

So the following recommendation, please, if we go to the next slide, which is also again within each piece of advice, articulate the separate implementable elements. Again, I have to say that this has already also came up during the first Accountability and Transparency Review Team discussions, and that's why we decided to bulletize the different pieces of advice to make sure that no one part of the advice is overlooked. But obviously in practice when this advice is logged into the registry, it goes into one record. And this is how it becomes more difficult to track the separate pieces of the GAC advice.

So I think this is the merit behind this recommendation. And I leave it at this and open the floor for discussion.

Anders, please, Sweden.

SWEDEN: Thank you. It would be wonderful if we could do this and all the other things. Speaking from experience, though, we tend to satisfy when we're writing GAC advice. We use the term and energy that we have available, sometimes till 2:00 in the morning. Maybe we will need to work til 4:00 in the morning or 6:00 in the morning because this is also -- it will open -- the more

precision we will require from our advice, which is desirable to have, but the more time I fear it would take to write them as well, to negotiate them. It opens area of new issues to negotiate.

So I think we need to find the level which is reasonable that we can deliver and not to set too hard, too strong, not to set the bar too high so that we won't be able to deliver. Maybe then we won't reach any.

It would be desirable to have this and many other things. But can we reasonably expect to be able to deliver it? Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Anders. Good point. So, again, if -- two options here. We can either not specify the implementable elements or write -- for the sake of the template right now, write implementable elements, if applicable. I mean, sometimes you cannot foresee how the implementation would go so you cannot really specify the different parts. So we can put a placeholder for now and see how things would go. I'm flexible.

So, Thomas and U.K.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I think Anders from Sweden is making a very important point. So we should have this structure, but we should not be too prescriptive in how we are actually filling this structure.

But this is not completely new. If you look at past advices in communiques and in letters, you have normally many times something like a rationale that is in prose or text and then you have some -- it just is not in a bullet form of bullet points. But sometimes we even do have bullet points already now that you could say these are implementation elements. So the idea is just to be a little bit more structured in the presentation of this.

But it will never be a legal text like A2, B, C, D, (indiscernible), quarter, and so on and so forth. So we should definitely not go there because that is not going to lead us anywhere.

And one element I think we need to be aware of is we probably have to go -- and this is why we are trying this with this zero-draft communique this time. We probably have to go with asking people who want to suggest that we have an advice of starting this before the meeting, which is something that is very common in other institutions, in other fora that you have draft resolutions, draft text circulated before, and we may have to, like, consider this more or less normal in the future that we will have these elements before, so that we don't have to negotiate,

ideally, the rationale, because if we agree on the rationale -- there may be cases where we won't, but as much as we can do in terms of text preparation before the meeting, the more likely we are to actually deliver.

So that's my answer to you. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: We have U.K. and then Iran.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes. Thank you, Manal, and very much on this question of perhaps there's a kind of risk of overengineering things, you know, dissecting advice and so on would be time-consuming and lead to discussions of minutia, and I guess there is a risk of that, but this recommendation I think is important because there are instances where you can actually be providing advice as a committee on -- on an issue which has some complexity.

And as you said, Manal, in your introduction, there have been instances in the past where we've lost track of elements of advice, perhaps accidentally, I would add, both from the board's side perhaps as well as from the GAC side.

So identifying elements and elements which may have different time lines to be able to be implemented I think is important and

then we can keep track of them effectively in those situations. So it's a -- it's -- this would apply in some situations, and we shouldn't, you know, rigorously have to apply this particular recommendation to every instance of advice.

I'm not suggesting that.

But I think this is a very valuable recommendation, and if we have some kind of reference system which Sweden mentioned earlier for elements, you know, that would help as well in terms of tracking a complex piece of advice possibly relating to new gTLDs or the conduct of a new round and different kinds of gTLDs and so on.

So that's the kind of situation I'm envisaging. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, U.K.

Iran? And meanwhile, if we can get the work plan on the screen, place.

Iran, go ahead.

IRAN: Thank you, Manal. What you and Kumar put is very good because they're very high-level instructions or high-level arrangements. We could put some qualifier in some part of the

GAC. For instance, when we talk about implementation, we could put a qualifier on that "where applicable," and so on and so forth, but that is something we could do.

But I would like to come back to what Thomas says. It's very, very important. We start our advice when we are in session. Then we get to the problem of 2:00 in the morning and under the pressure of the consensus by exhaustion. This is not good. Perhaps we should take it at the next meeting advice as sort of an anticipation of advice and so on and so forth. Prepare something, ask the people to think it over, work during the meeting, and then we come back, we have at least some structure, some drafting and so on and so forth. But don't start at the second day or third day and a half, go to 2:00 in the morning, and sometimes a pizza, sandwich, or nothing, and pressure. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thanks, Iran. So if we can go to the last slide because we're asked to finish a little bit early to have the room set up for the cross-community session. So if we can proceed to the last -- yes, please.

So just to confirm that we will fine-tune the GAC current definition of what constitutes GAC advice and circulate this on the mailing list.

We will work on a template for elements that the GAC advice have to fulfill, with the help of ACIG and support staff. And I think we can start working with this template from the following meeting in Hyderabad, and I think we agree to have a post-communique board/GAC exchange as a pilot to see how -- how this would -- would develop.

And just to -- to let you know that following this, we will be reviewing and consolidating the logging and tracking mechanisms into a single, transparent, easy-to-access, and easy-to-manage portal where we can have the GAC advice easily searchable, referenced, searched, sorted, and so on.

And this links to the new GAC Web site as well. We'll review the new platform features to ensure the ability to archive, track, retrieve, search and categorize as I mentioned, review the existing GAC records and see if the missing detail can be completed because at some point in time not everything was fulfilled in the current registry system because the responsibilities was not that clear who should enter the data when.

So all this hopefully by Hyderabad we're going to have a better picture of this.

The last three activities have to do with the overall picture, which we need to document the process in a flowchart

illustrating the checkpoints and roles and responsibilities, but this is after we agree on the overall process, agree how to institutionalize all things that we agree upon.

And finally, like Thomas mentioned, we have to investigate the need to review GAC operating principles in light of the overall outcome.

So this is to quickly wrap on the work plan and I'll hand to Markus to -- for the final words.

MARKUS KUMMER: I have not much to add except to thank Manal for her excellent work, and also, the fellow board members who were not able to be in this session asked me to convey their apologies.

Mike Silber who was unable to come to Helsinki, and Lousewies Van der Laan who has committed to speak in another session, and Ram Mohan who is chairing the universal accepting session. They send their apologies.

And with that, I hand over to our chair to close the meeting. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Thank you -- first of all, thank you very much. I think this is a very good example of how a well-organized, well-

structured 45 minutes can be used very efficiently, so I would really like to thank you for this because I think we can always learn from each other and I think this is very well prepared, very clearly structured, so that was great. Looking forward to moving on with this.

Just one element. We actually have, this time, a meeting -- a phone call with the ICANN board which is planned. We're about to find -- we're in the Google phase of finding a date that suits the GAC leadership and the board, and it's intended for the whole GAC to -- it's open to the whole GAC.

So there will be -- first, because we did not have a meeting here, so actually we used this to have this and then see how this works, whether we think it's useful, whether the board thinks it's useful.

I'll stop here because we need to free the room for the cross-community session. Sorry for those who are waiting outside.

So, yes. Thank you. As I said, I hope many of us will stay in this session, those who do not have other obligations, and for the rest, tomorrow morning 8:15, GAC working group on -- I forget which one but it's an important one, so please show up.

[Laughter]

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]