LONDON – GAC Communiqué Overview
Wednesday, June 25, 2014 – 10:30 to 12:00
ICANN – London, England

CHAIR DRYDEN: Good morning again, everyone. If you can take your seats, please.

Okay. All right. Let's get started.

So first of all, there is an announcement about a meeting taking place today. Then we will have an update on the GAC elections. Then we will go over the headings for the communique and refer to the draft you should have in hard copy in front of you for that discussion.

And then we will discuss the IANA stewardship process and enhancing ICANN's accountability, and, in particular, we will refer to the new brief that has been circulated by the secretariat. It's just a one-pager but it's meant to sum up the discussions we had the other day, identify some further options, and, therefore, allowing us to come to some decision about GAC participation in the Coordination Group and, if possible, the working group on enhancing ICANN's accountability.

So, first of all, this session now is open, so when we do discuss the headings for the communique, we won't be projecting any text, but you have it in hard copy in front of you, and we will discuss the headings. But as I say, that's in open session. And then as we have agreed, then when we move to finalizing the communique this afternoon, then those sessions will be closed.

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.

Okay. Regarding the meeting of the Commonwealth, that is going to be held in Fiamma which is a private room in the restaurant called Fiamma. This is on the ground floor just off the main lobby. So this meeting is for Commonwealth members, to gather at 12:30.

So when we complete this session, then it will start up in the Fiamma private room.

All right. And so now for an update on the GAC elections. Michelle, if you could give us an update.

Thank you.

MICHELLE SCOTT-TUCKER: Good morning. Thank you.

A quick update.

To remind you that the nomination for GAC chairs and vice chairs, the nomination period does not close until 27 August 2014. So there's still another two months to run where I might receive nominations or the nominations might change.

So if that happens, I will update you on the GAC mailing list as that happens.

So so far, the nominations for vice chair positions are Ms. Olga Cavalli from Argentina nominated by Peru, Dr. Vujica Lazovic from Montenegro nominated by Montenegro, Mr. Wanawit Ahkuputra from Thailand nominated by Singapore; Mr. Ihsan Durdu from Turkey nominated by Lebanon; and Mr. Henri Kassen from Namibia nominated by Rwanda.

The nominations for chair so far are Mr. Thomas Schneider from Switzerland nominated by Peru and Paraguay, and Dr. Imad Youssef Hoballah from Lebanon who has been nominated by Thailand.

If we come -- If by the 27th of August it's clear that we need to run an election, I will provide information on the GAC mailing list about how that election process will go forward.

The other thing that I'll be doing between now and the Los Angeles meeting is updating the list of GAC members, the formal list of GAC members and just making sure that all of our contact details are absolutely up-to-date.

So if you can help me out and go and have a look at the GAC Web site where the members are listed, and if it's clear that for your country, the membership details aren't as accurate as they should be, just let us know and we'll make sure that the most up-to-date details are there.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Iran, please.

IRAN: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Just kindly amend the nomination of Dr. Imad Hoballah, nominated by Thailand and seconded by Iran.

Thank you. I sent a message to everybody.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Iran.

The Commonwealth of Dominica, please.

COMMONWEALTH OF DOMINICA: Good morning, Madam Chair. My name is Bennette Thomas, and I'd like to make an intervention on behalf of the Commonwealth of Dominica and the GAC members of the Caribbean as well as small island states with respect to elections.

The broad support of GAC members for (indiscernible) of regional representation at the level of the vice chair favors the retention of the historical, albeit unwritten practice, for elections for the leadership positions in the GAC which allow for positions to be filled on a rotating regional representation basis using the ICANN regions as a loose template.

This is an equitable practice that allows for a balance of views to be heard, without the tension of an open election based on country candidates being put forward without regard to which country held the position in the previous term.

Open elections very often result in countries and positions being pitted against each other, leading to the distinct possibility of the GAC becoming fragmented into different groupings.

Elections on a predictable rotational basis would also obviate the possibility of the domination of the GAC by a single region.

In the interest of maintaining the spirit of unity and (indiscernible), the Commonwealth of Dominica on behalf of the Carribean GAC members

would like to recommend that the GAC, as it operates within the current constraints of its operating principles, continues with the formal rotating regional representation practice for election of the position of the vice chair.

Further, the Commonwealth of Dominica on behalf of the current GAC members would also like to recommend that the GAC consider amending the operating principles to increase the number of vice chairs.

Thank you very much, Madam.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you.

Next I have Peru. Please.

PERU: Just a reminder. I asked through an email to be given a list of all the chairs and vice chairs with their respective countries because I'm -- I assume that the idea is to have a well-represented table, and with an informed boat, no? With different languages and different geographical areas.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Peru.

Michelle, could you respond?

MICHELLE SCOTT-TUCKER: Thank you. I did receive that request, and I'm working through that right now and compiling that information. It's not readily available, so I'm working through each communique one by one and getting that information about all the past chairs and vice chairs since ICANN meeting number one.

So I hope to have that information for you all today.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you. Okay. Thank you for the update.

Oh, right. African Union Commission. My apologies.

AFRICAN UNION COMMISSION: Thank you very much, Heather.

I would like to support what our colleagues from Jamaica and Peru have said regarding the very important issue of regional representation and to support the call by Jamaica for the possibility of reviewing the GAC bylaws to increase the number of vice chairs to ensure that we have proper geographical representation. Acknowledging that reviewing the bylaws will take time, so maybe, perhaps, you know, in the interim, we could -- we may leave it possibility of increasing the number, you know, to four so that we have proper regional representation of vice chairs and the chair, while, you know, the working that's been working on review of the bylaws continues their work.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, African Union Commission.

Iran, please.

IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, we also support the regional representation and the rotation principle, including the number of the vice chairmen. However, there is a golden rule that the area or geographical area from which the chairman comes is excluded to have vice-chairman.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Iran.

Grenada, please.

GRENADA: Okay, good morning.

I am Jacinta Joseph from Grenada, and I'd like to support the submission made by the Commonwealth of Dominica for the election of vice chairs on a rotating regional representation basis.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Grenada.

Okay. I see no more requests to speak or question is. Ah, the CTU, please.

CTU: Yes, speaking on behalf of the Caribbean countries, I'd like to say that we also support the regional representation on a rotational basis. I think I mentioned this yesterday as well.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you.

Okay. So thank you, Michelle, for that update.

Thank you for these inputs. We will need to come back to you with a proposed way forward regarding the proposals coming forward regarding the number of vice chairs and the principles underlying our approach. Since we have an election under way, we're aware of the issues and will endeavor among the chair and the two vice chairs that are not directly implicated, we will try to come back and suggest a way forward or at least give clarity about how we can proceed in light of these interventions regarding the number and the approach to identifying vice chairs as part of the elections.

Okay. All right. Thank you, Michelle.

All right. So in front of you there should be the draft communique as it currently stands.

It is also being circulated to the GAC email list. And here we should have a sense of the possible headings for the communique and some

draft text proposed in most cases, which is to reflect the discussions we have had already on each topic.

So the purpose of this session is really to confirm and clarify what it is that we are including in the communique.

We have tried to identify this as we have moved through our meetings over the past few days. And this is really our opportunity to get some clarity and confirm, then, what is the understanding and what has been agreed for inclusion.

So as usual, we list the various meetings we have with other parts of ICANN or other organizations, and we reflect that in Section 2. And in 3, we're pointing to the various activities of the working groups that are active.

And then in the Section 4, this is where we include GAC advice or comments on various topics that we have identified throughout, as I say, the last few days of our meetings.

So the question for you, is there anything critical that's missing? We're not looking for a laundry list of issues. We need to remain focused on what we have agreed through the week and generate comments and advice where it is necessary to do so.

So are there any significant omissions here?

Okay. European Commission, please.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thank you very much. Just saying that -- Unfortunately, we have not been able to provide a text yet in relation to vin, wine even though there was a placeholder in the text. Now we have done so and I hope we will be able to circulate it a little bit later. This, of course, is the result of intensive discussions that have been going on, and we have tried extremely hard to follow your advice to try to resolve the issues outside this room. It has not been completely successful. So we are putting forward now a text. Thank you very much.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, European Commission.

So this is text that will be circulated to your colleagues in the corridors or....

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thank you. No, it's the text that I've already sent to Tom, to the secretariat, that I hope we can have a look at possibly after we've looked on the rest of the text or whatever your suggestion is, of course. We'll be able to follow that, of course.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, European Commission.

Since others have not even the text, if I understand you correctly, there's an opportunity when we break at the end of this session to share that text informally before it is put in front of all of the GAC.

If it is possible to continue to work on that text, to have some kind of agreement on text, that is preferable than immediately bringing it back to the full GAC.

So can we take advantage of our lunch break to have that text circulated among those interested parties that have been discussing this issue?

That would be, of course, an ideal situation.

The problem with this text that we have is I think it concerns basically most of us around the table because it has to do with the accountability, ICANN accountability. And I think it is worth everybody gets to see this text as it stands.

I'm sorry to be difficult. I know that you are trying to help us to resolve things outside the room, but I do think that it has an interest for everyone, also because in the text there is an opening for others also to add their concerns.

So I think it is worth to actually circulate this text for the whole group, if you don't mind. That is the best way forward.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, European Commission.

Okay. So this text can be circulated to the GAC email list. That does not mean that I do not expect there to be continued discussions around that text in the lunch period.

And as far as what ultimately gets put in front of us this afternoon, that is not yet determined. But I really am very hesitant to put anything in front of the plenary, the entire committee, that is going to be very controversial or lead to protracted exchanges with very little progress.

I really would like us to avoid that.

So as I say, that text can be forwarded by the secretariat to the GAC email list. And please continue your discussions in the lunch period. When we reconvene at 2:00, then I hope there will be something to report as far as text that would be acceptable to all, even if it is not, perhaps, ideal from everyone's perspective.

Okay.

So for this, I don't see any other request to speak.

All right. So I have Peru, United Kingdom and Iran.

PERU: Yes. I circulated also a proposal in regards to the communique, and I would like that also to be considered.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Peru.

So this is text related to the creation of a new subgroup, I believe, within the working group on future gTLD issues. So my suggestion is that we -- we minute that and look at that as part of our efforts within the future gTLD working group to create a subgroup.

I don't think we necessarily need text in the communique, but if we can move it so that we minute it, and then proceed on that basis.

Thank you. Okay. All right.

So let's do that.

Next I have U.K. Please.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thank you, Chair. I just wanted to flag that I'm going to circulate some alternative text with regard to the protection of the Red Cross/Red Crescent terms and names, which I hope will reflect the discussion we've had earlier in the meeting and also with the Board yesterday.

So I will circulate that shortly for the committee's consideration.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, U.K. Okay.

Iran, you're next, please.

IRAN: Thank you, Chairman.

Two things. Perhaps the issue relating to the high-level governmental meeting be moved to the beginning of the text because it is important, and we should a little bit expand the text, not just saying that the GAC

thanked. "The GAC expressed its sincere appreciation and thanks to the government of the United Kingdom," so on, so forth.

And I have some comment what the last paragraph -- last sentence means. It's "also enable the parties to gain a clear understanding of the role of government in ICANN procedures, including the GAC" perhaps needs some clarification. This is point number one.

Point two, something is missing here. We should add a title relating to the participations of the GAC in the two committees, Coordination Group and working group relating to the transition of the IANA function and the accountability, emphasizing that the GAC consider the necessity of wider participation of GAC representative in that committee. And we have mentioned that yesterday to the Board, and there was no negative reaction from the Board.

Just we have to mention that in the communique.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Iran. On that particular point we haven't yet reached agreement. And, in fact, we are moving, I hope, towards a decision regarding the options outlined in the most recent paper dealing with IANA stewardship and ICANN's accountability and precisely how the GAC will participate or be represented. And we will move into that discussion once we have clarity about the headings for the communique. Then we will have a discussion about that and, hopefully, come to decision. Then we will break for lunch. And this afternoon we will be focusing on finalizing the text. Thank you.

Next I have Indonesia, please.

INDONESIA: Thank you. I would like to -- well, one is a question, actually. How about the outcome of the high-level meeting on Monday? Because will it be a separate outcome produced by His Excellency Ed Vaizey from the U.K. government? Or, because whoever talked there, it is a GAC high-level meeting. So you will you put the discussion on the high-level meeting of last Monday in this communique as well? Because my -- it is a statement by our boss of the GAC.

And, secondly, regarding the elections, will we put in the communique all this discussion, whether it is a free foot for all or region by region or whatever? Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Indonesia. So that's a useful question for us to consider is the outcome from the high-level meeting and precisely what it is that we should have in our communique and whether it's appropriate to attach the outcome document. So let us reflect on that and find a way forward with the U.K. host that is appropriate. We had a suggestion to move it higher up in the communique text, which I think we can accommodate.

And, regarding GAC elections, that's very much an internal matter so not something that I think we need to include in the communique. But, nevertheless, we do need to take the inputs we have received about that and ensure that we are recording that and taking the next steps as appropriate on that. Ah, okay.

Is it Kenya? Kenya, please.

KENYA: Thank you. Kenya wishes to agree with Peru on the proposals for the future subcommittee to consider the generic domains that might affect developing countries. And I would like to, if possible, see some kind of timelines for the setup of that committee so that, by the next round of GAC meetings, we can be able to extensively discuss that issue. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you. I think that's a really good point for the minutes and for the workplan setting so that there are clear timelines for that activity. Okay. All right.

So at this point, I would like to move us into discussing the IANA stewardship process and enhancing ICANN's accountability and coming to decision, if possible, on how the GAC will be represented. Okay.

All right. So I see no further requests to speak. So let's move ahead.

So the document in question was recently circulated to the GAC in particular after our discussions earlier this week. It is one page and is entitled "Transition of U.S. Stewardship of IANA and Enhancing ICANN Accountability."

So it's a revised proposal for us to consider now. And so points of agreement are pointed to in one, two, three, four, and then around five as well.

This is meant to capture the key points of agreement coming out of that discussion. And then, if I can draw your attention to the three options outlined near the end -- two options, six and seven, option one and option two, I believe this is where we are in making a decision.

Sweden, please.

SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair. I'm sorry. Perhaps I'm the only one, but I wonder if you could give us assistance in finding this document. If you could give us the heading of the email perhaps or a time or date. I'm sorry for that.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Sweden. You should have hard copies in front of you. So can those be made available, please?

Is someone getting a copy for Sweden, please? Ah, there are others that don't have it. Okay. All right.

So let's pause so that colleagues can have this document in front of them.

Sweden.

SWEDEN: Just to inform you, I just received this from Poland and sent it to the GAC list, so everybody should have it on the email now.

TOM DALE: If I can just clarify, the document was originally sent to all of you on the GAC list yesterday morning at 10:34 a.m. That is the document we're referring to. We're getting some additional hard copies at the moment. But it's an email from me to the GAC list from yesterday morning headed "IANA Transition and ICANN Accountability."

CHAIR DRYDEN: Hopefully, you have access by email to the document. And, if not, there are hard copies coming. Perhaps we could project the document onto the screen as well to assist colleagues.

Okay. All right. So let's go through the earlier points then just to ensure that we are all on the same page, literally and figuratively.

So in point 2, it was clear that all wanted to be able to contribute. And that is true regardless of whether governments or GAC members are contributing directly as well as participating via the GAC.

In terms of the two different tracks and how the GAC would approach it, the point three here outlines that there seemed to be understanding that we would have both of those processes. So the coordination group for the IANA stewardship transition and the working group for the enhanced accountability for ICANN track.

So the key features in four regarding the combination of having the chair of the GAC plus a contact group would be that the chair is the formal representative and the coordination of GAC views are carried out by what has been described as a contact group. Agreement on formal GAC positions, if there are any, would be developed through the contact group but agreed by the whole of the GAC, which refers us to point

number 2, which says that all need to be able to contribute and so it is reflected here.

Also, diversity was clearly something important. And that, I think, includes diversity of views, range of views not only the geographic and linguistic diversity, which is also important.

And so this brings us to two options. So option one outlined in point 6. And that is that the contact group would comprise the vice chairs plus an additional representative from the Africa region. This would see all five ICANN regions represented, although there will be a new chair and vice chairs after the upcoming election. So that is something to think about in association with option one.

And then regarding option two, this would be the chair plus four GAC members. So the contact group would comprise four members selected by the GAC. And this also could be put together on the basis of the regions. And, again, I think it's also important to have a range of views, diversity of views, not just geographic diversity taken into account. Lebanon, please.

LEBANON: Thank you, Madam Chair. The question is what are the five regions? I'm used to the ITU six groupings.

CHAIR DRYDEN: In point 5, I believe the regions listed there are the ICANN regions. So it's as ICANN defines them. Europe would be one. Another region is

Asian Australia Pacific. Region 3: Latin-America, Caribbean. And 4: Africa. And 5: North America.

Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. In view of the urgency of the matter and the difficulty which might be encountered with respect to option two, perhaps possibly we could try to see whether we could agree on option one, which is quite simpler to implement. Otherwise we may get into the series of representation or informal discussion among regions, definition of the regions. And, not totally agreeing with the role of the vice chair, we have no disagreement with what they are doing. So I suggest that, if possible, we try to perhaps concentrate on option one and having one representative from African region which is not represented. And these four people plus the chair would represent the GAC in that meeting.

And I have some small corrections with the paragraph saying that the chair of the GAC would be only representative. No, chair supported by the four members that are represented, not only the chair. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Iran.

Next I have Poland.

POLAND: Thank you very much, Chair.

Apologies if I get something wrong, because I just started reading the document. But I have a question. Is there something missing? Because option one to concern only the country groups. So within the GAC, yeah? So, as far as I know, within this coordination group which would be comprised of 30 persons in the IANA transition, there will be two seats for GAC representation. And my question is: Is this document covering also the issue who will be sitting from GAC in this coordination group? Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Poland. So the proposal would mean putting forward the number forward to the process from the GAC based on which option we select. So, if we went with option one, chair plus vice chairs plus one from the African region to accomplish geographic balance, that would be -- here's my math, chair plus vice chairs, that's four plus one, five. So that means we'd be putting forward five to participate in the coordination group. Okay.

So next I have Egypt.

EGYPT: So thank you, Chair. Just seeking clarification -- apologies if I have missed this -- are we talking about the same contact group for both the IANA transition and the ICANN accountability? So it's the same contact group? Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Yes, Egypt, that's the idea here. Okay. Belgium, please.

BELGIUM: Thank you, Madam Chair. We haven't spoken about the mandate. This is something that we referred to the first time that we discussed this. I think that, in addition to GAC's representation, another difficult aspect is to ensure that these representatives have to represent the GAC as a whole. Here we go in to a very important discussion. Here we are talking about the IANA stewardship transition. And, on behalf of Belgium, I could not give this mandate to four to five representatives who will represent my country. So what matters is that the GAC should be well-represented in this coordination group. We have been invited to have that representation, but we need to have an information role for the GAC members. Now these GAC representatives on the coordination group should report back to the GAC so that we can discuss what is being done. But these GAC representatives cannot speak on behalf of all the members of the GAC.

CHAIR DRYDEN: The proposal here is meant to be able to accommodate whichever mandate. So, you know, as the coordination group begins to work and this becomes more clear, the aim here and in whatever we would put in the communique and communicate to that process would need to make very clear that the nature of the representation and how that works and that it's not possible to speak on behalf of each and every individual GAC member unless there is a process to do that. And the contact group would have the clear agreement of the GAC on any GAC view, wherever that is possible.

So you're right to remind us this is really important, I think, in being able to come to an agreement about the options that have been put in front of you is that that needs to be very central to what we understand and what we communicate to others about how we work. Okay. Next, I have Germany, please.

GERMANY: Yes. Thank you, Chairman. And also I need to apologize that maybe I have skipped something.

Frankly, I do not really understand what is task of this contact group. Why do we need this contact group? Because I would have expected that, if there are discussions going on, we should have some intersessional contact. That means having some kind of telephone conference where everybody in the GAC could participate and bring in positions shares that could be forwarded in this way or brought forward in a discussion in this in a group on ICANN level. And so far I do not really understand why we need this contact group, because it's limiting or may be having a filter function that is not necessary at the time.

And thank you also for highlighting in your position that we need to re-clarify the role of GAC representatives as they cannot speak on behalf of other GAC members.

I think we also should highlight in our communique that we, as a GAC, will comment on the outcome of this working group. And we will send a message probably -- I would expect it could be some kind of advice to the results or to the outcome document. And that is something we should signal that at an early stage, I think.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Germany. So to your last point regarding an expectation of commenting on the outcome document, I think if we put that in the communique now, this will be an indication to the group early on outlining our expectations that way. I think it's quite useful to do that.

Regarding the function of the contact group, I think the idea is really to acknowledge that this is going to be a lot of work. And when we have the discussion in the public forum tomorrow, I hope this will become more apparent and that GAC colleagues here are able to participate in those sessions because, you know, some in the community are really talking about many hours each week being on that coordination group. And the role is limited entirely to coordinating. So the substance is coming from all the different organizations including the GAC, including ICANN, the Regional Internet Registries, the Internet Engineering Task Force. They're all going to be working really hard at the substantive proposal.

So the coordination concept is really meant to just keep it to this coordination role only.

So it needs to be very much driven by the GAC. And, at the same time, I think it's useful for us to acknowledge it's going to be a lot of work. So this is a way of us putting some support around that activity.

Okay. So next I have Lebanon, then Denmark.

LEBANON: Thank you. My comment is not necessarily related to the coordination effort. I just want to make sure it's clear that I do not agree with the five regions that have been outlined here, if we are looking for linguistic and geographic diversity. Even ICANN started looking at them at least, especially the Arab speaking countries, as a separate entity. And I do not believe that we should continue to alienate that region, especially when presence in this organization has been limited. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Lebanon.

Does this mean, then, that you are more in favor of option one because it's less directly relying on the ICANN regions as ICANN defines them?

LEBANON: Actually, not. I'm not in favor of any specific one as long as we have some people with the contact group that are in communication with the rest of the GAC, this doesn't really matter. I just don't want to establish something in writing from the GAC establishing any communication saying five regions or five vice chairs, and not excluding the Arab slash Middle East region.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you for clarifying.

Before I go to Denmark, can I go to Brazil? I neglected to put you in the list, but please. Thank you.

BRAZIL: Thank you, Chair, and also thank the secretariat for preparing this paper. I also have some preliminary comments on the options we have.

First we have an overall comment that Brazil deems these two processes to be key to not only ICANN but also to the role of the GAC.

So we do think that the GAC's representatives of these two processes should reflect geographic and linguistic diversity.

It could be in the terms of something like option two in which you have the chair plus four GAC members selected by the GAC representatives, representing the four regions not covered by the Chair, or something in these lines.

But the most important thing to Brazil is that these representatives at this Coordination Group should be selected within the respected geographic groups, and they should not speak on behalf of the -- all the GAC representatives. It's up to this, these representatives, to coordinate their government views from their respected regions and convey them back to the group and report it to the respected geographic groups.

So for Brazil, the most important thing is that these people in the Coordination Group, they should reflect geographic and linguistic diversity and be selected within their respected groups.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Brazil.

Denmark, please.

DENMARK: Thank you, Madam Chair. It was only to follow up on your answers to Germany. I was not quite sure whether we, in the communique, will put in that GAC will come with comments on the final draft of the Coordination Group. If not, we will at least suggest that the GAC have that possibility to comment on it.

I think the IANA function and the accountability is something which are quite important for all of us, and we think that we should have the possibility as a group to comment on it.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Denmark.

I think we can include something in the communique along those lines in order to signal early on to the Coordination Group this expectation. I think that's quite useful.

Argentina and European Commission.

ARGENTINA: Thank you, Madam Chair. I will speak in Spanish.

Argentina has not taken any position regarding option one or option two. However, we would like to highlight the importance of preserving

the regional diversity and, more especially, the linguistic diversity, because we believe that representatives in leadership positions who are Spanish speakers have not existed since the beginning of this group many years ago.

So we believe that this is a very important barrier to active participation of other Latin American countries in the GAC.

We have strengthened our participation thanks to actions that have been taken over recent months, but we want this engagement to be reinforced and strengthened with the participation of more Latin American and Spanish-speaking countries. So it is important to have Spanish-speaking participants as well as English-speaking participants and also Portuguese-speaking participants. But with Portuguese, we have had some chairs and vice chairs who spoke Portuguese. We have never had in this leadership position somebody who speaks Spanish, and in these groups it would be essential to have somebody who speaks Spanish for the work to be done in Latin American.

We also consider that this will be intense work. So if the chairs and the vice chairs are going to be involved in this working group, perhaps the workload will be too big for these representatives, and they may find it difficult to do their day-to-day leadership jobs in the GAC, and we want that to be considered, too.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Does this mean you favor option one or two?

ARGENTINA: My apologies. Peru is supporting my comments.

                          Apologies. I missed that. Thank you.

                          And we support Brazil. My colleague from Peru is making me remember that.

                          Thank you so much.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you.

                          Is there an option one or two that you prefer?

ARGENTINA: I cannot say. I will think about it and come back to you. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Argentina.

                          So I'm really looking for guidance now on the options that are in front of us.

                          Okay. I see European Commission.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Sorry, Chair. Is it me first? Okay. Thank you very much.

                          No, I was just reflecting -- I don't know, I think we can go along with any of them, but I would more lean towards option two, simply saying

because the thing is that, of course, we have the elections of the chairs and vice chairs for the time being, and I suspect that this group will be -- be active longer than that period.

So if we take option one, then we will have a change of all the people in the middle of the work. So I think that would be a valuable situation.

I do support also the people that say that of course it should have as much variety as possible, of course. As you said, not only geographical, but also, I think, in terms of gender. I think that is an important issue.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you.

So I'm looking for clarity on option one or option two. All right.

So next I have Sweden, then Lebanon, and a request here, and Iran and Sri Lanka.

SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair.

Well, basically in the interest of time, I agree with Iran that option two would probably be the easiest. But as we mentioned, and what can be expected is that there will be quite a lot of work with this.

Perhaps it would be interesting to hear from the chair and particularly from the vice chairs whether or not they will be able to invest the amount of time that will be necessary over summer, and so forth.

And given the response from them it, would be easier to take a position on option one or two.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you. That is a good idea. And I understood Iran's comments to be favoring option one. So -- yeah.

All right. So -- I'm looking now to the vice chairs. I think one is not present currently, but we can ask the two that are here.

So Switzerland, please.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. For us, and I think this seems to me like also for some others, the key question is not whether option one or two. The key question is that we get the best representation of the range of views in the GAC. But I see that you need to have a decision sooner or later on one or two. So I try to answer your question.

The problem is that, indeed, we will have a change in the team of the chairs and vice chairs in the middle, probably, of this, which is something that might complicate matters. So it's not a question of available time but it's likely a complicating thing. So we would also -- or I would go for option two which wouldn't prevent -- it shouldn't matter whether somebody is a vice chair or not. That's not the key question. It should matter that we take five people that have the best chance to make the GAC feel represented through these five people. I think that's

the key point. And we should -- maybe we call for a proposal for people to come forward and have a discussion on that in an informal way or something.

But if you ask me to decide between one and two, it would be two, but for me that's not the key question.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Switzerland.

Trinidad and Tobago, did you want to comment?

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO: Yes. I support my colleague, vice chair in terms of the fact that we are changing -- I believe it's going to be the meeting -- the next meeting, that will be our last meeting. Sorry; the meeting in the first part of next year. And the team will meet, I think, until the end of the following year. So definitely we'll be challenged with that approach logistically.

Having sat in working groups, it is a lot of work. There are going to be two or three conference calls per week, I believe is what's going to be happening.

So given the fact that's going to be a changeover, I would support option two, and supporting as well the concept of linguistic diversity as well, I would imagine, would be very challenging issue if it's not there.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you. I'm starting to see some movement towards option two.

                       So Lebanon, you are next, please.

LEBANON: No comments. Thanks.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you. And the gentleman over here. Please.

OIF: I'm Emmanuel Adjovi from Francophonie. I would like to speak in French.

                       I would like to briefly say that from the point of view of linguistic diversity, it's important to consider the countries that speak French because there are 58 countries around the world that speak French.

                       So we should take them into consideration, considering this multilinguistic approach.

CHAIR DRYDEN: I have, next, Iran, please.

IRAN: Thank you, Chairman.

Variety of options is on the table, linguistic. French, English, Spanish, Chinese, Russian, Arabic. This is one option.

Geographical, going to politically east, west, north, south, and so on, so forth. Third, whatever is in the ITU six region, whatever is in the ICANN five region, we have a lot of variety and we have little time.

The issue is starting soon, and we have to have representations.

It is clear that in the middle of the process, we have some change. I hope, and that is hope, that in the next election of vice-chairman we would observe geographical distributions.

So whatever we have is just for one term up to the elections, and these people, chairman, perhaps it was not properly mentioned, this contact group has no mission than consulting and collecting information from their respective regions, bringing it to the contact group, consolidate that, and putting to the overall consultation with the GAC through email, through conference call, through physical meeting and whatever is possible.

This contact group does not represent any country. Belgium, Germany and other are right. Issue is quite critical, quite sensitive. No one would like to delegate its responsibility to any other person.

However, there are two element in this process. The first element, every country, member or nonmember of the GAC, has a right to send its views to these two groups, number one.

Number two, as far as the GAC is concerned, either 142 members participate in that group to represent each individual country, which is

impossible, or we should have some sort of representations. Representation in the form that they express their own views is not possible. The only -- As a focal point, this regional representation is consulting and collecting information, consolidating that, and putting into the Contact Group, and Contact Group trying to make further consolidations, and put it to the overall consultation of the GAC through appropriate mechanisms.

Next meeting, if there is anything to correct the situation, still we have time to correct.

Let us consider that we need to increase the number of the representation from two to five. How these five will be elected, how these five will be processed, that is something we have to find some solution at this meeting.

If we fail, the ICANN will be happy. Two, and I don't know who that will be. Chair and one of the vice chair. Whether chair and one of the vice chair, whoever would be, reflect the views of his own, the views of his affiliations, the view of his regions, without consulting others, that is some doubt for the people.

So let us have this Contact Group, and Contact Group has no mission than consolidating and collecting and putting the information from the region without having any right to interfere with those views.

Try to put them together and put it overall consultation of the GAC.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Iran. So I have Sri Lanka, Peru, Venezuela, and Sweden.

SRI LANKA: Thank you, Chair. I tend to support option two with the caveat that we ensure linguistic as well as gender representation.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Sri Lanka.

Peru, please.

PERU: I would like to support option two, but I still think that it would be even better if it was five members without the chair, because the chair will have a lot of work, and one of the members of the GAC that will participate in this group could always inform the GAC. So there's no need for the Chair to be there either.

So I would go with option two anyway.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Peru.

Venezuela, please.

VENEZUELA: Thank you, Madam Chair. I will do my comments in Spanish.

With respect to the opinions that are being heard, we think, and taking into account meeting on Sunday where all this discussion was started, we've seen that it's really significant to consider option two, mostly because in that option, the representatives of various regions will be present. And as my colleagues from Peru and Argentina mentioned before, it is important for the regions to be -- or to feel identified so as to make all their comments and proposals regarding various issues to be discussed in their relevant native languages.

And this is well-known at some other organizations, INTEL (phonetic), ITU, that we have access through English and through Spanish, and it's -- in those cases, they favor the position of receiving the comments in their native languages.

So they receive comments in Spanish, and sometimes there are language barriers. So it's important for us to go for option two provided that we think it will reach better results.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Okay. I have Sweden, Colombia, African Union Commission, Singapore, and South Africa, and then I think we need to conclude our session on this.

Okay. Sweden, please.

SWEDEN: Thank you. I'll be brief.

First of all, do we know that we have five seats already or are we just gambling that we're having five seats? Or do we actually have two seats?

So this is to consider.

And do we have a fall-back position where we choose two premier representatives if we only get two seats, and five if -- You understand. That's the first thing.

The second is I foresee it will be difficult to find -- to agree on representatives. I could be wrong. I hope I'm wrong.

I would prefer option one if the chairs would accept this job this, task, this -- and if they would be able to conclude it. If we could agree that they would take this work until it's finished, which is to the next summer, because there is a deadline of next summer, which is an additional couple of months after your vice positions.

And if this is not possible, then I promote number two as well. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Sweden. Okay. Colombia, please.

COLOMBIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. Colombia would favor option two for two reasons. First of all, we want to ensure geographic and linguistic diversity which would be done by that option. And second, we think

EN

that this topic is of crucial importance, so continuity is important, which is why we would favor two over one.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you.

So next we have the African Union Commission.

AFRICAN UNION COMMISSION: Thank you, Chair.

The AUC also favors option two with the cultural, linguistic, and if possible, gender diversity as well.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you. Okay. Singapore, you are next, please.

SINGAPORE: Thank you, Chair.

We would just like to say we share a lot of sentiments that expressed by Iran. The role of Coordination Group is simply coordination. And in that respect, we would also support the Sweden.

We think that in the interest of time and efficiency, option one is the best approach. We don't believe you even had time to look at option two. And if we follow the geographical representation in the next

elections of chairs and vice chairs, we don't think there will be a problem even though there is a change of team.

So in summary, we support option one. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Singapore.

So can we focus on what it is that we would need to communicate via our communique?

There are some elements of agreement, and I think we should not lose sight of that. And for the purposes of putting forward something to the Coordination Group or about our participation in that Coordination Group, it is possible for us to handle some of the specifics later on.

So, for example, we don't have to communicate today the specific names if we were to go with option two. We simply need to identify that we will be or we intend to identify who those names are, and we could invite colleagues to come forward in the meantime and spend a little more time after this meeting to identify the particular members of the Contact Group on the basis of the principles we have identified, which is geographic diversity, linguistic diversity, as well as range of views, diversity of views.

And this can be good guidance to us, I think, in achieving a good balance. I think it's clear that people need to feel some sense of equitable representation as best we can achieve it via having a total of five involved via this Contact Group.

So can we think on this? And at the same time, keep in mind that I think we have agreement that we can communicate, as well, some of our expectations, and that includes the expectation of being able to comment on any proposal coming out of this process before it moves ahead. So does that give us enough? I think perhaps it does.

I see some nodding which is encouraging.

So let's try to proceed on that basis. I do have a few more requests in the speaking order.

So I have South Africa, Germany, Belgium, and Lebanon. But please, if we can move as I have outlined on the basis of option two, then please say so and let's see if we can come to a conclusion on this matter.

Okay. South Africa, please.

SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you, chair. I agree that diversity should be maintained. If there that would be part of the contact group, they would be overloaded. So we would go with option two and just to add the chance of being part of it. As the members of the GAC should be pardon me of the contact group.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, South Africa. Germany, please.

GERMANY: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair. I fully can go along with the proposal. It's very good. It is just an internal question, maybe task for ourselves.

Would be really to make sure that we have a regular communication between each other. That means not that we meet next time in Los Angeles or afterwards and receive information only at four months time space. I think this is something we need to communicate intensively with each other with during the next month's. And probably we should also consider -- I do not see the necessity now, but we should consider at least to have intersessional meeting if it was necessary. This is just for bearing in mind that this is also an option. If the discussions come high and quite a lot of issues needs to be exchanged, you were mentioning the workload that is going ahead and maybe there's quite a lot of views. In this case, maybe it could be an option that we should consider and find a way how we can make a decision on that, if it was necessary.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Germany. So this is something I think we can also put in the communique as well to be explanatory to say we in the GAC, we have an interest in this, so there's this high expectation about the regularity of meetings, information sharing, communications, opportunity to provide input and so on. And regardless of whether that goes in the communique or not, I think that's clearly the sense in the room in the discussion we're having now. So that is, I think, very positive. All right. Belgium, you're next, please.

BELGIUM: Thank you. I will be very brief. I think, first, that we need to make it clear that we should not be limited to two. ICANN shouldn't tell us how we should be represented. There is a legitimate representation that is

EN

the chair and the three vice chairs.   Those people or other representatives, while it's the GAC the one who has to say how it's going to be represented.   ICANN has allocated four seats to other organizations.   I believe that there is one solution that is more legitimate and that is option one.   I don't have a problem with supporting option two. As regard point eight, I would like to make it clear that the role of the contact group or the role of the members of the contact group should not be responsible for coordinating the government views from across their respective regions. I believe that that is too big a burden for them. So I think that we have divergent views on different issues. So I would like to reinforce what I said before and what Germany, Iran and Singapore said. It would be a role of information and not a role to represent all the different views of the government. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: We agree it needs to have quite a bit of flexibility to it. I think you're right. We can't have too high an expectation about the ability of anyone in the contact group to coordinate a regional view, certainly not when it's difficult to anticipate the kinds of issues that might come up in the discussion. So keeping it flexible that way I think is going to be useful to us.   I wonder whether it's possible to take the proposal from South Africa, which I think is quite useful to us, and, in fact, say that it would be the chair, plus four coming from the membership and so we arrive at the number of five that we communicate to the coordination group. Then the vice chairs also would participate in the contact group and that gets us away from some of the logistical issues, so you can have some change in the vice chairs, and they can help with the information

sharing and the task of the coordination group but without, as I say, introducing those additional questions. I wonder if that's a nuance that we can make to this. All right. So we do need to conclude. I have Lebanon, Iran. Okay. Lebanon, please.

LEBANON: Thank you. I want to emphasize one thing before we move on, and that is I'm hearing exclusion statements and I really believe we should not have any exclusion statement of anybody in this group. Like excluding the chair or excluding the vice chairs or whatever. If we're going to go with option, like option two or option one, I think we should leave it up to the groups to decide whether they want to get that person or not, provided that these people have the time to do it and have the capability to be able to carry on the tasks. That's one. Two, I reiterate the fact that these five groupings that are there do not take into account the Arab region; the Arab area, whether it's linguistically or geographically. So I don't make it an issue, but I want to make sure that somebody is nominated, and I would say Egypt in this case who would be common to some areas to at least be there, even if you don't count them as one of the five main contact groups. It would be a member that could be collecting the data for the people because, you know, this is an area that we really need to get input from. But again, whether we go with option one or option two, I think we should leave it up to the chairs and the region to decide whether they want to continue with them or not. It's the same thing. I mean, for example, the chair is from North America. I mean, you could work with the North American region to decide on that. I mean, the priority in my mind should be for the chair and the co-chairs or vice chairs.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Lebanon. So what I'm proposing I hope avoids us getting into the very issues that you describe. So by determining to go with option two, we would then, after these meetings, invite people to come forward based on principles of geographic diversity and linguistic diversity and as well diverse views among the GAC. We won't be referring to anything tightly defined, if that's the principle. And on the basis of who comes forward, then we have an opportunity to try to accomplish that balance on the contact group. At the same time, there is a high expectation about the information flows and the ability of all of the GAC to comment to know what's happening, for there to be regular calls so that it becomes less important to distinguish between a GAC member and someone that's sitting in the contact group. So we, in this way, are able to find some kind of balanced way forward and offer some assurances to colleagues here who I think quite rightly are concerned that we do observe some sort of principles based approach to organizing ourselves. We also need to communicate very clearly to others about what we expect and how we intend to work. And so I hear there's also strong agreement here to do that. So we shall. Okay. So, with that, I have Iran in the speaking order and then I hope we can conclude on the basis of the understanding I have just outlined. Iran, please.

IRAN:

Thank you, Chairman. There are two separate things. First, we have to indicate to the board that we need to have more seats in these two coordination committee and working group, from two to five. This is a

separate issue. We have to insist on that and that that is our right. That government roles should not be marginalized. When a particular entity of ICANN has four seats, I don't understand why government, 142 currently, plus many should have two seats, I don't see any logic and rationale behind that. So let us separate this issue. The communique include that after discussions, GAC came to the conclusion that the minimum number of the representative of GAC in these two groups are five. This is point one. Point two, Madam Chairman, you are very optimistic. Having option two, very good. I'm not against option two. But you said that after you find to have a representative for a region, what is the modality? Let's take the region Asian-Pacific Oceania. After the meeting, you have representatives. Who will take the initiative to start to have that discussion in that region, one. What are the countries in that region, two. How does election or selection will be made, three. It may take longer time and come to no conclusions. Then the ICANN can say, look, these guys want to have five.   Among themselves they don't have any arrangement even to have a representation.   They're talking about representation, but they're unable because there is no time. Madam Chairman, I see the difficulty. I spent 40 years in the international organization. It's difficulty that absently or orally or from the, let us say, coordination among correspondents you have an election or a selection or representatives. But you must have a face-to-face is difficult. This is point one. Point two, from the outside, it would not be appropriately interpreted if we exclude chair and vice chairs, saying that there is no confidence, even currently in the chair and vice chair. I'm not supporting any of you. I'm not against any of you. Just professionally, it's not appropriate. We say that this would be excluding chair. We say, look, this is the GAC. They

don't even have trust in the chair and vice chair. Hopefully next meeting we would have a regional representations in the vice chair. So Madam Chairman, please propose something which is practical. Separating issue one that we have five finished. And then how does five be selected or elected? Please can we propose some practical ways?

Maybe we stop the discussion now, do the lunch break and have some consultation. And after the lunch break, spend half an hour to come to some practical way. I don't think that if we leave it to that, saying that Europe -- how will Europe do that? 50 countries. How will do that?

The only two areas that requested that -- one area that requested is Africa. Clear-cut. The others not as such. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Iran. Just a quick reaction to some of the points you raised. This isn't a process driven by the ICANN board. It's really very much meant to be bottom up. Even though I can in convening the global process has needed to initiate it, precisely how we would communicate that we seem to be converging towards around five being apportioned on the coordination group. But I think we can communicate that and that that suggestion would be duly taken into account as the coordination group really begins move ahead with its work. What we have in place is a loose collection of representatives from various parts of the broader community beyond ICANN, but relate today the Internet technical organizations. That includes me informally to try and transition us to setting up coordination group. So, in terms of numbers, we can communicate that. As far as my optimistic, well, in this job I have to be optimistic as experience has demonstrated. But I think this is

something that we can indicate to the community that would be useful to us to have an increase in numbers in that way. We're not intending to exclude the vice chairs at all, and I think the proposal from South Africa, if we're still including them in the contact group, would allow us to still involve them in an appropriate way. So current vice chairs, plus future vice chairs as well would then be involved in the contact group. So I'm hoping that we're converging, nevertheless, on some points here. And again, there's no tightly defined reference that we're referring to when we talk about geographic regional linguistic and so on. It's more on the basis of allowing anyone in the GAC to come forward that would be interested in participating in the contact group and then the need to achieve some sort of balance. I think we can see where there is strong interest in the room in coming forward when we get to that point. Okay. So Switzerland, please.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you. This is actually quite a funny situation. We agree largely on what we want, and we agree largely on we need to be practical and we need to move forward, but somehow we don't seem to find the channel to go forward. I think what we need to put in the communique is the message that we all agree. We ask for five and see whether we get it and we explain why because -- with all respect to geographical representation, if we all had one opinion, the same opinion, we wouldn't need to ask for five because we could just convey one opinion. I think the diversity of views in this question, that might of course depend on geographic and cultural things, but in the end, it's the diversity of views that we think is the reason why we want have more than two people in this group. All the details of how we organize

ourselves internally to get to the five people or whatever we get in the end, we should leave that for now for the communique and I agree with Iran. We have to find a practical informal procedure to discuss this hopefully today, if not tomorrow, if enough people are here to come up with something that we agree among us and just to make it clear. To me this is not -- I don't care whether it's a vice chair or not a vice chair. We need to have people that, A, have the time and B, have the trust to represent the GAC and that's it. Maybe let's just informally discuss names and then see whether geographically it's a representative or not. We need to be really practical here and just agree what needs to be in the communique and try to find a practical solution for tomorrow. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Switzerland. Okay. I would like us to stop here. So we will have some text coming around to us as part of the next draft of the communique for this afternoon. On this, noting the areas where we do have agreement. And Switzerland is quite right, there will need to then be efforts to help work out the practical details and names and so on. So let's focus on where we are agreed and those key messages that we need to have in our communique to signal at this meeting what our expectations are and how we intend to organize ourselves, at least from the perspective of principles or, you know, general areas of agreement. And with this, we can have a break here for lunch. When we reconvene at 2:00, there will be a revised GAC communique. But based on some of the suggestions or changes made this morning, I will look to a signal from interested parties around WINE and VIN, around when that text is ready to come forward in a draft of the communique. So there is text in

circulation now to all of you. And I do not want to put something on the table that is going to immediately be adversarial and lead us to a protracted discussion. So keep working on that text, and once I see that there is at least reason to continue my optimism, then we will include it and discuss it as an inclusion in the communique. Okay?

So please work on this over the lunchtime. And thank you all to efforts so far on this difficult issue. I can see you are working with each other very hard in order to come to some kind of agreement on text. All right. Israel?

ISRAEL: Can I ask something before the break about the specific strengths?

CHAIR DRYDEN: I'm sorry, what was your question?

ISRAEL: I want to add something about the specific strengths, if it's okay. A quick one.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Let's break for lunch and maybe I can discuss with you.

ISRAEL: Okay.

CHAIR DRYDEN: So I understand the issue. Okay. Thank you. All right. Good lunch, everyone. A reminder about the Commonwealth meeting in the Fiamma private room. That's the restaurant on the ground floor, Commonwealth members. Thank you.

(Lunch break)

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]