

---

BUENOS AIRES – GAC Plenary 3  
Saturday, November 16, 2013 – 16:00 to 18:00  
ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

This is the continuation of the GAC plenary, ICANN 48 in Buenos Aires, Saturday November 16th, starting at 4:00 p.m. local time.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Okay, everyone, if you could take your seats, please.

Good afternoon again. If you could begin to take your seats, please. So let's continue with our session this afternoon. Hope everyone had a good break and had a chance to continue their introductions and greetings now that we're all here in Buenos Aires.

So, before we concluded, we held the -- well, a re-election of the incumbent vice chairs because they had indicated a willingness to continue. However, in the break it has been brought to my attention that there was additional interest from a representative in the GAC in running and being nominated. But no nomination had been made prior to our considering the question of the three vice chairs' positions.

So what I would like to do is seek some advice from colleagues in the GAC on how we might proceed in this situation.

As far as our operating principles are concerned,

---

*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.*

We do have some principles there that may help to guide us in considering this question. One relevant principle, I believe, is principle 23, which allows the GAC to designate other officers as ready. I'm sorry, as necessary. But it does not specify with any further clarity whether that is intended to mean the vice chair or some other sort of officer. So it's quite a straightforward principle that we have, principle 23. At the same time we do have some discussions happening, I understand, in the working methods working group where there is discussion about giving a more active role to the vice chairs. And, of course, always in these environments, we are particularly attentive to the importance of having regional representation. And so it would seem, if we did have an additional vice chair, it may allow us to do this, perhaps, better.

But these are options that colleagues made that we should pursue. Or there may, in fact, be other guidance made to us in dealing with this awkward situation that we find ourselves in now.

So can I ask for colleagues to comment or provide some guidance in this particular situation as to how to best address it? Peru, please.

---

PERU: We believe that the GAC should have representatives from each continent. It would be -- we would feel better represented, and I think we could work better closer to you.

In the case of Peru, we have the support of all the Latin American countries members of this institution. And we would like to be part of this board.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Peru. It may be helpful to us to think of the question in the longer term and not associating it to a specific government. I think that might make it a bit more challenging for us to comment on.

Norway, please?

NORWAY: Yes. Thank you, Chair. Just a quick comment just on the fly. Of course, traditionally, we have always had three vice chairs. So, of course, in the tradition then, of course, it is difficult to accommodate representation from all the continents. But, of course, I would -- that's an interesting thought. And, of course, if we can have more work done by several vice chairs, maybe that's something to discuss.

---

But I would suggest that we delay this discussion until the session on working group plans and priorities and so on later today. That would be, I think, a more appropriate place to discuss that, if this is a possibility or if this is something that the GAC wants. Of course, our tradition has been, as I said, only three vice chairs. But I don't have any immediate strong feelings against four. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you very much, Norway. Other comments, please. I see an arm. I cannot see who the arm belongs to. Hungary, please.

HUNGARY: Thank you, Chair. I fully agree with the comments made by Norway and that should be the proper place and proper time during the discussion of the results of the working group how to proceed with this issue. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Hungary. Australia, and then I see Iran.

AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. Again, just some preliminary thoughts. But the comments from Norway and Hungary have triggered my recollection of some of the things the working methods working

group has been doing. And I recall -- I think it was in the initial discussion paper that was circulated by the European Commission or by Spain that suggested that the vice -- one of the roles of the vice chairs could be to do coordination and outreach in their regions. I recall that one of the things that was raised in relation to the fact that there are currently three vice chairs and more than three regions, which makes it extremely challenging.

So, to the extent -- you know, I think it does have links to the working methods working group. I haven't thought it all through; but there is some potential synergies there, some broader issues that we could potentially look at.

The other comment, I guess, is that we should be very mindful that we do have operating principles here and that we should -- to the extent that there is going to be more candidates for fewer positions, if that's the way we go, we need to look clearly to our operating principles in how to go forward.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Australia. I have Iran next, then Italy.

IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I think the issue of regional representation has been an issue which was raised in various international

organization or sister organizations similar to us. And, as a way of principle of solidarity and principle of collaboration and cooperation, this principle, in general -- I said "in general" -- has been agreed.

So I suggest that the chair, first of all, continue further consultation with colleagues. And also, when we come to the working method, you will see to what extent we could take account. It's quite clear that sometimes maybe a particular region is not represented. And, due to the fact that their representations would assist us, would help us to progress the work, if we don't find any deficiency to do that, why not to give a positive point to that? However, I suggest you do leave some consultation because leave a little time for colleagues to reflect. And also, when you comment on the working method what you have to do with respect to this issue. This is on the long term.

On the short term, again, the consultation provide you some idea that, once you decide on the long term, perhaps in the short term you could say that by analogy you could take that -- if people agree to have more than three vice chairman or agree with the principle of geographical distribution or geographical representation, I think you should take. If there are colleagues have an interest to be a vice chair and submit it to you, after the

---

discussion of the working method, you would come back with that. So you link them together. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Iran.

I have Italy and U.K.

ITALY: Thank you, Chair. So let me elaborate a little bit because why the number of three vice chairs was decided years ago.

And the point was that, before the end of the MoU and the Affirmation of Commitments, the reasoning was that maybe North America didn't need a vice chair. So there was never a vice chair from North America in the years before.

Then, in this point, the idea of increasing at least one more vice chair is something very reasonable. Because with the Affirmation of Commitments, then the liaison with the U.S. government was no longer there.

So -- and then why not five? So that is also another good possible idea, just in case the chair abstains to be the representative of the region of the chair.

So, in the past, when we had three vice chairs, not -- and there was not a vice chair in the same region as the chair. And especially if the chair will abstains, as I say, then there is a -- in our case, kind of the representative also in the GAC, then the idea could be that there is a vice chair per each region. So this is something connected to the history.

But I agree on the fact that we should elaborate much more on the working methods. Because there is the need also of defining more clearly which is the role of the vice chairs. And this is a role very important to try to coordinate and to make some opinion coming from each one of the regions.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Italy.

I have U.K. next.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. I agree with regard to the operating principles and extending the number of vice chairs beyond the current three is an interesting proposal and worth considering. I think that's for the long term as part of the working method discussions and so on.



---

I just wanted to pick up on your reference to principle 23 of the operating principles, the GAC may designate other officers as necessary. I'm thinking now of the short-term, really.

First of all, I just wanted to express gratitude that there is a delegation here which is interested in joining the officers of the GAC. I think that's very welcome and very much appreciated.

And I'm just looking at what additional role a fourth officer in support of you, Chair, might undertake.

And, just scanning quickly, our current agenda -- new gTLDs, the GAC working methods, early involvement in policy development, reverse liaisons, and so on with other -- or our relationship with other supporting organizations and advisory committees. There may well be merit in discussing whether we actually do have an opportunity here to help our work by designating another officer perhaps to oversee one of these major areas of work. So maybe that's something we can consider at this meeting in the light of this offer to be an officer of the GAC that we've heard about. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, U.K.

---

Are there any further requests to speak on this topic? Okay. I don't see any hands. Okay.

So it's clear that there is a lot of interest in continuing this discussion. And looking very carefully at the arrangement we have currently, the number of vice chairs or other officers that the committee needs to support its work.

And there's clearly interest in pursuing that via the working methods discussion that has been initiated at our last meetings. At the same time, I think our U.K. colleague is really quite right to express appreciation for the willingness of one of our colleagues here to come forward and take on such a role within this committee. And we need to remain mindful and appreciative of that effort.

So what I would like to do is move the discussion to -- or keep the discussion that's already under way in the working methods group going and to be informed by this exchange that we have just had and for us to seek things like ways to have better regional representation and as well how to evolve the role or continue to evolve the role of the vice chairs to support the work of the committee and to keep us effective and so on with our increasing workload.

So thank you everyone for your guidance in this and I hope this is a reasonable way forward, and it's clearly something we'll be coming back to with a great deal of interest around this table, and discussing.

Okay. So I will move us to the next item in our agenda, which was an update on bringing in secretariat support to be provided by ACIG.

This is in the agenda, the request of colleagues around the table who I understand wanted to comment, in particular, about the kinds of things about ACIG would be doing. And the main reference for myself and the vice chairs -- in particular, Tracy Hackshaw, who, as it turns out, has a great deal of experience with procurement and contracting and so on. So we've been relying quite heavily on Tracy's expertise to move us along in bringing in ACIG.

So we have been relying on the RFI that was issued by the task force that was created to look at an arrangement or an approach to this critical issue for our work. And as well, we have a response from ACIG that I think also may be useful information for us in that discussion.

I could also turn your attention back to the agreement in the GAC that we would pursue some sort of hybrid arrangement to make

---

this all work. And I think based on some of the discussions in the working group on working methods and other discussions we've had, it's very clear, certainly from my point of view, what kinds of support the GAC are seeking and which kinds of support specifically that they would like ACIG to do. And as they are here, they are being tasked to provide that kind of support throughout the week. And I will talk a bit more about that when we go over our planning and priorities in the next portion.

So in order to create this additional opportunity, to provide inputs, I saw it as necessary to put in place a short-term contract with ACIG to make sure they can travel here and have that funded and provide us with support and receive payment for it. It was a bit of a chicken-and-egg situation that if the GAC, at a face-to-face meeting, wants this further opportunity, it's impossible to finalize the contract and Service Level Agreement and then not possible to bring them here. So this is why we came up with the short-term contract, in order to at least allow further opportunity here at our face-to-face meeting to comment.

So that is, in basic terms, where we are from my point of view. I don't know whether my colleague, Tracy from Trinidad and Tobago, has anything to add there. But if not, I would turn it over to the floor to see whether colleagues do have any further guidance that they think is really critical for myself and the vice

---

chairs to take into account when looking to finalize quickly the longer term contracting arrangement with ACIG.

And I want to emphasize that this is something I really do want to get off my table very quickly. I just want to get it done and have to us benefiting, to the maximum extent we can, from getting all this great support from ACIG.

So, looking around. Are there any comments?

Norway, please.

NORWAY:

Yes, thank you, Chair. And I also want to express, and that's from the donor countries. We are very happy that the ACIG is here it provide support, and we are very happy that you are able to provide this short-term contract for them to come. So we are also very happy to confirm that, of course, we also want the long-term contract to be in place as soon as possible. And that when the long-term contract has been signed and put in place, we, of course, will be then able to release the fund and pay for the secretariat support. And I also want to also confirm that we also will then pay for the funding of the short-term contract for them to be here as well.

So thank you.

---

CHAIR DRYDEN:                   Okay. Thank you.

So next I have Italy, please.

ITALY:                               If there are other donor countries that want to intervene, I will prefer to speak later, but if not, let me give an idea. Okay.

So what I see the critical part of the work and what we could expect from the company then is to increase the support for the GAC meetings. And one of the most important point is to prepare briefing papers. And I'll try to describe what I mean by that.

So it is quite clear to us that the quantity of documents that are released by ICANN and by different commentators around the world is so huge that there is really a strong need that some organization prepares briefing papers that in one page, maximum two pages, tries to explain where we are and make some global resumé of all the inputs that have been produced in single points of attention to the GAC.

This will ease a lot, also, especially for those who have not the ability to read everything because it takes a lot of time. And this is the first point that I remember that was achieved by the GAC secretariat when it was organized by the European Union --

European Commission seven or eight years ago. Briefing papers are very, very important.

Then another point is the second, and then I stop, is concerning increasing the efficiency of the intersessional work of the GAC members. Because while the GAC meets in these global meetings three times per year, the Board meets at least double of this number. And then it is really important also to make some information, promotion that is also this one in the form of short briefing papers about this focus to the participation, especially in country codes, because with telephone calls, I remember that roughly 20 people are participating in these calls. And then a lot less than the present in global meetings, and then we have to do our best in order to increase the participation.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you very much.

So just to touch upon this proposal to have briefing papers. I think everyone in this room will agree with you that that is a useful thing to have, so I think that's something where we can expect early success for the incoming support. And of course ACIG is behind me listening very carefully to this discussion as well.

---

So next I have EU Commission, then Australia, New Zealand, and Iran.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Okay. Thank you, Heather. Just being very short. Of course -- I mean, I think I talk for everyone here that we are extremely happy that this is finally happening because of course its been six months since the decision. It does not fall on you completely, but it is important that this actually happens now.

I think it is important, first of all, to say that the secretariat is, of course, completely in your hands and you should develop what they should do. That is very much our baseline from the European Commission at least. Of course, later on we can discuss further on what they should do and not do, but one thing that is obvious for the European Commission is that we need much more preparations and much more sort of up-front work, of course help from the secretariat, for the Singapore meeting.

So I would very much appreciate if they would be fully functional within a month or so so that in Singapore, we have the full support from them so that, you know -- I mean, it's clear that getting the final agenda a week before is just one example. It's something that you really need the support of this group to actually do the job properly so that we get a GAC which functions



---

according to what I think everybody hopes here. An accountable GAC to the rest of the ICANN constituencies.

I just wanted to say that -- congratulate you that finally now it's happening and that we can move forward on this issue.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you for those comments.

To give you a sense of the timing, the short-term contract is in place until December 31st, and so that's the window within which we would like to then put in place the longer term, and then have it be quite smoothly moving from one to the longer term. We'll see how we manage with that, but I'm optimistic, yeah.

Okay. So next I have Australia, please.

AUSTRALIA:

Thank you, Chair. I'll be quite brief.

I wanted to welcome our ACIG colleagues to their first meeting. So welcome. It's really great to see the new secretariat on the ground. It's been a long process for the GAC, and I think we all acknowledge how important it is. So this is a really welcome development.

---

And I also wanted to thank you, Chair, for all your hard work on this, and also Tracy and Thomas who have been doing a lot of work intersessionally to make this happen. So thanks to all involved.

We had a chair, vice chair meeting just to talk about how the meetings were going to progress just this morning with the new secretariat, and we're already working on ways to integrate them and to start to ramp up the support that the GAC needs. I think we'll learn a lot about that from this meeting, but I think it's a really great development, and I wanted to say thanks, and welcome.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Australia.

So I have New Zealand, Iran, and France.

NEW ZEALAND: Thank you, Heather.

I just wanted to add my welcome to that of my Australian colleague's comments. I'm very, very pleased to see the progress that has been made and putting in a short-term contract and emphasizing the need for the long-term contract to come in so

---

that the work momentum builds up rather than comes to a sudden halt on the 31st of December.

I just note that the very, very valuable work that the working group operational -- GAC operational process has done has actually outlined much of the work that needs to be done, which is certainly in line with comments from colleagues immediately preceding on this topic. And that that gives a very, very sound basis for initiating the work of the new secretariat. And very much outlines the work that needs to be done by that group leading into Singapore.

So we already have a work program, and the operational methods discussion will no doubt reinforce that and give ACIG a good steer in what the priorities actually are.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, New Zealand.

Iran, you are next, please.

IRAN: Thank you, Madam Chair. I have three points to make. First of all, I fully support the comments made by New Zealand. We should, as soon as possible, confirm the continuity. We don't want to

---

have any hold after so many hard discussions. Now we have put in place something and I would like to put in place that we have the continuity and, in fact, that would help us a lot. So I think we should go to that path.

Secondly, with respect to the detail of the activities, I think GAC would give the general guideline. It remains with the chairman and the vice chairmen which is a management committee of GAC, and all of the details will be provided by yourself and the vice chair. We don't need to go to the micro management of the secretariat. It's up to you and your vice chairs, (indiscernible) guideline.

Coming to the point made by our distinguished colleague from Italy, while we agree with him, briefing paper, but we should have some limit on some topics. We should not have briefing paper of what and leave it in the hand of secretariat to decide on what issue. So at least there should be some guideline on what issue we want because there are many, many things. I don't think they should engage to provide a briefing on all the points which have been discussed or published and so on and so forth. So we should try to channelize that in optimized manner and perhaps decide on something that these are the points that we expect, if possible, have a briefing paper of not more than a page or half -- page and a half. So we don't want to put the whole activity of the

---

secretariat for the briefing paper arrangement and so on and so forth.

Everyone has their own support in the office. Although we are a small administration, we have really a few people; big administrations, they have many, many, but at least they would like us to let them to do the activity that we expect them to do, but not just preparing the briefing.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you for that, Iran.

So then I have France, Costa Rica, and Denmark. And then I think we can probably move on to the next agenda item. We'll add Norway. Okay.

All right. So next we have Costa Rica.

FRANCE:

Thank you very much. French with a Costa Rican accent probably.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

It's my mistake. Please go ahead, France.

FRANCE:

Thank you, Mrs. Chair.

I just wanted to say that we welcome our new colleagues. We are anxious to work with them, though it is clearly understood, Mrs. Chair, that they are your team and very much in line with what Frank March said. I believe they already know that they will have a lot of work to do and that you will keep them busy.

I was just wondering if they could -- or if you could introduce them to the GAC.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Sure. I'd be happy to.

So sitting behind me we have Tom Dale. If you could stand up. And Michelle Scott-Tucker. So they've come a long way, from Oz, the land of Oz, to be with us this week and thank you to the GAC.

[ Applause ]

Okay. So next I have Costa Rica and then Denmark.

COSTA RICA:

Thank you, Ms. Chair. Costa Rica, for the record.

I want to comment on the very clear indications by the Italian, but, first of all, I want to thank donor countries for making this possible.

Back to the Italian comments that our colleague from Iran also commented on, I think it's very important and we have very high expectation on the work between meetings. Nevertheless, there are processes in ICANN that are longer term than just between meetings. There are the policy development processes to which GAC has been hesitant to participate because they don't want to be identified as country positions in policy development processes.

So I hope that there is also a long-range follow-up of the policy development processes, and maybe also a discussion if the secretariat would be able to follow some of the more important relevant policy development processes that would put an emphasis, as our colleague from Iran said, on the most important things.

And I know this is going to be part of the working -- working procedures, but I really ask you to take your time and look at the annex of the Accountability and Transparency Review Team 2 which focuses on many issues of the policy development process and puts the question on the table in which way GAC could participate. Full-time, during the full cycle, or at some intervention points. And I hope that this work of the secretariat is fruitful. I hope they will help us a lot during the public meetings. I hope they will help us between meetings. But I also expect

---

discussion on how to follow-up the longer cycles of the policy development process.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you for that, Costa Rica.

And so I think Denmark, you might have the final comment, and then Norway, yes.

DENMARK:

Thank you, Chair.

And first of all, Denmark would like to welcome also the secretariat and express our appreciation that after years of discussion, we finally seem to have a real secretariat. We very much appreciate that.

Following up my Costa Rican colleague, we also from Denmark really emphasize that the secretariat can work intersessionally to keep the GAC up to speed.

We usually have long periods of silence on the GAC list, and that's not necessarily -- that's not necessary. Actually, it's very important that we respond when other stakeholders ask us for our input, et cetera. And I think that the secretariat can help us in



---

keeping track on requests for our input, provide us with a deadline and coordinating the different responses from GAC members.

And so that we are active during all the year and not just three times a year in a very hectic schedule as we usually end up with.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Denmark.

Norway.

NORWAY: Yes, thank you, Chair.

Just to be clear, I might have been a little bit unclear on the timing on the payment. So just to confirm that the donor countries will pay for the short-term contract and for the long-term contract when that will be signed. So thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you for that clarification, Norway.

Okay. So there you have it. We have an incoming new secretariat that we're all clearly very appreciative of, and welcoming, and

also we are grateful to the donors for making it possible. If we did not have their contributions, we would not have incoming support from ACIG.

So that's good news all around.

Okay. So let's move on to our last session, which is in several parts, where we will be looking at how we organize our week and our priorities. And also getting an update from some of the working groups that are currently underway. And this way we can anticipate what kinds of activities and outputs we are going to pursue over the coming days.

So to begin, GAC planning and priorities. I'll start by talking a little bit about how the work has been tasked.

So for the working groups that are identified as GAC working groups, the future gTLD Issues Working Group where Australia is leading within the GAC, we've asked Michelle Scott-Tucker to provide support to that effort. That also means working with the lead to either hold the pen or support them holding the pen on generating reports, outputs, and so on for the working group. Also managing the materials and making sure they're available. And also for anything that would be in the communique, and then minutes from -- and because the discussions are happening within

the working group in the first instance, it would primarily be the minutes from meetings taken in the working groups.

So all the kinds of things you would typically associate with supporting an effort. And for the Working Methods Working Group, Tom Dale has already begun to go through some of the issues and papers that have been generated by the working group, and so he will be providing support to that, which, again, implies anything related to outputs from the working group. And then if there are discussions in the GAC and communicate in the minutes and so on.

For the Multistakeholder Meeting Working Group, we'll also be asking for an update from the three GAC representatives participating in that. What they're discussing I think is of relevance to us and interest to us, but it's not clear to me, at least, how that work is progressing. So this is a good opportunity to get a better sense of that. And Olof Nordling, our liaison, has been tracking that and will continue to do so in order to help us liaise with the other parts of the organization since it is a board-led working group.

So other policy issues that I can recall we will be discussing later in the week relating to the lease of two-letter country codes, for brand top-level domains and, as well, the sunrise issue for geo top-level domains. Michelle and Tom will be taking on one of

those. And as well, within the ccNSO, there is a Framework of Interpretation Working Group. And as well, possibly further work to do on the IDN PDP.

So I've asked them to also work out between them, between those four issues, what makes sense for each of them to be working on.

And that is following that issue through throughout whatever processes are needed to give that due consideration.

And, as far as the communique -- at the end of each day, we will receive a draft, to the extent we're able, based on the discussions from that day for communication -- for communique text.

And so now is our opportunity to be very clear about where we expect there to be a communique text. And in the past we've had quite a strong impulse to want to advise on everything and repeat our advice. And I do want us to continue getting away from that and to be really clear about what are our negotiated outputs from each meeting. But I hope that is clear, and I hope that meets with expectations around the kinds of things that GAC representatives have been asking for to support our work while we are here at a face-to-face meeting.

So, if we, perhaps, begin by going through the working group updates and see how far we get by end of day. I'm particularly

interested in hearing what kinds of time will be sought and whether it's as a working group or whether there are things that are ready to come to plenary so that we can adjust as needed for the rest of the week. So I'm asking leads to try and crystallize for us precisely how they want to engage colleagues while we're here this week. First up we have the future gTLD issues working group where I will turn to Australia. And, if you could give us just a brief recap of what is the work, where is it coming from, what are the key issues associated just to make sure that we're all up to speed on this particular working group. Please.

AUSTRALIA:

Thank you, Chair.

So this working group was formed on the last day of our Durban meeting. So not all GAC members could be present for that meeting. It's a little similar to what we have here in that Thursday we have a room booked. We don't necessarily have a plenary session planned and so on.

So what we did in Durban, there were a number of GAC members who were interested to meet and to discuss some issues which had been identified in the GAC plenaries in previous meetings. And we were looking to form a working group to look at some of those issues.

Now, this working group, in particular, is looking at challenges that have been identified -- public policy challenges that have been identified in the first round of new gTLDs. All the issues, subissues that this workshop has looked at have been discussed in GAC plenaries. And I think most members will have some understanding of what they are. But I'll go through all three of them.

So the first relates to the protection of geographic names. It comes as no surprise that the GAC has faced some challenges from this first round of new gTLDs in this area. The GAC has provided advice to the board in the development of the applicant guidebook. The way that that was translated into the applicant guidebook has subsequently -- I think we've previously talked about -- created some gaps. And, in particular, the GAC has then avowed itself of the processes which were made available in the guidebook -- the early warning process and the possibility of giving objections -- to deal with some of the sensitive issues that have been identified by governments. Amazon being a very clear example, but we have several others.

The second issue relates to the processes which are in the current applicant guidebook again regarding community applications or the lack thereof. This issue has been discussed in the GAC a couple of times. And, as I understand it, there are two -- or at

least two parts to this. The first is relative complexity of the process for applying for a community application and some of the difficulties and issues associated with that, lessons that we seem to have learned.

And the second relates to the community objection process. So they're linked to deal with the eligibility and usefulness of those processes.

The third one relates to developing economies and applicant support processes. Again, this has been discussed widely within the GAC. There were some concerns about the way that those support mechanisms were operationalized once the board signed off on the new gTLD round and some of the lessons that we may or may not have learned when we started seeing what applications have come in, how those processes were utilized, and so on.

Given that each of these topics is quite broad and pretty complex, I'm pleased to say that some GAC members have agreed to lead on each individual topic.

So my Argentine colleague has agreed to take the lead on the geographic names topic, Thomas Schneider and Mark Carvell from the U.K. on the community topic, and Tracy Hackshaw from

Trinidad and Tobago on developing economies and applicant support.

It's -- I'm happy to say that we're still happy to take additional participants in this working group. Some of the work is already under way, but we always welcome new members who may be interested in helping out with this.

What we're really looking to do is to provide some advice and support to the GAC in how it might want to provide input to the rest of the community before a second round of new gTLDs, if it turns out that there may be ways of handling things better next time, this is to help the GAC get on a front foot.

In terms of progress that we've made to date, on the community issues, we're at a pretty early stage. So I think what we'll be actually looking to do is to provide a substantive update to the GAC before the next meeting to prompt some discussion there.

Similar progress -- a little bit more progress on the developing economies applicant support issue. Tracy has circulated a very useful discussion paper within the working group to help prompt some next steps. But, again, I think probably, unless Tracy would like to -- looking Tracy's way -- perhaps we're looking at giving a substantive report in Singapore. The most progressed area is on geographic names, where, really, we've been trying to narrow



down some of the options and some of the issues and focus in on them. Obviously, one of the -- the two main mechanisms which were outlined in the current applicant guidebook is, obviously, the use of some quite limited lists of geographic names which are given certain protections.

And the second is to outline a process whereby governments can deal with any issues, not just geographic names but, basically, a general set of process provisions. And that's the early warning process and the consensus process. So they're the main two -- or two of the main provisions in the current guidebook.

And I'll turn it over to Olga who has prepared a useful presentation or sort of framework for this discussion. But each of those things, I think, raises challenges, you know. I think the GAC is pretty aware of some of the challenges of using and relying on lists. And, equally, I think, in terms of setting out a process, raises its own concerns. Obviously, one of the things that would be nice to have is process certainty for all the parties in the future, if possible.

Before I pitch to Olga, I'll just close up saying, essentially, what we're looking for here is a really open discussion, some ideas. As I said, anyone can join this working group. The working group will go away and do more work before Singapore. So any ideas you

---

can give us to help guide that work will be really appreciated. And I'll hand over to Olga.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much, Peter. And thank you for the introduction. Exactly what you said is what we want from you, some feedback. Argentina prepared a background document that is -- has been distributed to you in a hard copy. We also sent it through the GAC list.

And I want to thank those colleagues that contributed with comments and texts. I want to thank Spain, China, and Chile for sending those comments. I want to thank many of you who have sent private messages to me. And also with some of you I had some Skype conversations to shape this new stage of this draft document.

I also want to say if Paraguay, Peru, Belgium and -- I'm missing one. It's -- I'm forgetting France -- wants to join us for the group, you're more than welcome. So the -- our idea is to show you the progress that we have done, receive comments from you now, and have some concrete proposal about what to do or some text to be added to the applicant guidebook or other ideas for the Singapore meeting, next meeting of ICANN.

So I have prepared a very short PowerPoint especially for those colleagues who are not following the work of this working group. So you can be -- to have some background about this issue. Can we put it in the presenting mode?

So the two or three first slides are about the background information, which is also in the document that we prepared.

Next, please. So this is the -- what we agreed in Durban. This is what that communique says specifically about our task. So recommend ICANN collaborate with the GAC in refining for future rounds the applicant guidebook with regard to the protection of terms with national character and geographic and religion significance in accordance with the 2007 GAC principles on new gTLDs. So this is our commitment to review this. This -- and Argentina wanted to propose to lead the discussion about the geographic names. Can we go to the next one?

This -- for those that are not so aware of this document, this was finalized by the GAC in 2007 in the Lisbon meeting. And this is a document that is called "GAC Principles Regarding New gTLDs." Full document you can find on the Web site. And also the link to the full document it's in the background document that we have circulated. It shows that these geo names have been always a specific concern from the GAC. I won't go through the whole

document, through all the text. You can read it. It's just for your reference. Can we go to the next one?

So the applicant guidebook addressed the issue. So it says that in the event of any doubt or concern, it is in the applicant's interest to consult with relevant governments and public authorities and enlist their support of non-objection prior to the submission of the application in order to preclude possible objections and preaddress any ambiguities concerning the string and applicable requirements. So this is the text that's included in the applicant guidebook.

But what really happened with some words that are related with geographic names that the governments were not consulted by the applicant. So relevant governments were just ignored.

Can we go to the next one?

So what happens when the governments or interested parties have concern? We have some mechanisms that are already established in the applicant guidebook. One is the early warning that we -- several of us used to communicate to the applicant that we had any problems with that. The GAC advice that we already did for, for example, for Amazon. And then there's the objection by the independent objector or by the governments or private companies or the ALAC had some funding for doing objections.

---

Can we go to the next one?

So I won't go in detail through this one, because I want to -- this is something that we thought in the first draft document that we shared with you, some ideas what to do, how to protect geo names. But I won't go into details because we have evolved from here.

One of the ideas that we proposed was to make a list, and some of the things enhance the list that already exists from ISO or design a repository.

Can we go to the next slide, please?

So we received comments about these ideas from three countries. Spain made a very important comment about making lists. It's kind of complicated. Has soured us to compile. And other colleagues called me and sent private e-mails telling me that perhaps the list is not, perhaps, the best idea and can be endless but. At the same time Spain thinks that governments should keep the right to oppose the delegation of a top-level domain if it's not included on these lists on the basis of its sensitivity to national interest. Furthermore, that right should be enhanced for further rounds. They agree we have to refine the document of the applicant guidebook.

Can we go to the next one, please?

---

China also sent a very interesting comment. We shouldn't be limited to this 5,000 geo names that are included in the established lists in the applicant guidebook. The range of Chinese geo names is far beyond the scope of these applicant guidebook names, and this is the same case with Argentina. Chinese government encourages the applicants to get in touch with related local governments to try to reach agreements. Dialogue and communication based on the laws and regulations might be a better way to solve the difficulty. And, in the agreement between the relevant governments and the applicants cannot be reached, the public interest should be priority. This is exactly what Argentina government thinks. Can we go to the next one?

Chile made a specific proposal about adding text to the applicant guidebook, which is the first attempt to enhance in the applicant guidebook content. So what they propose is to add specific reference to the principles of 2007 in 2.2.4 about geographic names review. And you can go through the whole text by your own.

Can we go to the next one, please?

And, also, they would like the paragraph about the event -- what the applicant should do in the event of any doubt to be placed in a more relevant part of the text related with geo names. I won't read the paragraph, because I read it a while ago. And you can

take these considerations made by the -- our colleagues from Chile. They have been very active in the group. And, unfortunately, they cannot be with us because they have national elections tomorrow. And they have to be present there, but they will be with us on Monday. So they will join us to keep on discussing these things.

And, if we can go to the next one -- so, we have agreed on some next steps that we want to share with you. So we agreed that ICANN should collaborate with the GAC in refining these documents.

My question would be to our chair and vice chairs and to our group how -- who in ICANN and how do we start this cooperation in between the GAC and ICANN to refine the document? I don't have that answer. And I would welcome comments about this. Because it's important in -- to know how to move forward.

And then we have to work on the text to be proposed to be incorporated to the applicant guidebook. The idea is to have a proposed text for the GAC for the next Singapore meeting.

Can we go to the next one, please.

And then some other ideas we would like to see, if they are feasible is, like, how can we enhance the ISO 3166/2 list? For example, in Argentina we have the names of all the provinces and

the capital city, but we have seen that some other countries do have regions. And, in the case of Patagonia, it would be great if we can add it. So we're in the process of enhancing that list. If we -- all countries do the same, maybe we enhance those lists. And, as they're relevant for the applicant guidebook, they could reflect better the interest of our countries.

And also we thought about maybe exploring not the creation of a list but kind of a repository of relevant names that the applicant could consult in the sake of clarity for their businesses and their intentions to make an application in the second round. And I think I'm done there.

So we're open to comments and inputs from you. And, of course, we will be working for the next three months. And the idea is to have a concrete proposal for text for the Singapore meeting. Thank you very much.

AUSTRALIA:

Thanks very much, Olga. That's a very useful way of framing some of the issues that we've been looking at in this working group and some of the challenges that are posed and, basically, some of the options that are available here.

I'd be interested in any comments from GAC members on this. Whilst we haven't provided an update on the community audit



applicant support issues, I'm sure the leads on those topics would welcome any input or thoughts from GAC members on those issues.

And, in response to Olga's question, just to start the ball rolling in terms of ways that we could begin to collaborate with the ICANN board and the community, one option is to be prepared in Singapore for a discussion with the community on this, if we're able, if the timing permits.

So, in terms of having a GAC discussion relatively early in the Singapore meeting, it may be that we're prepared either at that meeting or perhaps the next one to avail ourselves of the opportunity provided by the SO/AC joint meetings which are being experimented with on the Mondays to float some of our ideas, maybe that we could talk about geographic names. I know it's of interest well outside the GAC. Certainly, within the GNSO and many segments there would be interested in discussing this, I'm sure, as well. So it may be that in Singapore or afterwards, we could actually initiate a discussion more broadly in the community on some of these issues that cut across the various SOs and ACs.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you. So I'm trying to keep a bit of a speaking order for you, Peter. I have EU Commission, Norway, and France.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thank you very much. Of course, I'm coming back to our favorite geographic indications. Of course, we're not talking about geographic indications when we're discussing geo names because these are two completely different issues, of course. I just wanted to make that clear.

But I also at one stage asked, I think in an email to Peter, whether or not we should discuss geographic indications in this context, bearing in mind, of course, that we still have the controversy on the interpretation of geographic indications between different members of GAC and different members of the WTO. And I think it's in WTO where this discussion belongs. But, at the same time, I think it's impossible for us in a longer run to ignore this issue and try to find a solution which is workable within this context, in ICANN.

Bearing in mind, of course, that there are differences. And those differences we're not going to change, and we're not going to move on here. Obviously not. That's the not the right place.

But -- so I just ask you again, if we can in this working group start that discussion or if we should continue that discussion elsewhere, because this discussion I don't think we can keep it out of this. It's too important. It is too flagrant when we talk about trademarks, copyrights, IPRs, we also absolutely have to start talking about geographical indications. And we cannot ignore that

---

issue. We have to try to find a workable solution for us all here. That's just my comment. Thank you.

AUSTRALIA:

Thank you, European Commission. And I certainly do recall this being raised. I think my point at the time was that it hadn't been discussed at GAC plenary coming into this working group, so it wasn't identified as one of the founding issues. But here we have in GAC plenary, so I would welcome the comments of colleagues from around the table.

And Heather is reminding me that there is a speaking order already. So perhaps Norway first.

NORWAY:

Thank you. It's okay, Peter. Well, we'd like to thank Argentina for your presentation and also for taking the lead on this very important issue about use of geographical names.

Norway has attended the ccNSO study group on use of country and territory names as new GTLDs. And we see that using lists is very, very difficult and also probably problematic, because you end up with -- as I said what we had to call a non-exhaustive list. But as to the applicant side they will see a list that they refer to as an exhaustive list. So we think we should avoid lists almost at

---

every course, actually. Because we also see that we need to have the room to be protected and to use -- and to have the public interest and the use of geographical terms outside of lists. So, to not confuse the applicants, we would prefer no lists.

What we think is that the proposal proposed from Chile is really good. It is basically the thing we wanted to achieve in the first round that we didn't get, but the experience we now had with the first round, it should then be clear both to ICANN and applicants that we need something more to work for the other rounds; otherwise, we will be stuck in the same problems that we had. Applicants will say that this was not on the list, it was not on the ISO lists and how can we know and -- yeah.

So we think that the text gives us the protection we should have, and it's good. So we -- so we would like to thank you for this one and we look forward to working on it.

Thank you.

AUSTRALIA:

Thank you.

France is the next on the speaking list?

FRANCE:

Thank you. I just wanted to say to Olga that this work is extremely useful. It has the good taste of being comprehensive, very precise and very creative at the same time, so thank you very much for that.

I think we are at the core of the mission of the GAC, so I think we definitely have to keep on working on that. And I'm, of course, absolutely open to discuss the way we should proceed, but I think we need to do it.

Thank you.

AUSTRALIA:

Thank you, France.

United States.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Peter, and thank you to colleagues who have spoken before. Thank you, obviously, to Argentina for all of the work that has gone into managing this working group.

We haven't submitted any comments to date but we are monitoring this very, very closely and are very, very interested in contributing.

I liked your suggestion, Peter, that we perhaps target Singapore as an opportunity to actually engage with the broader community to get their views, which I think could be very, very helpful to the GAC. And so I would definitely put my hand up to support some kind of mechanism by which we would be able to consult with the broader community and get some feedback.

I had one question in terms of whether we are treating all of this, the sub-elements of this working group as a package, and so we would be producing sort of proposals that would cover the range of issues the GAC has identified, and maybe some we haven't yet, for future rounds. So I just wondered whether we were doing this as a package, to address community issues, applicant support, geo names, all together for future rounds, or whether we would do it sequentially. So it's not a pressing question. It's just trying to understand sort of the pace of work and how we will tackle it.

And I would have to say, I know we will get into this in much more detail tomorrow, I anticipate, but I would have to offer a counter suggestion to my colleague from the EU Commission as to the rationale for addressing geographical indications as part of GAC advice for future rounds. The huge stumbling block, we would say, to doing so is that there is no international consensus on what is or what is not considered bad-faith behavior relating to the use of geographical indications in the Domain Name System.

---

And as a matter of fact, we think you were quite correct at the outset to indicate that the discussion needs to really occur first in the WTO before it can move into the ICANN community because, to date, there is no international agreement on international protection for geographical indications.

Thank you.

AUSTRALIA:

Thank you, United States.

And your question is a very good one in terms of package. And I think in the working group, we'd be very happy to have that discussion. I don't have a preformed answer for you. Essentially, they're all ideas -- they're all issues that have been identified.

I think you're absolutely correct, what we're focusing on is discussion with a focus to providing any advice, if necessary, if there is any, to the Board, after discussion with the community and so on, to inform a second round. So that's the focus.

In terms of timing we've had a little bit of discussion there, and it's not perfectly clear, really. We know that there is going to be a review of the first round, and I think it would be potentially useful if we were in a position to be able to provide inputs into that review. And that's why we're focusing on Singapore to actually be

pretty well prepared, potentially for some discussions with the community there, which I think will put us ahead of the curve, potentially.

So -- But again, happy to have those discussions within the working group. And, you know, there are other issues potentially that this working group can look at. The -- If we look at what the GAC already provided in advice in the Durban communique about working with the community on names with national, cultural, geographic and religious significance, and we split the working group into looking at geographic names and community issues. It may be that some GAC members think that that's not a perfect overlap, that there may be other issues we need to look at and so on. And if anyone thinks that, I'd be very happy to hear from them. And if there is a new issue, I'd be very happy if they were to volunteer to be the lead on that sub-issue and to help us all out.

So this is really open. If there are big public-policy issues that need to be looked at before the second round of new gTLDs, I really hope that people look to this working group. We're trying to get on the front foot here with some of these challenging issues.

So next on the speaking list I have Italy.



ITALY:

Okay. Thank you. So I really welcome this report magna cum laude. Excuse me to use an old Italian language. So it is very well done, and also the issues and sub-issues that you selected are very topical, and it's something that we learned in all the discussion that we are having here, or we had since Beijing, and maybe even before.

So personally, I would like to join the group, but up to now, I've been too busy in discussing all the questions concerned to the present -- the present applications. So -- But what I would like to say, that in any case, this is a very important question that is preparing, let's say, the next future. And so this is something that also give an idea and instructs us about how to -- will be the next our interaction with the Board for the next Application Guidebook. This is very, very important. But we are still in a learning curve. And some of the points you mentioned will generate other points; like, for example, handling the auctions, just to make an example. That is something that we never -- we didn't start to discuss this seriously with the Board up to now. So in the production of this study, also taking care of the fact that the GAC recommended the Board, before launching the next call, there will be a moment of discussing the result of the first call.

So it is good that you participated -- you started this working group just to be in time, when the first call will be finished, then

---

to be well prepared to give good advice to the Board. Because I'm sure some of the discussions and some of the points that we raised to the Board will not satisfy completely the GAC in the end. So we have to be well prepared for the next call.

Thank you.

AUSTRALIA:

Thank you, Italy.

And if I could ask the secretariat to take a note to add Italy to the working group. Very welcome.

Heather has reminded me of time, so I have two more people on the speaking list, and then I might move to wrap this session up. The working group will continue working. Anyone is welcome to join and we're here all week as well.

Yes, Europe -- you don't want -- okay. So I have one person on the speaking list. So I'll move to Peru, please.

PERU:

I would like to thank Olga for the excellent job that she has done.

I would also like to tell the representative of the European Commission that I agree with your viewpoint.

---

Geographical indications, but the recent agreement on intellectual property within the framework of the WTO that has a broad chapter on geographic names. And that agreement is the result of an international consensus that involved also the participation of the U.S. We do not only have the trips. We also have some case law based on the free trade agreements that we have been signing at the bilateral and at the regional level.

In each of these free trade agreements, there have been chapters referring to intellectual property, and in most of the cases, at least in the case of Peru, there are very concrete references to geographical names. From the reading that I made of the Applicant Guidebook, my impression is that there is some confusion because there is no clear definition of the goal that is being pursued. There is an inference, but it is not clearly stated.

So as it is unclear, we infer that the goal is to protect geographical names, geographical indications, and denomination of origin.

So this working group that Olga is leading and that I am pleased to support has a very important role to play. It has to start with a clear definition of what we want to address as a geographical name. Otherwise, there is no reason to assume that we have to invent things. A lot has been done already. So logically, we would have to acknowledge what has been agreed at other international fora, as in the context of the WTO.

Thank you.

AUSTRALIA:

Thank you, Peru.

And before summing up, I might ask a clarifying question, if I may.

Are you in support of the European Commission that the issue of geographical indications should be looked at in this working group as a separate issue, or are you suggesting that the issue of geographic names which is being looked at by Olga is some way linked or entangled or the same as the issue of geographical indications? If you could please clarify that.

PERU:

What I think, both terms are very different. Geographical indications and geographical names are -- have different consequences.

So if we want to work this area, we want to -- we need to define the scope, first of all. Because right now, the way it is written out, it is quite confusing. It mixes everything, many concepts at the same time.

So if our intention is to include geographical indications, in that case we would have necessarily to go to WTO and to pick up on the consensus that we have already gained in that forum.

AUSTRALIA:

Okay. So I think I understand it. What you're suggesting is currently in the Applicant Guidebook, the two issues are potentially confused. So looking at the geo names issue, which we've been talking about and which Olga is leading on, we want to be very clear on what we're looking at so that there is no confusion possible in the future. Okay. We'll certainly take that on board, and that's one of the issues that we can look at in the geo names issue, is making sure that the scope of that is very clear and understood so we know what we're talking about.

Okay. I'm informed that Belgium is also interested, and Netherlands is also interested. Great. Belgium.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Okay. I'm going to step in here. So Belgium was asking to speak, so please go ahead.

And then if Netherlands insists, fine. But then we are going to move on to the next briefing from the next working group in our agenda. We will be concluding at 6:00 today. Okay.

So Belgium.

BELGIUM:

Thank you, Mrs. Chair.

I will take chance of the interpretation service, so I will speak in French.

If I may, first I want to express my recognition for the hard work conducted by Olga. Belgium has already mentioned its participation in this group. We only want to say that we'd like to reach Singapore with a complete text that we can submit to the plenary, because we have been working for months. There is great discussion going on, which we have already referred to. So it would be significant if we could convey a clear message, a common position that we are clear in terms of the candidates that submit requests to GAC.

So I'd like to see that we get to Singapore with a common position, with a proposal. And Belgium offers its full support to the GAC and the working group so that we can reach this solution.

Thank you very much.

AUSTRALIA:

Thank you, Belgium. That's a very useful contribution. We'll take that on board, certainly.

Netherlands.

NETHERLANDS:

Thank you, Peter. I think we have to be very clear that we are talking about first level for the next round. And if that's the case, then I think the discussion on GI and second-level is another discussion. It's about safeguards. And I understand the United States, but I think this is a different discussion. The discussion we have been having now is on the first level, and there I think geo and geo indicators are even much more important to have protection granted.

So I think we should focus on what we are talking about.

Thank you.

AUSTRALIA:

Okay. Thank you, Netherlands.

I -- I think I take the point that the geographic names issue, again, as I think the point was -- the point by Peru, is separate to the GI's issue; that we should avoid confusing them but they are obviously both important issues. So I take that point, yeah.

Now, in terms of progress, happy to discuss further during this meeting. We'll add Italy to the working group list. We will certainly be working to provide an update to the GAC in advance of the Singapore meeting.

I take the point from my Belgium colleague that we should be very clear, I guess, about what exactly we're targeting for the Singapore meeting; whether we want to be able to circulate something for discussion before -- so far in advance of Singapore that the whole GAC can be in a position. Certainly that's what we'll be aiming for.

As I said, one thing we can think about in the planning for Singapore is so that the GAC is actually in agreement with something to discuss with the community, I think, which I think would be a really important step as highlighted by my U.S. colleague.

Myself and the working group are obviously around this week. We're very happy to have further discussions.

So thank you all for your inputs. It's been very, very useful, and I'm sure my working group colleagues will agree.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you very much for that update and for making a clear request to bring this to the plenary. And so I will look -- in Singapore. So I will look to Australia and Argentina to advise myself, the vice chairs, the secretariat, so that we can manage the agenda and ensure that we are including things at an appropriate point in our agenda for the next meeting.



So that's appreciated.

Another reminder about Thursday. I think that's your opportunity. So if you do want some time, please be very specific about how much time you want, and then we will schedule that for Thursday morning. Otherwise, you're meeting in a coffee shop or something, I think. We don't have any meeting rooms on Monday when we might have otherwise been able to schedule something.

So I saw a request from Switzerland. Is it related to this or can we move on to the -- to the next update?

SWITZERLAND:

Thank you. It's actually a question of procedure. Given the time, maybe you're going to say what I'm suggesting, and then it's actually outdated.

Looking at these two working groups, I think we should use, as a priority, the time for the other working group, because -- and assuming that the discussion on the terms of reference and the working methods of these working groups are part of the actual discussion in the second working group on working methods, I think we should start with clarifying, before we discuss about Singapore and so on and so forth, clarify the working procedures and the relations between the working group and the whole of

---

the GAC as a first step to get an understanding on how this work is going forward.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

I think so.

So I think what I will ask, then, is we have the lead, Spain, on the Working Methods Working Group. So we have a bit of time now for some sort of update.

What I would look for is if you're able to give us guidance on how you're able to continue your discussions within the working group and how this relates to the plenary time that we have or really don't have in the agenda this week. But, if Thursday morning is of interest to the working group to continue then, then we can certainly use that time to continue work.

Anyway, tell us what you can in the remaining time, and then we'll plan next steps. Please.

SPAIN:

Thank you, Madam Chair. I had planned a presentation to give to you, but maybe there's not time enough to go through that. It would be a pity anyway. There has been some very much work done. And I would very much appreciate if I had kind of 10

---

minutes to just go through it and just explain, outline what the work has been during these last two months. And then we can talk about the next steps that the group and the different aspects of the outcomes of the group could lead to. Just very briefly, if Jeannie is so kind as to project the presentation.

Just the next slide just to tell you that the group was -- has been joined by 31 members. That we have actually our devoted workspace in the GAC Web site. We have been working through partial agreements in different weeks from September to November. A working paper was circulated last Thursday by my colleague Gema. I just made this presentation to go through the work. We have been working in clusters of topics. We discussed several issues that have been raised in different meetings and different ways that the GAC could improve certainly its working methods. And we have -- end up in the group talking about publicity of GAC meetings and decision-making process at the GAC, which, I believe, are the main issues that have raised concerns.

But the first part of the different outcomes that the group have provided are, I believe, very well understood. And they don't really have raised major concerns. So I believe we could follow on those and probably keep the only one or two topics under discussion for a later stage.

---

So I would just like to go over very briefly through points A through D in the presentation.

Next slide, please.

A to D would be very much a problem to an action plan that could be implemented by the working group as well as the ACIG support that would be very welcome and I believe that would give the GAC a very much-needed improvement in its working methods.

The first one, the A one -- next slide, please -- is related to different roles of the secretariat and vice chairs which has been already discussed. I just wanted to say that as regards to secretariat, the role envisaged as secretariat, of course, as my colleague from Italy as said -- and I back up -- drafting papers containing background information, which really does entail drafting position papers on behalf of the GAC. It's just, for example, if the secretariat finds out the constituency is trying to engage in a PDP, for example, that would entail public policy issues, then we could receive a briefing paper from our secretariat with the main issues concerned. That would be very, very useful, of course, making sure all occupants are available well in advance of the meetings, tracking internal ongoing discussions, providing guidance to the members, assisting the chair as appropriate, improving the GAC Web site, relating reports from other SOs and ACs. The role of vice chairs has already been raised up. And we --

in our position paper, we certainly came across this. And we mentioned the possibility of the vice chairs to cover all five continents. But, of course, this would be -- very much should be, again, discussed in order to find out if this is necessary or not.

So, as regards to the agenda, we would very much welcome the setting of the agenda time ahead of the meetings, distributing any negative draft, and then a finally annotated agenda. We should achieve a better balance in the time allotted for meetings with the board and the staff and the different constituencies and the time allocated for the real actual debates within the GAC.

Another suggestion would be to concentrate sessions with constituencies in one single day so that we can devote the other days to our internal discussions and to provide advice.

As regards the work plan, it would be nice to have an annual work plan with the calendar so that we can all be aware of the workload we have in front of us. It would be very nice to have a kind of information intersessional meetings which are attended by our GAC chair as regards to our capacity as GAC liaison.

As regards to meeting handling, we would very much appreciate some kind of minutes that will be circulated and should include session summaries, not just -- it would not be an enhanced version of the communique, but a real actual document on the

discussions that had been held. Because otherwise, we will not always have Stefano to remind us what we discussed about.

Then, as regards to the communique drafting, you have already said -- and I really appreciate that -- it's drafting the communique should be done as the meeting progresses day by day and not the last day.

And there has to be sherpas or pen holders, as U.K. has already said.

So the preparatory commencement of the communique should be in the six U.N. languages plus Portuguese. I think we all agree with that.

So I don't know if you're following with me, Jeannie, with the slides. I'm already in slide B.

Increasing active participation in GAC discussions. We should probably involve ICANN staff so that we can be better prepared for the meetings. Even conduct surveys to know why other governments don't -- are not involved in the GAC. The role of the vice chairs should be greatly improved so that they can engage people in the countries in their own regions. The conference calls should be upgraded and improved. Coming to slide -- to the next slide, please.

---

As regards to the meetings with other constituencies, we very much would welcome not to have joint sessions that only serve to provide updates of other activities. We could really have those in writing and focus our attention on the real actual important issues.

And I'm going fast through all of this, because you have already this -- all of these suggestions in the paper circulated on Thursday.

And I would focus on the reverse GAC liaisons, which we find very, very interesting. The U.S. government has as well commented on this. And we very much welcome the suggestion of initiating a tryout period for this function so that this reverse calculation would provide information updates as to the priority work items for the further constituencies.

We would very much have to improve in the fine tuning of the GAC early engagement. Here the role of the GAC secretariat would be very much welcome.

Then the next slide, please.

As regards to explanation of GAC work and monitoring of GAC advice implementation, there should be an improvement in -- a very, very, very important improvement in the GAC Web site, which should be changed, most of it, in order to really present ourselves to the rest of the ICANN community as to what we are.

Of course, we should seize opportunities to explain our contribution to ICANN policies and monitor the implementation of GAC advice through the GAC register of advice, which is really a subject of improvement as well.

And then I came to the last two points, which are publicity of meetings. We have had discussion about this as well. We should, in our view, break down the different activities of the GAC into plenary sessions and other activities of the GAC.

So there are some of the members of the group that believe that publicity of meetings should be at a level and that our meetings should be open by default. And there are other members who believe that we should, as a rule, have the meetings open but there should be some exceptions. These are reflected in the documents. For example, when we discuss on internal matters or we draft a communique or we discuss on sensitive issues, these discussions should be held in a closed meeting.

And, finally, as regards to the decision-making process of the GAC, we have been reflecting on this and we have been discussing with members of the group. And this is something that is really tricky, as the U.K. usually says. And this is something that should be further discussed because it's really a paramount change. It would be really a paramount change in how the GAC works and takes decisions. So, nevertheless, we have to seize this



opportunity to really improve our policy-making process and really have to assess if the consensus rule in the times that we are facing right now in the GAC, which is not any more about global principles that need -- that's -- in which it's rather easy to find a common ground and to have consensus. When we have to get down to business to actual business about, for example, strings or particular things, it's where the role of consensus really is failing us in some way. So we really encourage to other GAC members to engage in this discussion.

So we really encourage other GAC members to engage in this discussion.

And as a way forward, please the next slide, the next one, next one is about the next steps.

We would seek for the approval of implementation of the above mentioned clusters, A to D, which relate to the things or the topics that have not raised major concerns. And we would kind of ask for the colleagues for their view in order to implement this action plan. This, of course, would need the support of the -- of the new constructive secretariat. We could devise this plan that's to really try to improve things of the GAC on which we have consensus and we agree upon.

---

Discussion on points E and F, which relates to the nature of our meetings, closed or open, and the rule of consensus. Although we can, of course, settle the discussion right now, which really deserves it, it's something that should be further discussed in the working group and eventually in our next meeting in Singapore.

So this is all that I have to report.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you very much. With a few minutes to spare. That was a really helpful overview of all the issues that are currently being discussed in the working group.

I see requests for some input, so I see Egypt and New Zealand, and United States. Okay. I'm going to have to take it one at a time, but Egypt, go ahead, and then I'll take down the speaking order.

EGYPT:

Thank you. And (indiscernible) dedication and the tireless efforts in pushing this forward, this important issue forward in such a tight time frame.

---

Actually, I see this as very timely activity that continues on what has been ongoing through the BGRI and even earlier through the JWG working group.

So I would like just to note the importance of identifying points of acknowledgment, merging or even full transfer between both working groups, if I may, and ultimately factoring in also recommendations from the ATRT2, because I think they are all tackling, more or less, the same issues. And we definitely want to fully utilize those efforts with no redundancy and no overlooking of issues.

And I do apologize if this has already been discussed in Durban, which I missed, but it would be good to identify how we are ultimately going to merge everything in one thing.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Egypt. I think this is a really important point in managing our work. And ACIG, Tom Dale specifically, who will be supporting the Working Methods Working Group, has already been tasked with sorting through the different kinds of issues that are under discussion and identifying where there are links or overlap or, you know, some sort of relationship to work happening elsewhere.

---

Currently, we still have the BGRI, which you are leading, which we have found useful, particularly in the GAC early engagement issues. Then we know -- and that is still outstanding. And this is why I'm looking to you to lead us in our discussion with the GNSO on that same topic.

We also have the Accountability and Transparency Review Team 2 effort in a draft report with recommendations related to the GAC and with other parts of the ICANN structure for us to consider as well. And there may be other things that we're not thinking of. But this is very much what Tom is working on to support the working group as well as the GAC more broadly, because we are engaged in these different tracks of activity.

So I think that's really good news for us to help us organize our work, and your point is very well taken for that reason.

Thank you, Egypt.

So where did I put my list? Okay. So next I have New Zealand, please.

NEW ZEALAND:

Yeah, thank you, Heather. I just wanted to note -- first of all, to thank Spain for its very, very energetic leadership of this group. It's been a series of extremely valuable papers. And from New

---

Zealand's perspective, we're pretty happy to go along with A to D. We think that all of those papers, the points made are sound.

I'd like to reemphasize the point I did make earlier, that much of the improvements suggested would have already been in place with the secretariat in place. And I look forward to the role that ACIG will be playing in that, in ensuring that we can conduct our working methods appropriately.

I just want to note that part F has not, in fact, been worked within the working group itself due to the lateness of time, and I can appreciate the efforts that Spain has been putting into working these papers. The first paper was circulated to the whole GAC two weeks ago. New Zealand prepared a response to that. Otherwise have responded as well. These are discussions which have not, in fact, taken place within the working group and at the moment this has to be regarded as a very open discussion.

I would urge other members of the GAC to look carefully at those papers and ponder the consequences of some of the changes proposed.

Thank you.

---

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you very much, New Zealand. Next I have United States, then I have Iran, U.K., France, and Australia.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Madam Chair. Due to the time that we have arrived at, I will try not to take too long.

Like other colleagues, I do want to express my very sincere appreciation to Spain for all of their efforts in organizing this work and in producing proposals for us to review serially fairly quickly. And I think a lot of the proposals put forward that the working group has commented on are very practical and I think hopefully will meet with approval by the rest of the GAC I do want to stress this is a working group, and as a member who has been able to submit comments, I'm very mindful that not all of my colleagues around this table may have had the opportunity to comment on some of these proposals.

So as a member of the working group, I would certainly welcome a little more time for the GAC as a whole to provide some comments here. And so we might want to give some thought to that.

I know we're very pressed for time right now, but I think this is extremely useful to have in one document, but I would say -- and I'm guessing some of my colleagues around the table might agree,

---

particularly new colleagues, it's a little hard to digest. There's an awful lot of material that is being presented here with a number of, again, very practical suggestions. Some, however, that were more recently circulated do deserve a lot more consideration and discussion not only in the working group but by the GAC as a whole. So certainly the issue of how we amend, whether we amend the current decision-making processes.

So I do think we need to also, perhaps -- and good to know that Tom Dale will be providing the support, I think the paper might need a little bit of history or context. I fully take Manal's point, from Egypt, that we do need to make sure we are cross-referencing existing work. And the BGRI has certainly been working on a lot of these issues for several years now. The GAC/Board joint working group report was issued in 2010. That was the first time we surfaced the proposals for reverse liaisons.

So I do think we need, and it would be helpful for the GAC members to know how did we arrive at this point. What territory have we already covered, or, as Egypt pointed out, are we also covering through the BGRI?

So I don't think we want to reinvent the wheel through this working group when it's very, very strongly supported initiatives on the part of the same GAC members but under the aegis of the Board/GAC recommendation implementation working group.

---

So I think we need to be careful and present the material in such a way that it's clearly understood what those linkages are.

So again, I did want to thank Spain for how they have mastered sort of pulling together all of these very disparate ideas, but I do think we may need to pause to make sure all of the membership is on the same page as to what are we doing now, what have we agreed.

And finally, because I missed my opportunity earlier, I also wanted to thank the ACIG representatives and to comment to thank our existing GAC secretariat staff because I'm sure they're quite pleased. I know as a member, it's good to look at four people sitting behind the head table, not just two. So I do want to commend our existing staff. And I think some of these proposals, clearly under the management of the chair and vice chairs, it will be much easier to implement with four staff.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, United States.

I have Iran next, please.



IRAN:

Thank you, Madam Chair. I also try to be brief. Yes, our associate, myself and thanking the two chairman of the working groups. Although we didn't comment on the first one, that doesn't mean that we don't appreciate. We appreciate very much.

Chairman, two small points on the working group on the working method. I think that with respect to the yearly plan, we should put it a little bit more flexibility saying that it is the living plan. We should not want to plan for the next year without a possibility that to adjust it if the circumstances so requires. So we should have that one. In fact, every organization is like this. We have a living plan that next meeting, if there is a necessity, we try to adjust it for the subsequent one.

With respect to the openness or open meeting or closed meeting, I think now that even organizations that are closed we try to open, we should not take the reverse course of action. Being open and trying to go to the closed.

If you want to talk about the closed meeting, we should say meetings are normally open unless specifically decided, with justifications. But we should do that; otherwise, we should start to say that for this and this subject, decided that in advance should be closed, and that means we are not -- we are no longer following the principle of openness and so on and so forth. So we

should, in fact, make it quite clear unless specifically required with justification, meetings are open.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Iran. I can see there is a lot of interest in discussing this issue so we are going to go a little bit over time and go through the existing speaking order which is comprised of the U.K., France, Australia, Switzerland, and the EU Commission. And then we'll conclude for the day, but it's clear that we will need further opportunity to continue this discussion. I think it's a useful discussion we're having.

So I will take that on board.

Okay. So next we have U.K., then, please.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Thank you, Chair. I will be brief as we're going over time, as you say.

I have three points. First of all, I appreciate Spain's lead on all this work. It's been a fantastic effort and a lot of commitment by them. So much appreciated.

Secondly, the intersection of this work with the ATRT2 and the Board/GAC working group is very important, and it's very good to know that this is being fully taken into account because these are the means where we get other stakeholder inputs into this vital work. Nongovernmental stakeholders, I mean.

Thirdly, quickly on the timeline, I have confidence that A to D is going to move ahead very quickly, and I would suggest that following this meeting, colleagues go back and reflect and then respond with anything that they feel is not quite meeting their expectations. And then perhaps in January we have a stock-taking conference call, really with the purpose of signing off A to D. E to F, we should advance in parallel, but these are tricky issues, as I'm often accorded as saying. Voting -- This is a very, very difficult proposal and fully open sessions and so on.

So there are some issues there. We should aim, though, for deciding these issues in Singapore. And so from Singapore onwards to the London meeting in June, we have the GAC fully effectively working, and the community is fully aware of that.

So, sorry, just to go back to the January stock-take, we publish something after that so we inform the community of the progress.

Thank you.

---

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, U.K.

Next I have France.

FRANCE: Thank you, Mrs. Chair. I will shift to French.

I have heard my colleagues, and I am a bit at a loss with all the groups, ATRT2, BGRI, I'm a bit at a loss, but I don't think that's important, Madam Chair.

What I do think is that now we have in front of us an excellent paper that is really thorough and that can be immediately implemented in 80% of the points indicated there. I agree with some of my colleagues with regard to the fact that there is still a 20% of these issues that require more careful discussion. And I thank the New Zealand representative for communicating his reservations regarding the decision-making system. This is natural, and we really have to dwell on this -- to delve into this.

But when I speak about the working groups, I know that we need to have clarity. We are being told what we have to do as sovereign states in order to improve our work. We don't need that.

---

I think what the Spanish delegate has done is excellent. We don't need much in order to start setting this into motion because we will have a permanent secretariat.

The work so far has received no objections in 80% of its content. And these contents have to do with methods of working and not with rules.

I think it is practical and concrete, straightforward, and I urge my colleagues to speak up if they have any objections to the first four parts of the report that has been submitted here.

If there are no objections, no problems, then I think that we need to move forward quickly because we know that we have some other issues to take care of in addition to the decision-making process.

I am aware of what the Peruvian delegation has said, because we really need to know whether we have to have some other vice chair positions. That is something that we need to consider in the first place.

And, in the second place, Madam Chair, you have asked the GAC members to help you understand how to decide what to do with these requests for additional vice chairs. And that is important. And this leads us to look at the interpretation of the rules, so in addition to the decision on the rules. So this implies a lot of work.

---

That is why I think that we should try to move forward quickly with those things that we really can do that.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

It is clear that colleagues have been very complimentary about the work carried out by Spain, and it is commendable. I can see you've covered a lot of issues. And I wouldn't want to leave the impression that colleagues here are not appreciative; because I'm hearing, to the contrary, that there is a great deal of understanding about the accomplishment of the working group so far in contending with quite a range of important issues for the GAC.

So next I have Australia then Switzerland and then the AU Commission. And then I think Spain as lead, quite rightly, will want to provide us with further comments. And then we do need to conclude for the day. All right. So Australia, please.

AUSTRALIA:

Thank you, Chair. And thank you to everyone who has spoken before. I'm in the fortunate position of being late in the speaking order, so I'm going to agree with a lot of people. So that's always a good position to be in.

So, again, thank you to Spain for leading this working group. I'm part of this working group. And, as those who are on the working group will know, I've already expressed my appreciation. I think there's some really useful proposals that have been put forward here.

And, agreeing with my French colleague, some of them are pretty simple to implement. And I think, actually, what we're doing is actually implementing some of them. We already talked about in our earlier session how we're going to be drafting the communique this meeting and so on.

We've also seen, I think, the way that the schedule has been put together for this meeting is largely open sessions, except where needed. So, again, agreeing with my Iranian colleague on this issue. I think it's important the GAC be open and transparent and have open sessions where appropriate. And I think we're already doing these things.

And this is unsurprising. This working group has been going on for some time. And some of the ideas the working group has picked up and formalized and highlighted have also been talked about for some time. So I think there's a good number of these issues that, basically, we have already started doing and some more we can start doing.

There's sort of, as you said, working methods, procedures that are pretty straightforward to putting in place. I look forward, as we go through this meeting -- I'm really encouraged to see we've got one of our AC colleagues now assisting with this working group. As New Zealand said, part of this would have been pretty simple if we had a bigger secretariat all along. We have that now, and we're going to have the secretariat start to help us operationalize on some of this stuff. That's one cluster of the issues.

Hearing from my U.S. colleague, I'm reminded that some of the issues are a little more complicated. And it's work that's already been going on for some time in other working groups that the GAC already has, like the BGRI. So one thing we need to look at is coordinating that. How is the best way to take it forward?

One cluster of issues I think which is really clear to me is those that cross over with other parts of the community. Reverse liaisons, for example. This has already been talked about in the BGRI for some time. And, even before the BGRI, we've had discussions with our GNSO colleagues. In fact, we've got some time on the agenda to continue those observations here. So it's come up in the working methods working group as well. And that's great because it's comprehensive and covers lots of stuff. But we've got to look at the best way to take it forward. And in



some issues we've already got procedures in place to try to take things forward. So we need to be very careful with that.

And then the third category of issues, I think, from my point of view are the ones that come to consensus and decision making. For those on the working group, I've already expressed some comments there. Basically, from my point of view, I have a more positive outlook on the GAC's current processes. I think the consensus decision-making process that the GAC has adopted, which is based on a U.N. model, has, in fact, been serving us extremely well. If we look to our Beijing Communique and the advice we provided was a substantial piece of advice, highly complicated, developed in a relatively short time frame. And we were very successful with that.

And there are actually very few instances where the GAC has been unable to come to consensus ever. And, if we look at those issues, I think it's probably understandable why that's the case. Because people have national positions which are opposed or that they're extremely sensitive issues where countries have strongly divergent views. In those cases the GAC operating principles already provide a procedure that the GAC chair provide a range of views to the ICANN board who are the ultimate decision-makers here. So they get fully informed of the full range of views to help

---

them make an informed decision. So I'm actually extremely positive about the process that we currently have.

So there are my main comments, I think. Really great work. Some of it we're already operationalizing, and we should continue to do so. Some of it is also really good, but we've already got some parallel processes. And we have to be mindful on how to best take it forward.

On the consensus issue, I think real caution, I would like to express. If we're going to move away from a consensus-based decision-making process, which is based on a U.N. procedure, I think we should be extremely careful and look really, really carefully about why we're doing that. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Australia. Next, I have Switzerland.

SWITZERLAND:

Thank you. I just want to quickly join those who expressed satisfaction that we have now a 2 plus 2 secretariat. I think we've waited a long time for this, and we're happy that this is now a reality.

Second point also thanks to Spain and everybody who contributed to these papers. They're extremely valuable. And I wanted also

---

to agree with those who say we should avoid duplication with already existing work. And I think it's really important that people like Manal and all those who were closely involved in the BGRI and in the joint working group that they have the special responsibility and hope they have the resources also to help signal what has been done in a way that this has taken on by the new working group or -- as you already proposed, these things meld in a way that is most efficient use of our time.

The problem, I think, has been -- and this is, again, the problem that also this new working group is suffering to some extent that the BGRI and the joint working group have somehow fallen a little bit or have been working below the radar of all the super urgent new gTLD and other issues. And I think the energy that Spain and others put forward is that there is a feeling that we now have to come to results with all of this. This is not a criticism to the BGRI and all these processes. But we have to go. And I think we're on the right way to identify quick wins that we can -- some of these things have already started that -- things that we agree that are easy to implement, let's implement them quickly. Other things are more complicated. I will not go into details about consensus and so on, but these things are extremely important but more complicated. We'll need more time. And I would suggest that we use the hour that we, hopefully, have at the disposal tomorrow to have a quick discussion on how -- what are actually the working

methods for these working groups? How should decisions be made or proposals be made in these working groups, especially this one? And how should then this be transformed to the GAC for a final agreement that we can implement decisions that we agreed on in the working group and then agreed on in the GAC? I think this is the crucial question that we need to answer. How -- once agreed, how can we implement these reforms and improvements? Because some of them are really -- should be implemented as quickly as possible. Others will take more time. I think this is the key question that we should spend the hour on tomorrow not going into the substance. I think we will do this on Thursday, or at least I hope we will do this on Thursday. But we should get clarity on how we will work in the most efficient and inclusive manner tomorrow. Thank you very much.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Switzerland. My quick reaction to that is that, yes, if we take the hour we have set aside notionally to continue this discussion, that that would be useful. And what I'm hearing is that there are some things that that are implementation issues, things that we are, essentially, already doing or plan to do in the immediate future. But maybe there's an interest in somehow capturing that or making it more concrete. Whether it's actually satisfactory enough to say we're already doing those things --

because what I'm hearing is still pushing a bit to -- so I wonder if it's just a matter of working with Tom to actually identify those things and make it a bit more formal or real for us to see precisely what is implemented.

And, of course, we have the summary prepared for us that will certainly help us to move in that direction.

Okay. So I have one last speaker before we go back to our lead. And that is the AU Commission, please.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: I will be very short. I support the U.K., of course, in what has been said. I think it is important that -- and I also completely agree with Switzerland that has to come out something concrete out of this. Of course, many things can be implemented, as said by the fact that we have now a secretariat that will function. But there's a number of issues that have to be clarified and made very clear so that there's no room for interpretation, different interpretations of, for instance, the GAC operating principles. So I think it would be very important that in the end we would have -- we would have some concrete results. And I think London would be an excellent moment to have that concrete results. Okay. Thank you.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you. So. EU Commission, you're actually in a neighborhood of commissions. So to your right you have the AU Commission that was requesting to speak. Yes. But you're friendly. It's fine. Okay. So please, AU Commission, if you will. Please.

AU COMMISSION: Thank you, Heather. And thank you, EU Commission. I think I'd like to join my colleagues in appreciating a presentation by Spain and the working group recommendations. We note that some of the recommendations will be impacting on the future of the decision-making processes of the GAC. And we fully support Egypt's suggestion that we must take into account all the other GAC-supported initiatives, BGRI and ATRT. While we support some of the recommendations that have been presented by the working group, we would like to request for a little additional time to actually have some of them -- especially the ones that are going to be impacting on GAC's decision-making position to be discussed at our regional level before we come back with our input, especially on some of those recommendations. Or perhaps in Singapore or maybe further down even in London.

Some of the recommendations, for example A to D, are quite easy to implement. And I think we support Australia's and other colleague's suggestion that we may begin to implement them.

---

But I think those ones that are impacting directly on GAC's decision-making processes need further consideration and would like, you know, to request for additional time. And we don't think that this meeting is going to be providing us with that time to actually consult on the regional level. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, AU Commission.

So please, Spain, if you would.

SPAIN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Just to close down this session to say I just wanted to ask for the next mandate for the working group. So I -- as I take it from my colleagues' speeches that there's a consensus that the points A to D are about practicalities that can be put into practice more or less as quick wins, as someone has said.

So I take it that the next -- one of the next steps for the working group, apart from exploring intersections ATRT2 and BGRI and continue discussing points E and F in the next months in Singapore or further away.

So I kindly ask for you to -- colleagues to give us a mandate in order to -- what we'd like would be to devise an action plan to

---

implement these ATRT points, of course with the support of the secretariat. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you. So I think as far as working on an action plan within the working group, you have working group members to contribute to developing that further. And I see Egypt wanting to comment. Please.

EGYPT:

Just very quickly in response to what Switzerland mentioned. I just want to clarify that my intervention was not by any means defensive for the BGRI work. In fact, I -- although I was not that active on the mailing list, but I worked closely with (saying name) on a lot of issues, maybe off list.

I see this as very timely and very complementing to the work that has been done. In fact, it came with a very creative and out-of-the-box ideas that are all worth discussing. So just to clarify that I flagged this out, particularly for issues like the reverse liaison, which we are currently discussing with the GNSO, and is also being discussed within this working group.

So just to align the work together. That's it.

Thank you.



---

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you for the clarification, Egypt. And what I'm hearing from Spain, I believe, is that that effort to align things should continue. And knowing that we have support coming to the working group, that that will enable that to happen.

So the work can continue along those lines.

So I see maybe one final request. Iran. You insist?

IRAN: Yes, Chairman, I insist because I am fighting for years and years that all meetings we should continue to retain the consensus matters. We should not go back to other than consensus. It is not only the U.N. In the A.P., we and Australia working together, everything is based on the consensus. We never have anything other than consensus. We tried to do the consensus and build up the consensus. So that is the decisive manner in all decision-making.

Having said that, because of the good work that has been done by our Spanish colleagues, I think the Spanish administrations and colleagues, they deserve a big round of applause.

[ APPLAUSE ]

SINGAPORE:

Some initial comments on the part D. I think to publicize, to explain the GSE work, we would like to suggest the complement which right now capture that we make use of the Web site and GAC's meeting during ICANN meeting to publicize our work, and we would rather suggest, perhaps, that GAC can work with the global engagement group to arrange the information dissemination, seminar to the regional countries. The government who are not able to attend GAC's meeting, like, you know, meeting far away from their country.

And I do know that the regional, the Internet organization, they do have regular meetings from time to time, and I think it's good for GAC to work with the ICANN global engagement group to organize regional seminar to publicize guests. It's something for the working group to consider.

My second point is on the last part of F. I think F draw reference from a lot of meeting procedures: the ITU, the IETF, the OECD, et cetera.

So we would like to study in detail. I think there are a lot of information there, and we would certainly like to look at it in detail and offer comments later.

Thank you.

---

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Singapore.

So now to ask a very specific question to Spain. Do I hear you requesting an hour tomorrow?

Do you want to use the hour that we have marked for --

SPAIN: No, no. What I tried to -- to get out of this meeting with a clear mandate for the future of the working group in order to keep on working with the lines that we have set and fundamentally to have -- to be able to devise an action plan with the secretariat in order to implement this quick (indiscernible). In particular, it is from points A to D.

CHAIR DRYDEN: All right. So we will use the time tomorrow for something else.

And I think, in essence, yes, you have that mandate, but it is subject to that process of aligning the work with other tracks of work. And that's where I think secretariat support can really help us get that clarity.

So all those things, I think, can occur at the same time. And the emphasis that you are placing on intersessional work is understood, then.

Okay. Great.

All right. So let's come to a close at this point and reconvene here at 9:00 tomorrow morning.

And I will talk to some of you, I hope, now or in the next short period about that session in the morning that some of you have asked for so that I understand how we can best approach any outstanding issues related to the issue of wine and vin. I don't want to have the discussion in plenary now, but I do want to talk to some of you before we disappear for the evening about that.

One last point. I understand that there's some sort of Swedish birthday today. Is this correct?

>>

Yes, it is, but I thought that was only on Facebook.

[ Laughter ]

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Facebook and the GAC.

So, everyone, it's Anders Hektor's birthday today.

[ Applause ]

So happy birthday!

---

And so there will be a big Swedish party this evening for all of us.

[ Laughter ]

All right. So have a good evening, everyone. And please be here at 9:00 a.m. tomorrow.

Thank you.

[ END OF TRANSCRIPT ]