MONTREAL - GAC Operating Principles Evolution Working Group Meeting
Saturday, November 2, 2019 - 13:30 to 16:45 EDT
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Pua, Luisa and Julia. Please for GAC colleagues please remain seated. We will proceed directly with the working group on GAC operating principles. So –

GUO FENG: Good afternoon everyone this is Guo Feng from China. Thank you for your patience for waiting several minutes for starting the session, and I would like to extend my warm welcome to all of you attending the session and come to the next slide please. In terms of today's agenda, this session, we have 6 agenda items, number 1 is the opening remarks. And agenda item 2 is I'm going to give you the update regarding the work done by the working group since ICANN65. And agenda item number 3 will be perhaps to look through the pending items on the document of GAC working group guidelines.   And hear your comments and seek your guidance on those pending issues. So this is the number 4 item. Number 5 will be the review of next steps of this GAC printing principle evolution working group. I would like to show you what are the next steps, and also to hear your comments, and number

6 is any other business, I will -- in this item I will show you the very initial Work Plan of this working group for the year 2020.

So, I would like to pause here to see, any comments on the agenda? If no, we will proceed with the next one, agenda item 2. So seems none, so yeah, this slide show you the update of the work done by this work group since the last ICANN meeting. ICANN Marrakech meeting, so since the last ICANN meeting the GAC meeting, Marrakech from Marrakech this working group, all of the members of the working group have been working very hard to push forward the work of this working group, to being in alignment with the working groups Work Plan. So, a draft document of the GAC working group guidelines was completed shortly after the Marrakech meeting, together by the working group members, with assistance by GAC support staff. And in addition we also taking those valuable advice, and feedback from the GAC Marrakech meeting, the previous session in GAC Marrakech meeting. Such things like some GAC members were, were proposing that, that you know documents to saying that there is no overlapping between one group and something like to avoid saying the term of decision making at the working group level. So -- and after we -- we have the very first version of GAC working group guidelines document and we use the tool of Google doc so that all members can work together, work collaboratively, so we also encourage working group members to

make comments, and make ideas on the Google docs during the whole process of the reviewing of reviewing document in the past several months. So in the past several months since Marrakech we, as a working group, had held 5 working group conference calls, and we completed the first review of the GAC working group guideline document, the draft. So with this, my thanks go to -- go to our working group members for our active participation, and also to Benedetta and other support staff for your great assistance, and professional views. And each part of the working group was reviewing the working group documents sentence by sentence and paragraph by paragraph.

Before each call, an e-mail was sent out to inform working group members which section to be reviewed, and we also encouraged the working group members to have some preparations before each call. We spent quite a lot of time on discussion of the issues occurred during the call. And tried our best to reach consensus. So in the past, in the past 2 or 3 months the working group have been -- have met bi-weekly on the rotational basis. So on our first reviewing call, that was August 29, we, we think that instructive beginning based on the member's suggestion. We also decided to extend the time from 1 hour to 1.5 hour, so it gives us plenty of time to review the document carefully. So after the first call, we, we covered the review of the document by 4 conference calls. Those were on September 3rd, and 19th, and October 1st and the

17th. We have made quite some edits and changes based on these discussions. Also we shared different views on some of the issues in the document. And right after each call and e-mail was circulated by Benedetta on behalf of me to inform the whole working group about what was happening, and what was the progress, and asking working group members to make comments if they fail to attend the call.

So with this, looking ahead, in my mind I think that the working group guideline document needs to be further updated as appropriate for allowing these updated GAC operating principles applicable to future GAC working group efforts. So this document perhaps will need GAC review and eventually potential endorsement by the whole GAC. So once again I would like to thank the working group members, and also as well as GAC support staff for your great contribution to the draft. Especially I would like to thank Benedetta for your great help to consolidate the document to make sure the language consistency, and summarizing the issues based on our discussions. So, this is somewhat covered, what we have been doing in the past several months. So I would like to make -- to move to the next agenda item, which is the pending items on the document, which is the GAC working group guidelines. So we going to show you the pending issues. What are the pending issues, and after that we will open the floor for your suggestion and your comments. We

will have some discussion perhaps. So with this I would like to kindly ask Benedetta to take us through each of those issues. I will hand over to you.

BENEDETTA ROSSI: Thank you very much, Feng, and this is Benedetta speaking for the record. So as Feng was saying, there's a Google dock which I've shared on the zoom room which with the actual framework guidelines for working groups, so it will be easier for you actual review this calmly once -- we will circulate it after the but here we will just go through the pending items it's just hard to present them and for you to get a sense of what they are without viewing the whole document at the same time.

So I'll do my best to walk you through them. So the first item is really just a note that we left in, so to just once the working group actually reviews the operating principles for the GAC, we want to make sure that the 2 documents are aligned so that the -- any changes that are made to the operating principles will be reflected again in the -- in this initial document that the working group worked on. So the -- working group guidelines. So that's the first one. And then the second item that is pending is in regards to the establishment of a working group, so it's section 3.1 initiation and the current language states so this is from the original language, that was written I believe in 2016 if I'm not

mistaken -- and it states if the interim chair is not a member of the GAC the GAC chair should a point a GAC member as liaison. So the issue that the working group was reviewing was whether non-GAC members can chair working groups. So that's remained as a, pending issue. And here we are still in the establishment of a working group section and it's relative to membership applications. And the current language states GAC members who are interested in joining the working group should express their interest responding to the call for volunteers mentioned above. After the closing date of the call for volunteers, the secretariat will submit an initial list of volunteer names received to specified date to the interim chair and the GAC chair. So the question here from the working group for GAC review is if there is a limit to the number of advisors the accredited member of the GAC can have in regard to membership in the working group. The next item moves onto the actual operation of the working group. And so the working group is considering whether there should be a life span added for a working group within the actual working group guidelines. At the moment there isn't and the language states each GAC working group should develop a Work Plan for at least a year as per annex B of these guidelines. And then it refers back to annex B. So again something for the full back to consider, whether there should and life span for working group, and whether that should then be renewed if necessary. The next item is still within the same section so operation of a working group,

and it's regarding reporting to the GAC. And in the current language it states that briefings must be finalized at least 3 weeks prior to the meeting date. So this is referring to ICANN meetings. And there were concerns raised within the working group regarding especially for the working group chair since within the current language it's the working group chair's responsibility to finalize or at least share the briefings. Whether 3 weeks is, is difficult to meet the deadline just before an obstruction meeting. So that's what the working group has been wondering. Is that a realistic dead library or not? Should this be retained, or should it be changed?

And again still regarding reporting to the GAC, the current language states that if the purpose of the involvement is to invite GAC input to a particular issue, question or recommendation by the working group, or to seek to make a working group output a consensus GAC document, then an appropriate time slot should be added to the agenda to enable this dialogue. This should be determined at least 8 weeks in if advance of the GAC meeting. So the working group is considering whether a template should be created for any consensus GAC documents since for all working groups since right now there isn't one. Here we are within the operation of a working group and it's some relative to the use of SUB teams and this is I think -- do we need to go over this. Whether it should be moved to a different section of the

document, but you would have to be looking at the document to see whether it should be moved so I'll just spare you reading all of that. Again, within operation of a working group, here we are at closure of a working group. Of and this is something that the working group worked very hard on and we have different options for consideration, so right now in terms of the closure of the working group, the language is there on the screen. But I will read it for you so it's states working group co-chairs will determine with the working group when the mission of the working group is deemed complete and advise the GAC leadership team accordingly. If the working group has been inactive for a prolonged period, the GAC chair or a person designated by the GAC chair will contact the chair of the working group to assess whether the working group should continue its work or needs to be closed. In the event the chair of the working group or the person designated by the GAC chair is of the view that the working group needs to be closed the GAC leadership team will be advised to close the working group.

So the working group has been reviewing 2 alternatives to this current language. Much and it's still pending review and discussion. So the first alternative is GAC working group's will be established by a decision of the plenary for an agreed period of not more than 12 months, and the end of 12 months or sooner if agreed, working groups will cease and the chair will provide a

report of the group's work for consideration by the GAC plenary. Working groups may continue for a further agreed period of no more than 12 months by a decision of the GAC plenary. And the second alternative is GAC working groups will be initiated for terms agreed to by plenary. Depending on the issue and the anticipated time necessary to effectively address it. The term of the working group once agreed by plenary will dictate in part the terms of reference and time-line by which the group will continue -- complete these activities much the working group may request an extension of its term to be proposed to and agreed to by plenary. So this sort of ties back with one of the previous issues that were pending whether there should be a life span and whether that should be made clear within the operation of the working group. We're still in operation of a working group. And this is about section 4.8.3 regarding translation. And there's just a question from the working group whether because right now there's very long section, which is the standard ICANN language relative to translations, and whether this should be maintained or if it should be just linked to the ICANN website. And then broader questions raised by the working group about whether -- what documents should actually be translated for GAC working groups, how much detail is it required in terms of translation? There was a lot of discussion I believe on the fact that you know the working groups are run in English, so do working group documents actually need to be translated? Is there just

needs to be more discussion within the GAC in terms of expectations for working group documents and their translation. And the next item is under section 5 which is norms.

And right now there's only members so I'm just -- don't want to read too much to you so I'm trying to summarize for you. But the question that the working group is looking at in terms of participation in working groups is whether there should be an additional observer status. Rather than just active member within the working group. Since right now it states that working group members are expected to actively participate in the working group's process. And there isn't an in between sort of observer status. And then I think this is the last part. This is relative to annex A and B. So annex A is the GAC working group term of reference template. And this entire section was considered redundant by the working group since a lot of the information present in this annex was moved as part of the working group work within the actual guidelines. So the working group is wondering whether this should be removed from the guidelines, and anything that is missing just moved to the section 4 which is the operation of a working group rather than having a whole annex again with the terms of reference template. And then finally annex B is the GAC working group grew plan template and right now it's annual, within the title section so it says it's annual but there's no title section of the year for which the Work

Plan is prepared so that should be added but again that's up for consideration since the working group has been discussing whether is this a calendar year or from the establishment of the working group? And again it ties back to the issue of a life span of the working group and how should that be reflected within the Work Plan of the actual working group. So I believe -- yeah, so that's the last one. So I'll just pause to see if you have anything to add Feng. Thank you very much.

GUO FENG: Thank you very much, Benedetta, for taking us through all of the pending issues. Now we have -- with regard to the document, those issues are either proposed by a member individual member of the working group or several members of the working group so we think we might not need to -- in if a rush to make a conclusion on those of the pending issues. So we want to take the opportunity of the session here to hear your views on those pending issues, as well as perhaps on the whole -- on other part of the document, on the whole part -- on the whole document, perhaps the structure of the document. So we want to perhaps in the next phase, to take your comments, and -- for each of the issue we want to perhaps to make analyze, and to try to propose a way forward, try to, to research consensus, among the working group level, so that, that is I think what I want to say at this moment, so

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL **66**
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

with this, I want to open the floor to hear your comments with regard to the document or -- and also to the pending issues within the document. Please Morris.

MAO-SHONG (MORRIS) LIN: Thank you, chair. And, Benedetta, for your presentation, in the firstly I want to express by gratitude to our chair, Mr. Guo Feng for your work and effort and also send to the ICANN supporters … working group member. Members input so now we have at least a framework for discussion. And for the pending issue, I want to commend all ask question about the item 2, 3.1 initiation. There is a question.

GUO FENG: So can we move the slide to the specific issue.

MAO-SHONG (MORRIS) LIN: Page 1, yeah, initiation. That's a question can get member to working group in my opinion I think we have a 178 GAC members, GAC representatives, and according to the background -- I mean the item 1, each GAC representative can assign several advisor to participate in the working group, so I think we have sufficient candidate to chair the working group, so I think -- for me I prefer the GAC member, or GAC advice or assigned by the GAC

representative to chair the working group. I think we have sufficient data, and for the background intervention they are mentioning each GAC representative may ... an advisor to participate in the working group. My question is, the -- all of the advisor list ... on our GAC website. All working group is established, and the chair call for the working group member, the GAC representative just assign the advisor by e-mail to the working group chair. I think is it just do this okay, or the GAC representative need to put advisor on the GAC tornado site and then ask the advisor to participate in the working group. This part not so clear to me. I mean for the -- how to assign the advisor to the working group, and the -- second question for me is the according who I know, we need to finish this part working group principle framework or framework by the end of this year, and as the chair mentioned. The next -- analyze all of the items in the manner proposal -- I want to know what's the time-frame, time-line next step and for the -- Work Plan for the in next year because according -- yes, I know we need to finish this working group for -- by the end of this year. In the next year we have a new Work Plan, so I hope to know the Work Plan for the next year. Thank you.

GUO FENG: Thank you for your comments, Mr. Lin. Let me try to respond to your questions now, and with regard to your first question, you were mentioning the participation -- I mean, if I understand it correct, that you are asking how to assign advisor from a GAC representative? How can a GAC representative assign his or her advisor to participate in a working group? So with this, I think just my personal view -- I think we, we can adopt approach that we ask that specific GAC representative to, to send an e-mail about this information, also we confirm by the -- perhaps by the GAC support staff, and, list the name of the GAC advice or on the working group member's page.

Perhaps this an option we can use. And if you have other option, we can deal with the issue I would like to hear your further comments perhaps later. So but definitely we take note of this issue. Perhaps to look, to look at this once again, and to hear all -- or to hear other GAC members view on this. And a second, your question is about the Work Plan of this working group, so as I was mentioning in -- at the beginning of the session, in terms of the agenda of the session, I'm going to show you the Work Plan of next year, of this working group. So actually within the Work Plan it was mentioning -- it mentions about the following work of this task -- the document of GAC working group guideline, so with this task, I would like to propose that we are aiming to finalize this document, and try to have this document agreed or endorsed by

the GAC leadership or the GAC plenary in the next GAC face-to-face meeting. I mean ICANN67. So after this GAC Montreal meeting we will try to put together a lot of pieces to solve the pending issues, and to try to finalize the -- this document. Of so this is specific plan for the task of drafting the working group guideline. So there are some of the other task I would like to show you later perhaps in the draft Work Plan later in -- at the session. So this is my response to your second question.   Please [inaudible].

PORTUGAL: Thank you very much it's and from -- on the same page about the working groups to be chaired or not by GAC members, well for me it should be GAC members, but I would like to hear a little more about the rationale, why it could be not GAC members. It is because we need advisors on specific themes? Well, sorry, I didn't really get that. Thank you.

GUO FENG: Jorge first, and then Olga.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you.   Jorge Cancio for the record.   First thing on this question of sharing of GAC working groups perhaps it's a

clarification question, when we say GAC members or non-GAC members, what are we referring to? Are we referring to GAC observers? So for instance it could be, I think Interpol as an observer of the GAC could chair a working group for instance if we had some security issue, and they could be available for that or I don't know, some of the other organizations which have an observer status, be it on IGO's. It could be OECD or WIPO and they are observers. Or when we are making that distinction are we referring even to external?

Stakeholders which are not members and not GAC observers, so I don't know what we are exactly discussing there. And on the other issues on the other issues I have to admittedly when I looked at the GAC briefing for this working group, I don't recall to see so much information, but maybe that's my personal problem, and as I said before, I'm also striking with the work flow of information, I would welcome that we go issue by issue, and have a discussion, and we have it on screen, or even if we had the a red-line version of the whole document to see what is being changed in comparison to the standing document. But first of all we have this clarification question. Thank you, Feng.

GUO FENG: Thank you, Jorge, for your question. Also thank you for your question from... as far as I can remember, on the issue of who can

chairing a working group, whether it is a member or non-member, I think the non-member theme refers to the observer within the GAC. It's not -- please, please.

BENEDETTA ROSSI: I was looking it up as Jorge was speaking, and in the language it currently says if the interim chair is not a member of the GAC the GAC chair should appoint a back member as liaison. That's where that stemmed from. So I am assuming that that means non-GAC member at all that's why there should and liaison within the GAC. So that's what the working group was wondering whether that should be removed from the current guidelines FWOU answer your point Jorge we've shared the red lined version with the whole GAC, and the pending issues list. So I think that will be useful to then based on Feng's Work Plan to see -- to get input in written form. Easier than like this on the screen without seeing the full document.

GUO FENG: Yes. As Benedetta said, we have circulated a link of the document with working group members, and also with GAC members. I would like to encourage you to read those documents see the red-line version and you can make edits on-line, and so perhaps

with this issue and other issues we will get more feedback from your comments from you we can better solve them. Olga, please.

ARGENTINA: Thank you. With this issue of leader or co-leads or chairs of working groups in the GAC, we never had the experience but the recent experience done in the GNSO of part of the new gTLD development policy development process open in a part of it co-lead, by other members of the community one from the GAC, which is myself. One from the ALAC, one from the ccNSO and one from the GNSO resulted as a very interesting experiment. I'm not saying that the GAC necessarily has to do that. But I think that we may have that in mind. That it depending on the issue, that could be a possibility that we can think about. Also, in the, in the working group about use of geographic names and new gTLDs, we experimentation. We organized sessions of the working group inviting people from the GNSO on other constituencies and also what we did once is that we allowed others to comment, a document which was not adopted by the whole GAC, but it was a working document of the working group. It resulted in a lot of comments, that more than 100 and that we presented in one meeting, and it was a very interesting experiment. So I think we have to be open to that other possibility depending of course on

the issue that we are discussing about and depending of course on the decision made by the whole GAC, thank you.

GUO FENG: Thank you for your point Olga, and from what you are raising. I'm thinking that perhaps we can have the flexibility for the GAC working groups for them to have more interaction between the -- internal GAC working group and other working group or other AC or SO within the GAC so that we perhaps give more better experience when we are conducting our work, and perhaps can take -- we can bring in some fresh air from outside of the GAC, so this is my personal reaction to your -- what you are raising. Thank you very much. And any other comments? Please? Thank you.

EGYPT: Hisham Aboulyazed. Thank you. I wanted clarification on one of the items and the pending items list. Specifically I think it's 3.2 on membership applications.   And in this part of the guidelines I think we are trying to set the role of how we are establishing a working group, and the process for the call, and how to receive volunteer requests, so my question was basically for the maybe the current practice. What is the practice for GAC members who would express interest to join working groups after the initial calls have closed? Is this a possibility for GAC members?

GUO FENG: Thank you for your question. I think for the GAC members to join the working group, I think during the whole process of the working group it is open as the beginning, anyone within GAC, whether you are a GAC member or you are GAC observer, you can join the working group, perhaps at any point of time. But indeed we want to encourage, if you really want to participate in one specific working group, we would like to encourage to engage more in this working group to make, make your contribution to the process of the working group.

EGYPT: Thank you.

GUO FENG: So any more questions, or comments? If, if we don't have additional questions or comments, I'd like to move the next steps. So, as you can see in the slide, for the, for the -- this task, the review of the GAC working group guideline document, the next steps perhaps would be number 1, after this meeting, GAC meeting we will circulate again the working group guidelines document to the full GAC for your further input, on the whole or -- and also, as well as on the pending items. So, next, we will consolidate a new version of the working group guideline document based on your input during the comment period. Next,

we will try to seek approval of the document from the, perhaps GAC leadership team, at the next face-to-face GAC meeting. And we will when this work, this task is done, we will move to this working group -- I mean, this working group will move to other work, translate to the review to the review of the GAC operating principle and we want to also do other issues identified by the GAC and the GAC leadership team, so those are the -- some of the thoughts regarding the next steps of the working group in terms of this reviewing, drafting and reviewing working group guideline document. So move to the next -- yeah, so in this final slide, show you, showing you the initial, very initial draft Work Plan of this working group for the year 2020. So, we divide the working period into 4 phases, like in the table. So at the first phase is before ICANN67. We identify 3 major tasks to, to be conducted. The first one is to update working group guideline document based on your feedback and try to finalize this document. Number 2 will be to complete the first draft of the code of conduct of the GAC liaison because of the workload of the guideline document drafting, so in this year, in this year, we really don't have the -- enough time to conduct drafting of the code of conduct. This year, so we would like to postpone this a little bit. So -- but compared to the guideline drafting, I think the code of conduct drafting is more easier task for us to complete the first -- perhaps the first draft version. So this is the two. Number 2. Task. Number 3 is to start identifying issues, on operating principle,

starting by e-mail exchanges. Those 3 points 3 task is in the Phase 1 of the next year. Phase 2 will be perhaps at ICANN67 GAC meeting. We will try to seek adoption of the working group guideline. And also the Work Plan for the working group of the year 2020. And in addition, we want to present the draft of the code of conduct of the GAC liaisons to the GAC during the face-to-face meeting next year at the first meeting of next year. And if, if we are going to have a session next year at the beginning, at the beginning of the next year, beginning meeting of the next year, we will try to discuss and confirm the identify the issues of the GAC operating principles. So next is after ICANN67 and before ICANN68, we will try to update the code of conduct of GAC liaisons based on your feedback and continued effort on updating the GAC operating principle. And at ICANN68, during the face-to-face meeting we will secure approval or adoption of the code of conduct document, and we will present -- plan to present an initial study and issues regarding the GAC operating principles to the GAC. Can we -- Benedetta, do we have a number 5 under this?

BENEDETTA ROSSI: Yes not full screen so --

GUO FENG: Yeah.   Okay.   Actually we have a phase number 5 which is continued effort on updating the GAC operating principle. So this is the very first draft of the Work Plan of the working group for the next year. So with this, and the previous slide about the next step of the -- our current work, I would like to, to as well, to secure comments or guidance on this, if you have comments or questions? Jorge.

SWITZERLAND: Jorge Cancio, for the record. Thank you for the initial draft Work Plan. At least my first reaction is that we have many points on the screen for very few time, and at the same time as we know we have so many other things going on, so I -- my first reaction is a bit of perhaps we are being too ambitious, and maybe we should try to get the GAC working group guidelines document done, and be a bit flexible about the timing of the other issues. On the other issues, and I have to excuse myself, and ask for apologies in advance, again, but could you perhaps elaborate very shortly about what is the code of conduct of GAC liaison? Is it referring to GAC liaison to PDP working groups? Or what is the scope of this document?

                                      Because we have at least some

guidelines on participation on cross-community working groups, so I don't know what, what is the precise scope of this code of conduct. So and without knowing that it's difficult to, to estimate how much work we will have to invest in that.

GUO FENG: Jorge, thank you for your question, and your comment, perhaps. Your first comment mentioning with flexibility of this working group. I think I very much agree with you, and we need to nail down the -- perhaps the working group guideline document first, and then we can move to other important tasks. So this is the number 1 priority for this working group in the -- perhaps in the future several months, and with your second comments regarding the code of conduct of GAC liaisons it -- this task force mentioned in the term of reference of this working group, and also mentioned in the Work Plan of this working group for this year, so it refers to the GAC liaison to other AC or SO and also some GAC members also mentioned about the GAC liaison to perhaps a community. Cross-community working group within the GAC, or the other, perhaps working processes within the GAC. Perhaps it is very clear to me that it definitely cover the GAC liaison to perhaps -- for me I'm the ASAC, liaison and for status and for other status, GAC assigned -- GAC members participating in perhaps a PDP or other cross-community working group within ICANN, we

need to clarify this status furthermore. But I think with regard to the GAC, liaison to other AC or SO we want to try to develop a guideline also for them. We currently we, we use the word code of conduct. We also can change the term. The language in the future. So this is explanation from my, from my side. So thank you. And any other -- Manal, please?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much Feng, and thank you Benedetta, and thanks to the working group. I think it's tremendous effort, and I thank you for your time, and effort. I'm just -- and this is more of a brainstorming question, not necessarily that we need to answer it now, but 2 things, first I think we are losing the bigger picture, we are getting deeper into it the details, so sometimes I'm not sure whether the language is new language or it has been in the old operating principles and we are modifying or it's already as is in the old operating principles, so this part, I am not sure is clear at least to me. The other point is that -- and I'm sorry, if it I'm repeating myself again from previous meetings -- I just us want to make sure that we are not putting all this in the operating principles, right? I mean we have agreed that the operating principles is going to be more high level thing, and those are sort of supporting documents, so I'm wondering about the Work Plan, are we going to work vertically, deeply, thoroughly through all the

details of piece by piece or maybe agree on whatever needs to be in the operating principles, and then do another deep dive into the details? And again, I'm thinking out loud here, I'm not -- but the only thing I'm definite about is that we're not putting the whole text of the documents in the operating principles.

Again this is a high level thing and should be kept at such but definitely the details are important and we need them but separately from the operating principles so I'll stop here, and as I said it's more of brainstorming question, so we don't have to answer it right away, but at some point in time we need to agree.

GUO FENG: So I choose to not answer it and to save the last 2 minutes for other GAC members for you to have, if you have more reactions or comments. So if not let me try to respond to your comment in a quick way. So my reaction to your comments is that at the beginning of this working group, some member within the working group was -- they were proposing that we should review the operating principle. The GAC operating principle, at the beginning of the working group we were identifying we need to develop a guideline for the working group, the GAC working group so we postpone the issue. So at this phase I think we can -- we may need to have further consultation within the working group also with GAC leadership and other member who are not in this

working group, to in my view to first to identify issues regarding to our operating principle, and also what the working group need to do with regard to the evolution of the GAC operating principle. So when we have consensus on the direction of the next phases of this working group, we can, we can start our work next -- in the next phase. This is my, this is my thought at this moment. So, with this, would like to thank you for attending this working group session, and looking forward to your further comments, and questions. Or if you have also encouraged you to, to read the document, the red-line version and we want to hear your valuable views, and also your views on the future work of this working group. So thank you, this this concludes this session. Much thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Feng, and thank you, Benedetta. For GAC colleagues, it's coffee time now. We have 15 minutes break, and then we will be back for the nominating committee working group, Olga, I apologize in advance for not being able to be in the room. I need to step out for another meeting. But you are in the capable hands of Olga. But I will be back 5 sharp for our meeting with the root server system advisory committees. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]