
BUENOS AIRES – GAC Open Plenary
Saturday, June 20, 2015 – 14:00 to 18:00
ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. Welcome, everybody, to the GAC meeting of the 53rd ICANN meeting here in Buenos Aires.

My name is Thomas. I'm coming from Switzerland, and I'm happy to be here with you to open up the meeting.

You have all received the agenda. As usual, we start with going around the room, yourself quickly presented so we know who is in the room.

Before that, I would announce to you that we have two more members since the last meeting, which is Mauritius and Kiribati so the GAC is now 152 members, and -- yes.

Maybe let's start with this table here, so everybody can quickly present him- or herself, and then we go through table to table.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hi, I'm Tracy hind. I'm from the ACIG GAC secretariat.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hello, I'm Gema Campillos from Spain.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hello, welcome, everybody, to Argentina.

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.

My name is Olga Cavalli, I am representative of Argentina to the GAC and GAC vice chair and if you need something while you are here, let me know.

TOM DALE: Good morning. My name is Tom Dale. I'm with the ACIG GAC secretariat.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hello, good afternoon. This is Ihsan Durdu from Turkey. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. I'm Nenri Kassen from Namibia.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. Wanawit Ahkuputra from Thailand.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hello. Olof Nordling, ICANN staff in support of the GAC.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hello, good afternoon. My name is (saying name). I'm from Morocco. Thank you, Argentina, for hosting us.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Alice Munoz, African Union Commission.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'm Megan Richards from the European Commission, and my two colleagues are on their way but since they're European, they had to have lunch before they came to the meeting.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Julia Wolman from Denmark.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Finn Petersen from Denmark.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Ana Neves from Portugal.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Rafael Perez from Spain.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Manal Ismail from Egypt.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Par Brumark representing the government of Niue.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. I'm (saying name) from the Ministry of External Relations of Brazil.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon, (saying name) from ministry of External Relations of Brazil.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. Pitinan Kooarmornpatana from Thailand.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. (Saying name) from Thailand.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. (Saying name) from Thailand.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. My name is Yamaguchi from Japan.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon, (saying name) from Japan.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon, everybody. Suzanne Radell from the United States.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hello, everybody. Peter Nettlefold from Australia.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Annaliese Williams from Australia.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. Nicola Treloar from New Zealand.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hello, everyone. Andreea Todoran from the government of Canada.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. (Saying name) from the government of Canada.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. Mark Carvell from United Kingdom, Department for Culture, Media and Sport.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. My name is Hubert Schottner from German Ministry of Economic Affairs and Energy.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hi, I'm Sabine Meyer. I'm from Germany as well.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. I'm Christian Singer from Austria.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Buenos tardes. Kavouss Arasteh from Iran.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hello, everybody. I'm (saying name) from Iran.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. Elise Lindeberg from Norway.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. My name is Ornulf Storm, also from Norway.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. Thomas de Haan from the Dutch Ministry of Economic Affairs, Netherlands.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. Yuval from Israel.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. Ricardo from Colombia.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hello. (Saying name) from South Korea.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. My name is Bo-young Kim from South Korea.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. Brian Beckham from the World Intellectual Property Organization.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hi, everyone. (Saying name) from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hi. I'm (saying name) from Bulgaria.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. My name is Bo Martinsson from Sweden.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. (Saying name) from Mexico.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. My name is Lim Choon-Sai from Singapore.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Charles Chew from Singapore.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Rita Forsi from Italy Ministry of Economic Development.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. Mauro Milita Vatican City State.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. (Saying name) from Italy.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. I'm Peter Major from Hungary.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. (Saying name) from Viet Nam.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. I'm (saying name) from Viet Nam.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. Jorge (saying name) from Switzerland.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. Stephane Bondallaz from Switzerland, too.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Bonjour. I'm the representative of Gabon.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. I come from Uruguay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. (Saying name) from Dominican Republic.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. (Saying name), also from Switzerland.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. I come from the International Francophonie Organization.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. I'm the representative of Guinea.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. (Saying name) from Cameroon.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. Laurent Ferrali from France.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Saying name) from France.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Saying name) from Poland.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hello, everybody. My name is Chen Chung-Shu from Taiwan.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon, everybody. My name is Ashwin from Indonesia.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. I'm Jean-Philippe Moiny from Belgium.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon, everybody. My name is Jan Vannieuwenhuysse from Belgium.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. My name is Wahkeen Murray from Jamaica.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. Bennette Thomas from Dominica.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. (Saying name) from OIF, Francophonie, France.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. My name is (saying name) and I come from Chad.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Saying name) from Argentina.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Saying name) from Argentina.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Saying name) from Indonesia.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. My name is (saying name) from Taiwan.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Angela (saying name), Singapore.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Emmanuel Adjovi from the International Francophonie Organization.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Saying name) from Taiwan.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I come from the ITC, Kinshasa.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: From Namibia.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good day. Nigel Cassimire from the Caribbean Telecommunications Union based in Port of Spain, Trinidad.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. My name is (saying name) from Nigeria.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. Nicolas G. Caballero from Senatics, Paraguay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. My name is (saying name). I'm a representative of the Russian Federation.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. Thank you very much.

So we have a growing diversity in this room, which is very nice.

I will give the floor to our colleagues from ACIG to give you an overview over the week. So please go ahead.

TOM DALE: Thank you, Thomas. Good afternoon. Buenos tardes.

The GAC's meeting this week will be focusing on a number of objectives, the first two of these that will probably take up most of your time and discussion time on the agenda. The two of these are to agree a position on the final proposal from the Cross-Community Working Group on stewardship names, on naming functions for the IANA stewardship transition. That is an exercise with a deadline for the GAC of this Thursday to reach a position as a chartering organization.

There are a number of sessions on that starting tomorrow in the GAC and continuing on Wednesday. As well, there are a significant number of meetings outside the GAC in -- across ICANN, both of the CWG and information sessions conducted across ICANN. These are detailed in the agenda and in the schedule.

The second priority issue that will take up some time is for the GAC to clarify major issues with the work of the Cross-Community Working Group on ICANN accountability, and to provide some feedback to that CCWG by the end of the week on their most recent proposals, which are continuing to be developed in discussions, again, outside the GAC throughout the week. And, in fact, that group started yesterday with its discussions.

The GAC will also be working through a number of specific issues through working group structures. The GAC has a number of new working groups that are meeting -- some of which are meeting for the first time this week. They're detailed separately on the agenda, but the GAC will be progressing issues in the working group structure on public safety, including law enforcement and consumer protection, in the group on human rights and international law, working group dealing with government engagement, one dealing with future protection of geographic names as top-level domains, working group on GAC involvement in the NomCom, and a potential new GAC working group dealing with community applications for gTLDs.

In terms of new gTLDs, that's generic top-level domains, the GAC has a session dealing with safeguards in the current round that will be discussed later this afternoon. There is provision for discussion on some issues in future rounds, which we'll come to in some later items. And there is an information session on auction proceeds from the current round which is being dealt with on Monday in the SO/AC high-interest topic sessions.

GAC will be engaging with a number of other participants in the ICANN community over the next few days. GAC will be meeting with the GNSO to talk about a range of policy development work for gTLDs, which is what the GNSO does. The GAC will also be engaging with the ccNSO on ccTLD matters, with the At-Large Advisory Committee, and also with the Security and Stability Advisory Committee. Those are all detailed in the agenda that you have.

Finally, the GAC will also be discussing a number of aspects of broader Internet governance issues, including ICANN involvement in the WSIS+10 process and in the end, the ICANN Cross-Community Working Group on Internet governance.

That's a very quick overview of what the GAC feedback to the leadership group has said should be the priorities for this week, and that is how the agenda has been structured. Thomas, with your permission, I'll ask Tracey just to provide you with some information about a very important administrative support matter, which is how to record the fact that you are here. We've had a number of efforts at improving the system of recording attendance. We're trying something again because I know you get most upset if I leave your attendance out of the minutes. So we're working on better ways to do that. I'll ask my colleague Tracey to give you a bit of an update on attendance. Tracey?

TRACEY HIND:

Thank you, Tom. Yes, we are trying a different method this time. Up on the wall there right near the doors to the right of the fire

equipment, you'll find some removable sheets that I've posted up onto the wall there. And what we would like you to do is to write down your name and the country you are from on those sheets. And there's instructions to do that up there both in French and in English.

It's a very simple system, a very manual system. But we're hoping that will give us complete data about who's here over the course of the 5-day meetings so that we can capture that for the records.

To encourage you, we have a lucky door prize or a prize that we will randomly allocate to somebody who has got their details on there. And it's a very beautiful Argentinian mate dish and spoon. I can't profess to tell you the ins and outs and the details of how one professionally drinks from mate. But I'm sure that Olga can. But it's a beautiful thing. Sorry. And I should say that I'll be giving that away on Wednesday.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Tracey. So we hope this works. So that's more or less it for the first agenda item. I may also ask you to make comments on the agenda. I think so please now is the time to make comments on the agenda, if you would wish to do so.

One point regarding the agenda that I tried to repeat because we discussed this already in earlier stages in phone calls.

As you probably all agree, one of the key elements or issues in this meeting not only for the GAC but also for the GAC is the process of the IANA transition and the accountability process. We have built in as

much time to discuss and, hopefully, come to a consensus on a GAC position on these issues as we could. In case that, in particular, there's a particularly a session on Sunday morning, the session on Sunday morning would show that we would need more time, we would be ready to modify the agenda in a way that we could devote more time to this item, of course, with your permission. But this is just -- we tried to keep the agenda as it is in case we would feel that it would be necessary to amend the agenda. We would then discuss this with you on tomorrow, whenever that would show up. So this is just for information.

And then another piece of information, as you may have seen in the emails, you're invited to eat and drink tonight in this nice small house just across the street from here. If anybody has not yet -- because we are supposed to have been telling the restaurant how many people we will be, if somebody hasn't been able to reply and register, of course we will take you along. But then please come and inform us, in particular Julia. By the way, Julia is -- Julia Charvolen is part of the ICANN support staff that is working very hard and well for to make our meetings possible. Send an email to Julia and to me or to Olga. Notify us that you'll be coming along as well. Of course, we won't exclude anybody from the GAC to participate. It was just we needed to give a number to the restaurant to know more or less how many we are.

Yes, Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Thomas. Just on the activities of ICG, as a -- one of the five members of the GAC in ICG, perhaps it will be good that very briefly we inform the GAC from the activities of that group and any feedback that may be required. If you have not included in the agenda, please do it. If it is already in the agenda, please provide some time that we and/or some of our colleagues brief distinguished GAC members of the activities of that group. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Yes, you're right. The ICG is not explicitly mentioned. But we take it that this is part of the discussion on the transition process that will start tomorrow morning. But thank you for raising the awareness that it's not only the CWG, but that is also the ICG is part of that process.

Thank you very much.

I see no more comments on the agenda. So that means that -- yes, I see a hand up. U.S., please.

UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. Just a quick comment about the specific amendments to the operating principles. We have it on today's agenda and again on Thursday, I believe. And I just wanted to ask if the Thursday session could be pushed to the first part of the morning. Because there is another CCWG meeting Thursday morning. And so there's a bit of a conflict, and it would be extremely helpful if we could

push the substantive operating principles issue up earlier in the morning. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you for alerting this to us.

Let me look at our colleague Henri who will be leading this. Is it okay for you if we would move this to exchange, I guess, item 30 and 29? Would that be what you concretely would suggest? So that would work out for you, I think, we don't have a problem. And in the hope that that will enable some of us to participate in parallel work. So we take note. Okay.

All right.

With this let's go to item number 2, which is an issue that is in line with trying to increase transparency awareness, traceability, of our work, of the effect of our work, in particular with regard to the advice that we give or have given and will give to the Board and to try and make it more apparent, more visible what the effect of the advice has been, whether this has been accepted or not but also taking into account what has happened.

And we've already for some time have GAC advice registered on the Web site. But that has not been consequently used. And so the idea is that we would launch, basically, a process to track our advice and what the effect of it is in a more systematic way. I would, therefore, like to give the floor to Tracey, who will present to us a proposal how we could make this more visible. Tracey, please.

TRACEY HIND:

Thank you, Thomas. There is a presentation up on the screen at the moment and also in your pack which is the proposed approach at the moment to look into this issue. The issue being both what happens to GAC advice after it is provided and potentially improving the way that we can record and share amongst GAC members that information and also a way of measuring whether or not outcomes, public policy outcomes are improved. So that's the basis of the purpose for doing it.

We propose to have a look at -- go back and have a look at different pieces of GAC advice. This is really on the last slide. We propose to go back and have a look at a range of pieces of GAC advice that you have provided between Prague and ICANN 52 at Singapore to look at particular case studies within that advice and to measure that against the sorts of things that are on slide 3, which, you know, are questions about the quality of that advice. And you can tell how good or bad quality of advice is often by whether or not there were implementation issues, whether or not other stakeholders were able to adequately provide input and that that input was taken into consideration, whether it was fully put in place, and whether or not there's been clear outcomes or whether or not both the outcomes and the process have been fairly nebulous. So that's our proposal to you as a GAC is that ACIG, as part of the secretariat support, will analyze GAC advice from that period. We will report back to you in Dublin with our findings, independent findings, obviously.

And, at that point in time, you, as a GAC, can revisit whether or not there are some changes to -- that you would like to make to the way you give advice or the language that's in the advice or the way we keep records about advice and that sort of matter that might make it easier for us to achieve those objectives back on that first slide whereby me as a GAC -- or you as a GAC can make statements about our outcomes improving as a result of all the hard work that we and our working groups do. I think that's all I've got to say on that, unless there's any questions.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Tracey. Any questions? Sweden, please.

SWEDEN:

Thank you, Chair. Well, it's not a question, actually. I wish to say that we support this initiative to review the effectiveness of the GAC advice. And may I, perhaps, add another element to the effectiveness. Maybe it could be possible to consider if we could sort of review the -- what we say -- clarity of the GAC advice itself, whether it has been understood by the recipients of the advice. The Board, obviously, but maybe also the community, the other parts of the community.

I don't know whether it's possible or whether it's needed. But that's an option to consider. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Sweden. And In this context I would also like to recall that we have had several requests and recommendations by the ATRT but also from entities like the GNSO that we should provide a rationale to advice that we give. And we've taken that on board. And we're trying to formulate our advice as clearly as we can to make sure that it will be understood or to at least raise the chance that it will be understood. So we take note of your point and -- yeah, see to what except we can build this in. Any other questions, issues? Yes, Iran.

IRAN: Thank you. Thanks, secretariat, for providing this useful document. I wonder whether we should call it -- the document effectiveness or implementation. The effectiveness, it gives the impression that whether advice is effective or not effective, perhaps we are more interested to the degree of implementation of that. And, according to the bylaw, it is more or less implementation that the Board received the advice of the GAC and examined that and make or not make, proceed with its implementations.

Perhaps we should add implementation and effectiveness or effectiveness and implementation of that.

That is important. The issue was that it was raised in CCWG, and we all raised the question. And that was not corrected, modified, not to give the impression that our advice are not effective. Our advice coming from the GAC it aims to be effective. But the importance is not implementation. At what stage they are and what is the follow-up action? That is something that we need to further pursue. Thank you.

TRACEY HIND: Yes, thank you. Yes. Implementation is definitely on our horizon to look at, but perhaps we didn't make it very clear in that presentation. So thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes. Thank you, Chair. Just to pick up on your point about the vision of the rationale for the advice. I mean, one aspect of examining that, how effective the GAC is in communicating that, is to consider the modalities. Would it be a written narrative to support the communique's articulation of the advice, or would it be some kind of physical forum where we could present the GAC advice and face-to-face with those members of the community who want to explore how the GAC has come to that position of advice and to sort of provide the context for that advice. Maybe that is one option to -- for this review to consider. I support the initiative very much. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Well, of course, there are several elements to this. And, with regard to giving the rationale, of course, one thing is that the words that we produce are as clear and unambiguous as possible. Then, of course, that can be complemented by people talking about

explaining individually, bilaterally, or in public meetings and so on and so forth. I think that's a whole range of issues.

And this is the first time that we are trying to make this exercise. And probably after some time we will look at the results and then present it to you and then again discuss like what has been useful or in what way we may have to amend it. But I will take it that we think that this should be done. And thank you, secretariat, for undergoing this exercise.

Any further comments or question? This does not seem to be the case.

So then I guess we can move to the next agenda issue ahead of our schedule. It's unbelievable. We'll see how long we are able to keep that.

Which is number 3, which is the specific amendments to the operating principles. For those who are new or haven't been present in the past meetings, let me just quickly recall that in Los Angeles in last October we had elections. And the original idea was to elect the chair and three vice chairs. It was then after the election felt that it would be good to amend the number of vice chairs to increase the number of vice chairs to five for allowing for a greater diversity and including but not only regional diversity in the GAC leadership team.

We did this using the opportunity that we have in the operating principles to have additional officers which we are now calling vice chairs. But we decided that this a little bit informal setting should be formalized as quickly as possible. And, therefore, launched the official

procedure to amend the operating principles on this particular issue, which is to amend the number of vice chairs from three to five plus to amend some minor elements of the provisions in the operating principles regarding the election procedure because, as this has been the first time that we had such elections, we realized there are a few things that are not very clear or are a little problematic. So we decided to launch this process to amend these operating principles with regard to these specific minor amendments where we had a basic agreement on the fact that we should do this, noting that there is a strong and shared sense that the whole of the operating principles should be revised. This is something that there have been several attempts in the past to start this. And then somehow always something so-called more urgent and important came in between so that it was never completed.

So we have taken a decision the last time in -- we took the decision in Los Angeles, I think. And that was reconfirmed in Singapore that we will have two processes. The one is -- the first one is the one we're trying to complete today, if this is possible, which is to agree on these minor changes to allow for having five vice chairs and having sound election mechanisms on the one hand and a holistic view on the operating principles, which may take a little longer because there may be different views on how to or whether or not to modify some parts of the operating principles. And this is what we will be discussing on Thursday as part of the internal matters block, if I may say so.

So keep in mind there are two processes. One is, in order to have things in place before the next election of the vice chairs, which is

going to take place at the October meeting this year in Dublin, we should fix this now. This is why we start with this. And all the other issues related to possible changes of the operating principles will be dealt with in a longer term, broader process that we'll hear more of on Thursday.

With regard to presentation of what happened since the last meeting including your feedback during the 60 days comment period and so on and so forth, I would like to give the floor to Tracey to present this to you. Thank you.

TRACEY HIND:

Hi. In Attachment A that is up on the screen at the moment, we ended up having feedback from -- I think it's 1, 2, 3, 4 -- yep, four different GAC members. I'm not going to read it out. You can see it in the pack there.

The job for this morning is to decide whether or not to accept the specific minor amendments as they are presented in the briefing or with the specific feedback that various GAC members have suggested here. Julia, if you could just go to the next document, the next document, which is Attachment B.

No, no, same -- sorry. The next page on the document, which is Attachment B. In the document that's about to come up, down, down, down, keep going.

Yep. That's it.

So in this version of the document that's up on the screen now, the specific minor proposed amendments that we're asking you and we gave the 60 days' review period to are highlighted in yellow. They allow for five vice chairs, which we suspect is fairly non-controversial and that most people will endorse. But that's up to you and for the conduct of the elections to be electronic rather than, instead of being in person.

The blue comments that are on the screen as we scroll through are the comments back from the GAC members put into the context of the principles. So perhaps if you could scroll to principle 32, Julia -- and you'll see what I mean here. Thanks.

So you can see there principle 32 has both a specific minor amendment proposed plus a suggestion there.

So the question for the GAC today is I guess twofold. Do you accept the specific minor amendments that are in this document that you've got that are in yellow, or do you accept the ones with the blue? And I guess all I can do is throw it open to the floor for that, yeah?

TOM DALE:

If I may make a suggestion, Thomas, perhaps it would be helpful if the GAC considered firstly the proposed amendments dealing with additional vice chairs. And then, after deciding what to do about that, then consider amendments to the voting procedures. That might be a logical way to deal with it, if that make sense.

So the discussion, firstly, and the proposal before you is that the document and the proposals to amend operating principles 21, 25, and 31 to refer to election of up to five vice chairs, up to five vice chairs. The question is: Is the GAC in agreement with those changes, firstly, about up to five vice chairs?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Tom. That makes sense. So let's start with asking you. Yes, Iran.

IRAN: Thank you. Thanks, secretariat, for bringing this proposed amendment to the attention of GAC.

Chairman, from a legal point of view, there is a difference between up to five and five. When you say "up to five," it could be one, two, three, four, and five. When we say "five," it's five. I'm not suggesting either of the two. But I just want to draw the attention of colleagues that we have this nuance in other areas, other international organizations when we have the term "up to," it is subject to interpretations. So either you want to have further discussion at the next meeting talking about the number or you want to fix it once forever. This is just a suggestion for you. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Iran. You're absolutely correct.

It used to say, "up to three." We've always had three. But I don't know why it happened, for instance, that a vice chair is not present in a meeting or something, that gives you the flexibility that you can, if there's a reason, also have less than the maximum number. I personally wouldn't see a reason to change this. Because the thing is we want to have five. But, if for some reason we only have four, for instance, if not more than four nominate themselves. So, if you have five, you would have to urge people to nominate. So I think that up to five will cover all the eventualities without having to undergo a change in this again.

So, basically, let me turn the question around.

Is there anybody opposing to the changes on the three paragraphs that Tom has read out to you with regard to the number of vice chairs? Doesn't seem to be the case.

So we take that that's decided.

Thank you.

That makes our life easier in the coming -- with regard to the coming election. Now let's move to the other bit.

Tom, maybe you -- Tracey, whoever, would want to again just list the paragraphs where minor changes with regard to the election procedures have been made or have been suggested in the comments by members.

Thank you.

TRACEY HIND:

Thank you, Thomas. The changes with regard to election procedures are on the second page. Principle 32, principle 31. But, in particular, the two that are -- that have a lot in them is principle 35 and principle 36.

And the main change that is attempted to be being made in the specific minor amendments is that we're trying to shift the elections from the in-person physical ballot box that happens here at a GAC meeting like you had at your last election to an electronic tool that is open for a longer period of time both prior to the meeting where the election is finalized and in the first few days of that meeting. So there's a longer period of time.

And there's a cleaner single process. And that's what we're trying to achieve with the elections.

The proposal in the ACIG brief, which is the one after this, in fact is that there only be an electronic election; that there not be any voting in person. But for the purpose of this discussion -- which is what the proposed minor amendments are. But for the purpose of this discussion, I bring your attention to the feedback from New Zealand, the European Commission, and Spain against principles 35 and 36, where they have suggested that there should also be votes in person as well as alongside electronic means.

So the -- There's -- There's, I think, the question of is -- There's, perhaps, Thomas, two ways to divide this. Perhaps the question of do

people wish to move to electronic means, and if they wish to move to electronic means, the subsequent question is do we want to then look at the proposals from New Zealand, Spain, and the European community about having -- you know, that involve alongside physical elections as well.

Two separate questions, maybe.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Tracey. I think maybe we can go through paragraph by paragraph and see if we can adopt it, and ask those who made comments to quickly explain them. And then we see how this works. Is that a --

TRACEY HIND:

Okay. In that case, the first paragraph is principle 32. And we've already said the five chairs, but the suggestion from Australia on this one is that we make a change to the text of this principle to make it clear that the results are determined by simple majority. So that's the first thing.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Yes. Australia, and then Austria.

Thank you.

AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. I think it was pointed out on the list, by perhaps Spain, that the alternative text we proposed is pretty much the same as what is already there, and I'm happy with the existing text.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So that means that the blue part, you're withdrawing -- you're fine without the blue part.

AUSTRALIA: I'm withdrawing it. Thanks.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. Austria.

AUSTRIA: Thank you, Thomas. Just a question regarding the last paragraph of principle 32, where it's written in case of the second round of voting only present at the GAC meeting GAC members participate. When you introduce formally the possibility of electronic voting, and let's assume that personally less than one-third of the members are present, then this would mean that we will not be able to have a second round. What's going to happen then?

So if the majority is voting electronically, which is possibly the first round, and then we need a second round and there are not enough people present, what's going to happen then?

TRACEY HIND: That's a very good question. That is some open and subject to change. That's actually come out of the existing operating principles, I think, the one-third.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. And what we could do is we could then say in a second round, basically we need to have one-third of the voices of those present. But maybe -- New Zealand, thank you. And Egypt.

NEW ZEALAND: Thank you, Chair.

I think this was also a proposal or a comment from Spain when we put forward suggestions that if the proposal in principle 35, which allows electronic voting in the second round, would go ahead, that this paragraph would also need to remove the text in the case of the second round to facilitate everybody doing that by electronic means.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. So let's wait with this paragraph until we have modified -- agreed on a modification of paragraph 35, if that's okay.

Egypt, would you want to add something?

EGYPT: Actually, I was going to add to Austria's question. What if we have remote participants to this specific meeting? I mean, are we limiting it to in person, even if we have remote participants?

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you for this point. I think we will discuss it under 35; okay?

So I take it that the first -- the first -- that 32 is basically agreed without the last bit that we need to come back to once we went through 35.

The next one is 34.

TRACEY HIND: 34 is really just a grammatical change, replacing "by electronic mail" with "electronically," because it won't be by electronic mail, per se. It will be an online change. So it's simply a grammatical change, that change.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yes, Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Chairman.

Voting electronically means that you need to have an authorization of the one who votes. That means focal point in the membership with

authority to send the vote; otherwise, vote maybe come from any points. Do you have any control to identify the origin of the voting?

TRACEY HIND:

Yes, we do. In the next agenda item, the second part of this agenda where we talk about the vice chair election process, there's a presentation in there that demonstrates the electronic election tool that ICANN has acquired that we propose to use for the GAC. It has a lot of safeguards built into it for traceability and management of elections. But that discussion is tabled to come after this one.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Tracey. So it's basically just to give us the freedom also to go with time and whatever electronic means that we will see fit in the future won't force us to amend this phrase again. So I hope that is acceptable.

Yes, Indonesia.

INDONESIA:

Yeah, thank you, Chair.

I think for the electronic system, the secretariat will set up the secure system for the election. How about the direct elections by the GAC representative? Because it is possible that during the meeting, the GAC representative names as listed in the secretariat may not be coming to the meeting, and he was then -- he or she was then represented by other colleagues from -- from the country.

How you can convince that that person who represent the GAC members can do the voting?

Thank you.

TRACEY HIND:

Again, the answer to that question is specifically described in the next paper called the GAC vice chairs election process 2015 that we haven't moved on to yet, but it -- whether or not you're happy with that answer -- with that proposal, I'm not sure, but that scenario is explicitly in the next paper, not in this paper.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. We'll come to that. And for those who have been here in Los Angeles, it was actually required to have -- be to have a name on the list, on the verified list of GAC members. And if your name wasn't there, then you were not allowed to vote. But we'll come to that later.

TRACEY HIND:

Yes. There's an "eligibility to vote" section in the next paper.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Can we take the very, very minor change in 34 as adopted? Any objections?

No? Okay. Thank you.

35. Who wants to start?

Maybe one of those who proposed amendments? I don't know, New Zealand or Spain or....

Germany.

GERMANY:

Thank you. Rather a question than comment to this. I wonder what this -- why we have integrated this 21 days of time before the voting that you should be able to cast your vote? Why this -- Why do we have this 21 days?

Wouldn't it be possible to have only one or two days before the -- to vote before the meeting? What does it -- Or is it technically a question or is it, rather -- how did you come to this date? Thank you.

TRACEY HIND:

It's not a technical question. It was a question of making sure that we provided enough time for GAC members to vote in a way that was convenient for them. So if the GAC collectively decides that a shorter period is preferable, that's fine.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Before giving the floor to Paraguay, there was a period for when you could vote electronically also previously, but of course we could change it. But I think it's just to make sure that everybody, no matter if, for instance, that particular day your electricity, power is off because of, I don't know, storm or whatever, you have some time frame that you can use to vote electronically, or other reasons why.

So that was the reason, to give a long enough time to make sure that if somebody is on holiday or in hospital or whatever happens, that he can vote.

Paraguay, please.

PARAGUAY:

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Just to mention that we agree with Germany. We think that three to five days would be more than enough. 21 days is maybe a little bit exaggerated.

Thank you, Chair.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you.

Germany?

GERMANY:

Thank you. Maybe we come to -- Maybe we come to a clarification a bit more.

I understand two possibilities for electronic vote. You may have one form of electronic vote which may be almost online, and this may also help to serve what Christian was asking earlier, what happens if in the second round there is not -- not so much people present to reach a quorum. Maybe people are online available, but they are not allowed

to vote. And insofar, it might be helpful to have some online to get some means to get to vote online during the time period for the voting.

The other question is if you need to vote in advance, then you need an adequate time window for finding that. But on the other hand, yes, it is a question whether you really need 21 days or it could be a much narrower time window, because probably you do not have earthquakes for 21 days all over the world. It would be a bit difficult.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you.

Well, you're right in the sense that if you had an electronic voting system where basically everybody, no matter where you physically are, would vote within a few seconds or in a minute or so, of course you don't need these days ahead. Although it may -- there may be cases where one person or one GAC representative is somehow prohibited from using that time slot. So this is why we had this.

And the last time in Los Angeles, I think there was a similar time span for those who voted electronically to cast their votes, and then in addition we had a physical vote which was one queue. So we've basically had two processes, one that was, like, physically instant and the other was electronically via a certain time span.

So the question is of course we can also reduce this number, but I think it says up to 21 days. Is that in any way binding that we have to need -- have to stick to the 21 days or can we also, when the details of

an election come out, say ten days or five days? Or up to 21 days is the maximum, so that can be concretized before the election. If we say that we want to give everyone five days, we can still have up to 21 days in the operating principles.

Egypt.

EGYPT: Thank you, Chair. I have the feeling that we're mixing two things here. The duration to vote and -- I mean, the 21 days here is we're going to stop voting 21 days prior to the meeting; right?

No?

Because all members will be provided with the opportunity to cast their votes up to 20 days prior to. So this is -- this is the duration of the -- be.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: No.

EGYPT: I mean, is this the cut-off date or is this the duration?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: This is the starting date, basically.

EGYPT: The starting date.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: You can start casting your vote maximum 21 days before the election. At least that's how I read it.

EGYPT: So this is my first question. I'm sorry.

The second question is the rest -- the second sentence says, "Voting shall also be made possible during the relevant meeting." Is this for a second round in case of a tie or is this, I mean, additional votes for the same round?

TRACEY HIND: Thank you. Perhaps -- perhaps in retrospect we should have put these two items around the other way on the agenda.

If you have a look -- perhaps if we just take five minutes out to have a look at the next paper, and under "elections" in the next paper it says, "Votes shall be taken by secret ballot electronically between Monday the 28th of September and Monday the 19th of October."

So -- And that includes a period that is both before the Dublin meeting and a few days into the Dublin meeting. So it's to give a length of time both for those who can't come, for those who are remote, for those who are present, all in their own convenience, time, space, location, to cast votes in that single election, one election.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Tracey. Maybe it would make sense to present the concrete proposal, and then if this is more practical and less theory, then we can go back to the text of the operating principles after the presentation and discussion of the concrete proposal. Maybe that would help and make it more tangible. So just go ahead.

U.K., please. Sorry.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thank you, Chair. Just following up Egypt's point. You'll have to change the text, I think, to clarify the intention here, because as it reads at the moment, it does indicate a cut-off date. When you say "cast their votes up to 21 days prior." So maybe you can change that to "cast their votes in a period commencing 21 days prior to." Maybe that clarifies that point.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thanks to our native colleagues for helping us out here.

If it's okay for you, I would like to not discuss the text any further for the time being but listen to the presentation on the concrete proposed mechanisms for the next elections. I think that will help us to get the logic. And then let's come back on the concrete text, if that is okay.

Gema, is that okay for you or did you want to -- it's okay. Okay. We note that you come back after this.

Please, Tracey.

TRACEY HIND:

Okay. Julia, perhaps you could put the presentation up now.

While that's happening, I'll just read to you from -- it's happening very quickly. That's good. Don't have to read to you from anything.

Okay.

Thank you, Julia. This presentation is about the actual proposed vice chair election process for this year. So it's the tangible way of doing the elections that the changes to the specific operating principles try to describe in a theoretical basis. So, perhaps, it is easier to go through this proposal first.

So next slide. Thanks, Julia.

As you all know, the GAC appoints vice chairs annually. We've just agreed to the change to make these five.

There is a call during this GAC session for nominations, a formal call for people to nominate to be vice chairs as we close this -- not right now, in this second. But before Thomas closes this session, we will make that call for nominations. And the nominations will close on the 17th of August.

If there are less than five candidates that put up their hand for vice chair position, we won't need an election. It's only -- we're only going to need an election if there are more than five candidates. If there are

more than five candidates, the election is proposed to be held in the lead-up to and during the Dublin meeting, as I've just answered in Egypt's question with those particular dates.

The votes will be cast electronically is the proposal between the 28th of September and the 29th of October. 29th of October from memory is the Wednesday of the Dublin meeting.

The five candidates who poll the most will be elected as vice chairs. So this is the practical implementation of the changes that we're trying to reflect in those operating tools.

There's an online tool. I don't know -- we can quickly flick through this and go back to the operating principles. There's an online tool, next slide -- thanks, Julia -- that ICANN have put in place to support elections. It is certified. It does have -- we've tested it amongst the support staff, and we've found it to work very well. It's very simple. It's very straightforward. It is available in multiple languages, which is a great benefit. And a person can only vote once. And only people who specifically received the invitation to vote, which goes to the question earlier from Iran about eligibility, will be able to vote.

Next slide, thanks.

So the process is that you'd get an email saying there's an election for GAC vice chair. Only one email per person. And, if you lose it, you won't be able to vote.

You click on -- it will have your credentials in it, because we will have preloaded it up with the people who are eligible to vote. You'll click on

the email link. You'll cast your five votes. And the tool will then confirm with you that who you're voting for is who you wanted to vote for. And you will submit it. You'll get an email receipt.

Next slide, thanks. Oh, gee, that's hard to see, isn't it? Sorry. I didn't think that would be so hard to see. That's what the email invitation looks like. And in there a few lines under the red line, you can see a "click this link." It says, "Dear Elector, the vice chair election is upon us." Click this link. As I said, the link is linked to your email address. It doesn't go to anybody else. Other email addresses can't use it. And we provide the email addresses from the list, the GAC mailing list. So it's really important you get your details up to date on the GAC email list. Next, thank you.

Again, this is a little hard to see up there. But, hopefully, you can see that these are -- this is dummy information that we put in for the test. And you can see that I've got 10 candidates standing in this election that I have selected. And all you do is you put a cross next to them. Very, very simple.

Next slide, thanks.

And, once you've elected, it goes to the screen that shows you, again, this is dummy data that I've put in. But these are the dummy candidates that are voted for. It says to you is this who you really want to vote for? And you can either confirm it or you can go back and make a correction. Next slide, thanks.

After you've done that, it sends you a receipt. And it tells you that you've voted and who you voted for so you can go in and know your vote has been counted. Next slide, thanks.

After we close this session, the nomination period is officially open. It will close on the 17th of August. I think we can come back to this slide about the nomination process after we've -- do you want to do this now, Thomas, or do you want to finish the specific minor amendments now that we've seen a concrete example first. Pardon? Finish? Okay.

So the nomination period we open after today. It will close on Monday the 17th of August. Nomination is by email to myself. And the nomination -- the email address is there in the pack. It's also in the accompanying document.

You need to identify your name, your country. You can self-nominate, or you can nominate somebody else.

You don't have to make it -- your nomination public at the initial stage. Once I've got the full list of nominees and I have validated those -- we have validated those at ACIG and under the direction of the chair against the list of eligible persons to stand for elections as per the operating principles, we will put the list of nominees on the GAC Web site. And that will be by the 31st of August.

And that list that's up there by the 31st of August is -- you'll then have a month to think about that before you start casting your votes between the 28th of September and the 29th of October using that electronic system.

So that's the practical implementation of the changes we're trying to make to the operating system. And that's how we propose that it works for you this year. We ideally like to stick to purely electronic for two reasons. One is a purely selfish reason for us, which is it's much more administratively simple to count votes from one source being the electronic source not two sources combining the electronic with the physical votes here. And it's just easier to have one system that everybody's voting in the same way.

But the second one is that, in terms of validity, there's a lot lower error rate in both counting and the potential for missing votes if it's done electronically rather than a physical ballot box. So our preference is for that first election to be purely electronic and to not have an accompanying physical election. But it's not up to us. It's up to you. You're the GAC members. So those are why the changes in the operating principles are as they are. I think that's all I've got to say.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. Any questions or comments? European Commission, then Iran. I note Egypt and Vietnam. Yeah. U.K., U.S. Okay.

European Commission, please, go ahead.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION:

Yes, please. Thank you very much, and thank you for the explanation. Well, of course, we're very much in support of electronic voting. We think it's modern in keeping with this kind of organization that's dealing with Internet, et cetera. So I would encourage that very much.

The only problem is that it's then inconsistent with what you have in the operating principles. Because the operating principles in principle 35, which I think you skipped over -- you started opening the discussion on 35, but then it got skipped to 36 -- says -- and I quote -- "where votes are cast in person" blah, blah, blah, "the GAC secretariat will distribute ballot papers to members," whereas, your presentation says there will be no voting in person. So somehow you have to consolidate those two. So I would suggest that you just eliminate that second paragraph in 35. Because, if there's a tie vote, you're going to go back to electronic voting if you accept the electronic principle. You're not going to accept it. Okay. So that's a clarification that we need. Are you going to go to ballots in person? And that was the exact reason that we raised that question in 36 at the end. Because there's a time limit. It's just a simple legal implementation principle. If you establish a time limit, it applies to that particular time limit. And you have also the possibility of voting in person during the meeting. So it's just really to clarify exactly what you need. I would like to see something that's clean and clear and used as electronic voting. Otherwise you have contradictory messages. Thanks.

TRACEY HIND:

Can I answer that one? Yes, I understand exactly what you mean. In the written document as opposed to the PowerPoint presentation, we have a section in there called tied ballots, which says in the case of a tied ballot to determine the final or the fifth vice chair position, a second in-person ballot will be held during the Dublin meeting. And the second ballot is restricted to the candidates who are subject to the

tied vote for the remaining position. And that's the in-person part to which principle 36 refers here. But, of course, it doesn't have to be in person in event of a tied ballot, if that's not what the GAC wants either. We could also make that electronic. That's up to the GAC.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Just on principle 36, as Mark mentioned, it is a language which caused problem. Instead of saying that "up to 21 days prior," perhaps one could say "as of 21 days prior." Not "up to." Because up to it means that we have a cutoff date, as Manal mentioned.

Second, on the second line, voting shall also be made possible. Is not that it shall be held. It's shall be made during that relevant meeting. Coming to that in many countries they have electronic voting, still they continue to have physical voting. So it is too early to talk that physical voting should be eliminated. We have to get experience to see how this electronic voting is. In some countries that I'm aware of they started electronic voting since five or six years. Still they continue physical voting on the day of the voting deadline up to midday of the Sunday of the voting and so on. And they count the voting in the afternoon of that. So that is maybe too early to talk about cutting off the physical voting. Physical voting democratically is the right of the people to vote, if they want to vote. So that possibility should exist for

the time being. And let's wait to see what is experience and not to jump to any quick conclusions at this stage. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. Just quick reaction. I think you're right. If we keep both options in the operating principles, we can then still decide from election to election whether we use only electronic vote or whether we use electronic vote for the first election. And, in case there's a tie ballot, we would then go to physical vote. So it may make sense to keep the both somehow regulated in the text and then up to case by case on the concrete modalities.

I have Spain and then Egypt. Thank you.

SPAIN:

Thank you. They said what I was going to say. Maybe it's better to keep some flexibility in the text so that each time we decide what method to use. And also to cater, for instance, new members who turned up in that meeting for the first time and haven't joined the GAC mailing list before the meeting. I think we should provide for that exceptional situation.

And, taking advantage of the floor now, I would like to say something about the tie ballot and the question made by Austria. I think GAC has a quorum of one-third of members for any meeting. So I suppose that whenever an election takes place and a tie ballot occurs, there will be a third of GAC members present in the meeting. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Spain. Egypt.

EGYPT: Thank you, Chair. And, in fact, I have four points to make. So I'm sorry. Please bear with me. First, I think you mentioned that nominees will not be made available or public, the names of the nominees, until the very end. Is there a specific reason why not? That is my first question.

The second question regarding --

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: May I just quickly answer this?

Of course, any nominee or anybody who nominates another one can make this public. But, if somebody does not want to make it public, the secretariat will not make it public by itself.

EGYPT: So it's up to each --

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So it's up to you -- yeah, exactly.

EGYPT: So the second question regarding the second round, I don't see why -- if we have an online system, why should we restrict it to in-person. If

we have other members who are available and willing to participate to the second round remotely, I think we should not restrict this.

The third point -- and this has to do with the geographic distribution and principle 21 that is already, I think, mentioned in the other document, which states, "to the extent possible, the vice chairs should appropriately reflect the geographic and development diversity of the membership."

I don't really see where we're applying this principle. I mean, even -- I see it a pure voting thing. And, even when we have a tie, we're going directly to a second round. I mean, maybe we can give preference or priority, if there is a tie, to maybe a region that is not represented.

And the very last thing regarding -- the nominee is requested to send the name and the country. I suggest also that they send the region or regions they represent. So thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Manal. With regard to your second question first.

I think there's no reason why we shouldn't also use the same electronic voting tool for second round. So I guess that's -- let's take this at least for the next election. I think that's okay.

With regard to your questions about the regions, the problem is we do not have regions in the GAC. That concept is not existing in a way that it would be usable. So this is why there is a diffuse notion of representativity and not of representativity but of diversity. But we

don't have five regions that we've ever agreed to that we would use for any representative purposes. That may be coming out of the holistic review, and then we may be able to use this. But so far, it simply does not exist.

Yes, Egypt.

EGYPT:

But, I mean, we have the principle, and we're referencing it here. So -- again, it's principle 21. So I mean, it's more or less known the region -- it doesn't have to be rigid regions. But at least, if people don't know each other or don't know really where the country belongs, it would be beneficial if the nominee presents their region or even if it's more than one region. I mean --

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Manal. What is written here is appropriately reflected geographic and development diversity of the membership. That doesn't refer to clearly defined regions. And we don't -- if we would go down this line, we would not get this through, and it hasn't been proposed. It's not part of what we are changing under the small minor changes. Because to develop a regional concept that works for elections we'll not get there until Thursday. So I urge you to note that we will put this on Henri's list. If I may say so, but we'll never get something done that black and white with regions. It simply doesn't work. Egypt, do you want to come back?

EGYPT: Very quickly. I'm not saying we discuss the regions or even name them right now. I'm saying, whenever there is a nominee, they can say which region they belong to. I mean, this is pretty straightforward. But, again, I thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Next on the list I have Vietnam, then U.K. and USA. And Iran.

So Vietnam, please.

VIETNAM: Mr. Chairman, in order to help GAC members to choose the right persons to be the vice chair, may we request all the candidates to send an email to GAC members to introduce themselves who they are, about the reason he or she wanted to be a vice chair, and what is his or her plan? Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. This is what normally happens when somebody either puts him or himself forward or is put forward by somebody else. Thank you for this. United Kingdom.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Just on this point about ambition to achieve geographical diversity. I'm very sympathetic to Egypt's point. At the Los Angeles elections, after consulting internally, my voting plan had

very much in mind achieving geographical diversity and also gender balance, which I don't think is mentioned anywhere in the principles.

Perhaps one thing we can do is in the "Dear Elector" letter, a reminder of this aspiration to achieve geographical balance in the elections could be stated. I think perhaps that's the most we could do. And, if the nominees do state broadly their geographical sort of context, that will help, too, in achieving our common objective here, I'm sure, shared by everybody. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, U.K. Just to remind you that we are trying to agree on a number of minor changes to the operating principles. The rest we can -- whatever we put in the procedures and whatever will be communicated to you from the secretariat is something that we can still see. But your point is taken.

And I think the point about gender and other -- and geographic diversities is well taken. But we try to get an agreement on some minor changes here. And, if we extend the discussion to issues that are not part of this, we will not get this done.

We actually are already in a coffee break. I will give the floor to my colleague from the U.S. and to the Netherlands. And then I think we'll have the coffee break. Okay? And Iran. Sorry.

UNITED STATES:

Thank you, Chair. First of all, I'd like to thank colleagues who have spoken before me, in particular, Egypt and Vietnam. I think they have raised very, very important points for us to embrace, not just to take note of. I really do think they have to be fully taken into account. And I think that your comment just now suggests that this was the challenge that several of us flagged in Los Angeles as a result of the elections at that moment.

It is very, very challenging to choose or to attempt to choose to amend very specific portions of the operating principles and to not adopt a holistic approach. Because, as we are quickly finding out, they're all interrelated. Many of the key provisions in the operating principles are interrelated. The secretariat herself must have used the word "eligibility to vote" more times than I could possibly count.

That is precisely the point that the United States and several other colleagues raise the during the Los Angeles election that it is absolutely imperative, if we are going to hold elections, we will have to tackle the issue of who is eligible to vote in those elections.

The two cannot be separated and bifurcated. And kicking the can to some subsequent future election is simply delaying decisions that absolutely need to be taken. So I'd like to go on the record very firmly, again, that we do not believe it's possible to make these minor amendments to increase the number of vice chairs from three to five, which the United States fully supports. We completely endorse this proposal. However, it is very challenging to contemplate holding elections without addressing the very issue the secretariat has

helpfully reminded us of. Who is actually eligible to vote? So, as you know full well, the Los Angeles elections raised the question as to different interpretations of the membership provisions suggesting that perhaps as many as two regional intergovernmental organizations believe they have membership status and they have eligibility to vote. The other intergovernmental organizations clearly do not.

We also learned in Singapore that at least one of our IGO colleagues formally requested -- or informally -- I'm not entirely sure how is it being considered -- but made the request that their status be changed from an IGO to a full member.

There are also IGO-related provisions, observer provisions, principles 15 and 18 that are clearly outdated and need to be updated.

So I really do think it's imperative that we revisit the operating principles, all of the key provisions that should be in place for another election.

From our perspective, again, we do have concerns, very strong political concerns that a regional or intergovernmental organization whose members are also members of the GAC should not be eligible to vote because that is a concept called "additionality" that is on principle unfair. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, U.S. I think your point is understood.

I might recall that we accepted the change in the number of vice chairs 10-15 minutes ago. This is done.

We have accepted this. We have the possibility to not agree on modifying the minor changes related to the voting procedures. Then we will do it the same way like it was done in Los Angeles with the slight minor effects of dissatisfaction for some cases where people couldn't vote. It's your decision in the end. Sorry. I'm in your hands.

I suggest we take a coffee break. We don't have to take this decision now. We can also take it on Thursday. But I note the decision regarding the number of vice chairs has been taken. We've agreed that we'll amend it up to five. Thank you very much. This is the coffee break.

(A coffee break was taken.)

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you all for getting to your seats so that we can resume the meeting. Please sit down. Thank you.

Just to recap from where we were, or where we ended up before the break, so as I said, what we agreed on is the amendments regarding the number of vice chairs. So far we have no agreement on the minor changes related to some details of the election procedure.

We'll give us a chance to maybe prepare an agreement on this until Thursday, where we will discuss the holistic review. If there is no

agreement until Thursday, we'll stay with the modalities as we had them last year, and the secretariat will then send out the same procedures like last year. You will get these procedures again so that you know how this is going to work.

And the other thing that I would just recall is that the call for nominations is open now, so you can either nominate yourself or somebody else from now on until the deadline of 17 of June.

Thank you.

So with this, we will move on to item number 4, which is the new gTLD safeguards, which is something that has....

Thank you, Olof. We forgot to, when we had the presentation round, we forgot to -- because they're hiding in the back, to actually present to you Ozan and Julia from ICANN staff. So will you maybe please stand up so everybody who doesn't know you yet knows this is you. So our support staff, in addition to Olof, is sitting over there.

And the other thing is of course there is the possibility for participating remotely at this meeting. There are some people that will participate remotely. And of course they will be listed as participants as well. So this is something that we cannot omit, and you should be informed about.

So back to the safeguard agenda item. This goes back to our so-called safeguard advice from Beijing two years ago, and there is a long history of communiques and letters from the GAC to the Board, from the Board to the GAC on this. So we're having two leads here. This is

the European Commission and the United States. I just wanted to recall you that after consulting with the leadership team, I have sent out the draft letter last week to start the discussion, and we've received some comments, including the one from the U.S. that proposes a different procedure.

So in addition to the substance, we will also have to discuss the form of any communication to the Board, if we decide to do so, on how we communicate to the Board, through which channel or channels.

The objectives of this is to finalize the outstanding issues for the current round and to consider a GAC discussion on an approach for the next round.

May I give the floor to the leads? If you want to start the debate. So I see the U.S. is willing to begin.

Thank you.

UNITED STATES:

Thank you, Chair. And just to help colleagues understand the thinking behind my proposal, which was just -- now I can't remember. I've already been here so many days, I can not quite remember when I sent that email to the GAC list. Perhaps a week ago?

My suggestion was that we tweak the concept of a letter to convert the key points in the letter into bullet talking points that the GAC would review itself and come to agreement, and then that the GAC, via the chair, via the leads, however you wish to do that, Chair, would use the

face-to-face meeting as an opportunity to publicly express the GAC's current thinking and to raise the questions that the draft letter raises. We would just convert the actual vehicle from a letter to talking points so that we create a record -- so we're still going on the record, is my thinking, but rather than sending a letter, we would go ahead and take advantage of the face-to-face meeting, which is also open to the public, so my hope was that the community would also find this of some value, and then we would be able to present the Board with sort of a to-do list, full, some homework. And then in the interim period between the Buenos Aires meeting and Dublin, we always have the opportunity to then follow-up with a more formal letter that sort of establishes, okay, now we're all on the same page. We know where we are, both parties. And as you were pointing out, our goal is actually to complete this cycle, because it has gone on for quite some time.

So that is -- I hope that was clear to colleagues in the room. That was sort of the intent behind the email, and I believe I did do a track change version of the letter to convert it into bullets.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, United States.

So we have a proposal from the United States.

European Union, please.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Yes, thank you very much. Well, I think the idea is a good one to have public debate and to have it on the record at the discussion, of course, but I think it's also important that we reinforce this issue in the communicate itself. And so I think the idea to have the open session and present your issues at that open session is very good, but I think we should also not forget that we should add some clear text to the communicate, because this is an issue that's been going on for a number of years now, and the communicates keep coming forward. But I think we have to really push now, also, in that context.

Thanks.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, European Commission.

Other comments or questions?

So would you then agree to basically follow the proposal by the European Commission that we will table this in our oral exchange with the Board and we would work on a text for the communicate?

Which -- Yes, Indonesia.

INDONESIA: Thomas, just want to get clarification from your side.

I agree, of course, that you and the team will work out the wording and so on to become a concrete proposal, and so on. What I would like to get clarification from you is how later we can have the final

decisions on a timely manner? Because from the communication that you sent to us through email and so on, there's always a problem of wording and, you know, things like that. And in short, the most difficult point is how to make final decisions as a GAC decision. And before we have a decision-making system, then we always have these type of problems. I mean, in one of your letter, for example, in one of your email to us, you are asking -- you are, quote, unquote, "complaining" that if all the GAC members start to ask for improvement of A, B, C, D, it will never stop, something like that. I re-read your letter this morning, you know, so (laughing)....

Perhaps we can even have deliberation as how we can have a quick decision-making system or a standard operating procedures for the decision so that you, as the Chair, can have a better response to the rest of the ICANN.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Indonesia. If I understand the proposal of the European Commission right, it's that -- and I think that the U.S. is in line with this, we would not send a letter after -- we decide not to send a letter after this meeting. We would have a text in the communique about this issue. That means that we would need to have an agreement on this text by Friday evening, which means that somebody needs to work on this text starting from now based on, if you wish, the draft letter, other comments that have been made. Also taking into account, if possible, the latest communication that we received last

week on discrimination from the Board, which is something my letter, for instance, didn't take into account because it wasn't there yet.

So -- and I assume that we have a little bit of an exchange what exactly we use the time that we have to discuss what the elements of oral communication and of our text for the communique should be. So that those who will be drafting it, I would suggest that we will continue with having the U.S. and the European Commission to take the lead on drafting that part of the text; that they have some guidance from the whole GAC on what the elements should be. As I said, you can build on the elements that have been circulated so far, but it's not limited to these, of course. These are just -- be -- this is just input to the debate.

Further comments or questions on the procedure?

Germany.

GERMANY:

Thank you, Chairman.

From our point of view, this is a very important step forward, and I think we should raise the questions that are still standing in the room and are not answered, and we should find an appropriate way. I think having some text in a communique would be good, and we surely would prepare -- be prepared to work together with the colleagues from the U.S. and the European Commission.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Germany.

Other comments?

So do we have an agreement on the what to do? Okay. So now we have some time to discuss the substance of that communication, if you want. We have 30 minutes -- even more; right? 35 minutes to discuss substance, if we want.

Yes, Switzerland.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Chair. I think that in keeping with -- with what the leads have proposed, and as there is a lot of convergence on the substance of what are the questions we want the Board to answer, we have a very good basis there to have the discussion with the Board. And in the communique, also in keeping with tradition in the GAC of reflecting discussions, we could easily use that agreed substance on the questions, the feedback we get from the Board, and also as a new addition, our reaction to that, our follow-up. But that we will know after the discussion with the Board.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Switzerland.

Other comments?

Spain?

SPAIN:

Yes. I think that there are a couple of questions here that are key and that should be in the discussion with the Board and possibly in the communique.

We need to initiate dialogue with the Board on the issues that have been accepted or even implemented by the Board, or the ones that have not been addressed yet or that we have to consider rejected. And when we have clarity on those issues, we kind of start the dialogue, the consultation procedure that is foreseen in the bylaws in order to get to mutual understanding and mutual agreement on the way forward. And then the Board could finally decide what to do with GAC advice on new gTLDs and continue -- and not continue, but to close this long work at once.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Spain.

Further comments?

If there are no further comments, then let me ask you, the leads, are you willing to start the drafting and come up with a first text as soon as possible? So ideally that we have this ready already before the meeting with the Board, at least as a draft.

Okay. Thank you very much.

That means that we would move to the next agenda item -- unless somebody takes the floor before that; no, that does not seem to be the case -- which is number 5 about IGO protection.

Maybe it's worth giving you an update on what had happened -- has happened since our last meeting.

We have answered, and you have participated in drafting the answer, we have answered the questions that have been posed to us at the end of last year by the NGO -- ah, NGO. GNSO -- all these acronyms -- working group on curative rights. We have sent the answer to that in April, and in parallel, we have had some informal discussions in a small group of some representatives of IGOs, members of the NGPC, and Suzanne Radell from the U.S. delegation and myself as two GAC representatives with -- in consultation with the GAC leadership team, and we have arranged a phone call meeting in early June, if I'm not mistaken, where we decided in that group that we would pick up the work that has been started towards the end of last year where there has been an exchange between the IGOs on an informal level and the NGPC on a concrete mechanism to get to a permanent protection mechanism that has then come to a halt. And it was decided that we are going to resume to work on a practical concrete mechanism, and not entering the debate about how to interpret paragraph -- Article 6ter of the Paris Convention, and so on and so forth, because it has been the feeling that that will not lead us to a solution very quickly. So we try to basically try to be pragmatic and get the aim done that there is adequate protection for IGOs in a way that should work for the IGOs

but also for the other side; i.e., the registries and through the GNSO. And that the Board can then basically move this issue forward.

So we have agreed that we will work on that basis for the time being. We'll concentrate our resources and energy on this, trying to work out a pragmatic, practical solution.

We have agreed that we will try and have a physical meeting of this small, informal group in the first half of July, probably either in Geneva or in Paris, maybe linked to the face-to-face meeting of the CCWG Accountability, as some people will already be there because of this in order to reduce, let's say, travel burdens.

This is an update that I would like to give you on this. Please, those who have been participating in this, add to my comments, and everybody else also, of course you can make comments and ask questions.

I see that the OECD wants to take the floor.

Thank you.

OECD:

Thank you, Chair, for that recap.

Yeah, I think it's important that you mention the sort of linkage with the GNSO process because I think that's sort of the main selling block now, is trying to come up with some sort of solution that sort of bridges the gap between the advice the GNSO has given up to this point and also the advice that the GAC has given.

I just want to remind everyone that it's been over three years since the IGOs first organized to try to get protection for our names and acronyms in the DNS, and we're really hoping that at some point soon we will come to some sort of workable solution.

In the meantime, though, temporary protections are still in place. And that's really critical until a solution is reached. Any solution we come up with needs to take into account the fact that IGOs are -- as we noted many, many times in GAC advice, the IGOs are fundamentally different rights holders because of our status under international law, because of our limited resources, and because of our publicly funded mandates to act for the public good. I think it was also important that you mentioned that, you know, we're sort of moving past the kind of tricky legal issues that have proved to be stumbling blocks in the past. What we just need is a practical administrative solution. I think it's good we're able to move past these issues and come to a solution that's agreeable to all of us. Like you said, it seems like we want to be close to some sort of agreement on protections on a second level. And we're hopeful that these meetings in July -- we're still waiting for confirmation on exact dates and locations -- will allow us to get there.

So -- and also I just wanted to point out that this -- the discussion we've been having in the GAC also about protections for country and territory names at the second level really demonstrates that it is possible to come up with a simple, relatively elegant solution to these issues. So, hopefully, we can come up with something as equally easily implementable for IGOs. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Further comments or questions on this issue? No questions? No comments? Okay. We take note. Then maybe the remaining question is do we feel that we need to have some reflection on this in the communique or not? Or should we spare each other the exercise to formulate something that may be misunderstood but just agree that we'll try and move this forward in this informal process and report back to the public when we have something concrete to report. OECD.

OECD: I think it's critical that we have something in the communique. And, in my understanding after our conference call about 10 days ago, was that it was expected that there would be something in the communique that reflected that the GAC wanted this small group to move forward and propose something concrete.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. U.S.

UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. I'd like to thank our colleague from the OECD. And I also believe WIPO is in the room, so I think this is extremely helpful. I think it's not a bad idea for us to indicate that the GAC has yet again, as we have consistently since October 2012, we have supported the

concept of providing appropriate protections for the names and acronyms of IGO at the second level.

I would like to go on the record, though, since I know we have other colleagues in the room and they may not be as familiar with this issue which is probably nearer and dearer to our hearts than to anyone else's. But we think a considerable amount of progress has, in fact, already been made. So this is a two-part problem, if you will. And the first part has some -- is quite well on its way to having been sorted out. And that is a preventative mechanism. And where we are now is the second part of the two-part problem. And that's finding a methodology for a curative mechanism.

So I do think it's important for people to understand that, while it may seem as though this is taking quite some time -- and I do appreciate that it is -- but, nonetheless, I do think a considerable amount of progress has been made. And I think it's also worthwhile taking note of that. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, U.S. So we'll try and reflect this in a text that should be as short and concise as possible but clear along the lines that the two of you just spelled out.

Should we ask the IGOs to prepare a first draft for us on -- for a small text in the communique on this issue? Would that be okay? Acceptable? Okay. Thank you. So the work is on you. Thank you very much.

Any further questions or comments on this agenda item? Yes, United Kingdom.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Yes. Thank you, Chair. And thank you to those who are leading on this and to the OECD in particular for reminding us that this is a critical issue that needs early resolution after a very protracted period.

And, of course, we should be mindful of, you know, the gTLDs that are launching and rolling out. And registries need to understand what the situation is. So I really urge that we do set a clear timeline to conclusion and we communicate that as a shared objective for the community to embrace. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Yes, thank you, United Kingdom. Other comments? Questions? If that is not the case, then nothing can prevent us from moving ahead to the next item on the agenda, which is number six. Country and territory names as second level domain names. Review of progress.

Those who have been here the last time may remember that we have started a procedure to help us and also the registries to have a clear and simple mechanism for knowing who does not need to be or does not insist on being notified when a country name or a territory name is being used by a registry. And we have had some discussions about how to do this.

There is also, just to recall to you, a history to this with regard to the two-character codes where we had a similar debate earlier that was creating some confusion. Also we were trying to learn on -- from that experience and come up with something easy and clear and simple. This is why we have developed this form that Olof has sent out to you sometime ago. And already quite a lot of countries have sent back the form. And I will now hand the floor to Olof because he has a few remarks. And please to make to you with regard to the form and the accumulation of this data. So, Olof, please go ahead.

OLOF NORDLING:

Thank you, Chair. And while I should really thank you all, because many of you have filled out the form, sent it back. Not all of you but more than half. So we still would need additional input, but at least on a good path. So that said, I would like to emphasize what the purpose of this form is. It's really an "opt out" form in preparation for the foreseeable notification procedure that will come concerning country and territory names alone, not for the ccTLD codes or anything like that. So it's an opt out form. It's not an opportunity to add anything in a protection that's already foreseen.

And the basis for that protection is in specification five of the new gTLD registry agreement, which is, in itself, a bit complex because it has three lists of country and territory names. And they're rather extensive, some of them.

So, with that said, I would like to have a look again on the form as it stands. And the first column where it says -- no, no, no. Back again. Thank you. Back again, keep it still. Thank you, Julia.

So it says name of country or territory in English.

It's in singular. It's singular for good reason. Because, just by identifying the country, well, then it applies to all those versions of the name that appear in the various lists.

And let me give an example. I mean it's a short name in the national language. It's the formal name in the national language. And there are the six U.N. version in both the short and long name.

So, instead of listing everything or making separate entries of those, well, the preferred option is to just have one name in the entry on the first line.

And then the opt-out options which we have foreseen is the full opt out by indicating on the second column with an X that the country in question or the government in question does not require notification.

So full opt out. Or partial opt out. The third column for brand TLDs as defined in the footnote -- and it's too difficult to find. Print to read. But you can all look it up, if you like.

And then the third opportunity for any other version of opt outs in the remarks column. Like, for example, well, all right, we don't need to be notified of the use of our country name in non-Latin languages, for example. It could be an option. Nobody has done that. But I just

mention it as an opportunity to come up with other exclusions that you could foresee.

And then last, but not least, a contact provided it's not somebody else than a GAC representative. And a few of you have used that one to good effect.

What I have done is really to try to follow literally the submissions you've made and compressing them to one line per country rather than listing all the variants but dividing them by slashes and with the options indicated. So you have seen that in version four of the list. And there is a version five which is underway of that one as well.

And then I've also excluded all the entries of the country codes. Some of you entered the two-letter country codes. And this is not the purpose of this exercise. That was the previous exercise we had for that particular purpose, another part of the specification five.

So, with the permission of the Chair, let's look at what Switzerland provided. So please scroll a bit, Julia.

This is an example of one of the rather elaborate replies I received. We have Switzerland on one line. And we then partialled it out for the brand TLDs and remarks on the coverage.

Swiss Confederation, which is actually the English version of the formal name of Switzerland, with the same option of doubt for brand names and brand TLDs. And, in detail, the same rules also applied to Confederation Suisse or Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft, and

Confederazione Svizzera and Confederaziun Svizra, which is in Romansh, which very few speak and certainly not me.

And all right. And then you have Swiss, which is interesting, because that's not really the name of the country.

Then again, so what do I do? Well, I put them on one line and I divide them by slashes. And I have all these comments in the version four.

But, actually, it would suffice to have Switzerland there. No Swiss Confederation. Not Swiss, because it doesn't appear in any of the lists. And there's not an option to add anything to those lists.

Also, when it comes to the names, short name of the country and all official languages, fine, they're already foreseen. So the entries in the fourth column are actually unnecessary.

Also the formal name appears in four different languages, the four national languages. Fine. They also appear in that particular list, or they're already covered. So it's not necessary to have that entry there.

So what I would suggest that is, A, that you keep them coming. Those who haven't sent them yet, please do so.

Secondly, let me try to harmonize it. And I simplify by using the name in English and following, actually, the name and the list of names in the GAC member record. That's one way of identifying it.

Then we get it in the same order as we have it in the GAC membership list as well.

And then that many of the entries that actually call for protection must be made in this, that, and the other, that we move that to a preamble to the whole list and clarify what's the intention of the list? What are the provisions that we foresee? And, actually, make reference -- clear reference to the specification five. So, in order to clarify it and make it more harmonized.

Then there is something else, which I haven't touched upon, but clearly important. When you speak about territory, it's not about a region of the country or anything like that, but the territory names in the 3166 list. Those -- there are more such territories than there are countries. And some of those are overseas territories with some degree of independence but under sovereignty of a country like, for example, the U.K. have plenty of such. France has some. Finland has one. And those are not covered in the list of all the U.N. languages and such, but they're most certainly covered by specification five. So, if they're not covered or they're not listed, the assumption is that notification is required, if a registry would like to use those names on the second level.

So listing those, that's an option. And I've recently received something from the U.K. where they start listing it very usefully. And we'll add those at the end of this list in order to make that perfectly clear.

And, in particular, it's most useful also with the contact to use the fifth column for the contact to notify if there are requests for that name.

That may be the mother country, but it most certainly may be the territory itself that has that prerogative to respond to it. So that's a pretty lengthy explanation. And we tried to make it as simple as possible. But, once we start digging into it and you get responses, you start realizing there are always some complications here. So we most certainly couldn't close it out right now. I would suggest that we continue to develop it. You send me more additional entries to it. I prepare a simplified list by the end of June. So that would be a cutoff date. And send it out to the GAC list for your review until mid-July.

So that's my proposal. Thank you very much, Chair. And excuse me for being -- spending some -- quite some time on this.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Olof.

So to try and sum up for the particular -- we thought it may be useful for you to have a concrete case so you see what that means, what Olof has told you.

In the final list, there will be just one entry where you have Switzerland and the cross. And the rest is not necessary because it will be stated that in the preamble that this covers all that is covered.

So this in order to keep the list simple and short. But it won't be made clear to those who will use this list that it's not just a word "Switzerland," but it's all the rest as well that will be covered.

Did I get this right, Olof?

OLOF NORDLING: Spot on. Thanks for compressing it to 30 seconds.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. So I think it's a good suggestion to extend, because not everybody may have been aware or may have been sure about how to fill this out. I hope we have been able to clarify this. So there will be an extension or there is an extension of the deadline to send in further forms to Olof until 15th of July. So please do so. And now the floor is yours. Questions, comments, whatever is still not clear or whatever -- yes, Germany.

GERMANY: Thank you. And thank you for presenting this discussion and preparing the discussions, which is, from my point of view, a bit complicated if you see and have to check out which are the names that are really protected according to the applicant guidebook.

And we have to consult various lists. And what I, just for curiosity, would like to know is what is really protected if there is more than one word involved, if you have a country name that consists of two parts or if you have official name. In Germany it would be Federal Republic of Germany. Would you have this in one word protected, or would you have between the different words protection with underline blank or with a hyphen, whatever? I would seek the question what is really protected if it comes to more words.

Another question I would have raised as soon as in respect of the time limit. You mentioned that you want to complete the list until July 15th. I just can give an explanation from our perspective.

We discussed this issue whether we would like to open up completely the using of the name Germany in this new gTLD system. And we had internally a discussion on that. And for some colleagues there were still some concerns remaining. It means so far we want to follow the discussions and see how is delegation of second level domains with Germany will develop and may be in a future -- in the future may come back and liberalize it completely.

I think that we should be open for this, that we could add our country name in future time, maybe in a half a year or maybe in one year, to this list. In contradiction to the time limit, the strict time limit you gave us. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. Just before giving the floor to Olof to answer the first question, a quick remark on the second one.

I think this list is -- will, of course, be a rolling list. The question is just, at some point in time we have to say -- give it a first stop that we can hand this list over to those who will actually use it. But then we can actually -- I don't know -- decide on a half yearly or yearly update that those who have made up their mind and went from notification to, as you say, liberalization, can -- that this list can be amended. But we need to have a deadline at some point in time where the first version

of this list is made public and sent out to those who will rely on that list.

That what would be my proposal.

Olof, now about the languages and names and hyphens and whatever we may come up with or others may come up with.

OLOF NORDLING:

Thank you, Thomas. And well, indeed, the -- I think this is -- well, it's not a never ending story. But, of course, we need to advance this for the current round. That's sort of the -- what is the pressing matter. It's for the future as well.

As to your question whether -- how would a multiple word name like a formal name, which typically -- or multiple words like the formal name of Sweden is Konungariket Sverige. Try to spell that.

And with something in between then. And you cannot have just an empty space in a domain name really. So what do you do?

Would a dash between Bundesrepublik Deutschland -- between Bundesrepublik and Deutschland then constitute a use of your country name? And I would say that probably Bundesrepublik Deutschland, that is you, would contend that yes, it is. Then again, a registry might say -- if I was a registry, I would say, well, it's not identical to the formal name because there is a dash there. So I think the jury would still be out on quite a few of those cases. It's not obvious. And I think there are examples in -- from other quarters when

this has been resolved. But I have not a good answer to this that is uncontestable.

The only answer I have is really that probably, before you try to have Bundesrepublik Deutschland as a second-level domain, you probably have to start out with Deutschland or .DE being much shorter. But that's just from a practical pig perspective.

So half answer, but not a full answer.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Olof. Well, first of all, we have some experience with this with trademarks, of course. And my main point would be -- and that would be it's not up to us to go into this detail of defining. But it's actually regulated, if you want to say so, in the applicant guidebook and the specifications. And, if there's unclarity, then it would be actually, in my view at least, be up to ICANN to clarify what that means. This is why, if we ask every government to list all the names that they think are covered, like in this case we have done, there may be some errors in it and somebody would need to go and check and so on and so forth. And it would actually be rather confusing.

So, if we just limit as to one version and make reference to the source where the other versions are listed, I think that's the easiest for us. And it doesn't bring us into areas where we actually are not really competent in -- as GAC, to define what else may be protected or not.

So I would really suggest that we stick to just having one line, make a reference to the applicable lists, and then those who will want to use

it, they will go to these lists. And then they will also get some practice because maybe they will not just want to use one country's name but several ones. And that is not our problem.

I have -- CTU. Thank you, yes.

CTU: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's Caribbean Telecom Union. Our question for clarification. If I'm a country that does not want to opt out, do I need to submit this form?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: No, you don't need. Those who do not give us any information, the default setting is that that means that you will be notified. You may, however, fill out the form. And maybe we can just scroll down. In the case the default setting is that, if you do not opt out, it will be the GAC representative that will be contacted. Because this is a contact that ICANN has and that registries may have access to.

In case you would wish to indicate that somebody else would -- should need to be noted, then the GAC representative, because in your government or in your ministry somebody else is actually in charge of protection or use of their country name or territory names, then you may actually not take a box but just fill out the last column and indicate the name plus coordinates, whatever, on how to identify that person.

Thank you.

I have Mr. Chen Chung-Shu, please.

CHEN CHUNG-SHU:

Thank you, Chair. My humble suggestion for a longer term for the overhaul for ICANN, since layer diverse situation which many countries or governments or authority are facing and the ultimate purpose of specification five, section four of registry agreement is believed to be -- to respect all countries and whereby to protect their country and territory name, we suggest that GAC could make a proposal to ICANN to deliberate on extending such scope beyond ISO3166 list or, just as Olof has said, three lists which are in general definitely doesn't count in or cover every scenario, at least for those countries that have many connotation than one of those countries that are not U.N. member states. Concretely, ICANN should consider to augment the existing protection scope by adding some additional provision to a specification five, section 4.1 of the registry agreement like acting, "or otherwise specified by the respective country or governmental authority" after the language of that "show form in English of all country and territory name contend on the ISO3166-1 list." Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. For this round, I think we have an existing framework that defines what falls under these provisions, but I think it -- of course, everybody is free and the GAC is free to -- when it comes to the review of this round and to developing a framework for the second -- for a next round, to bring issues like this up if this is what the GAC or other

parties in ICANN would want. So I think we take note or I suggest we take note, and in case or at the time when a second round is up, then we may look into what should be the appropriate framework and lists that should be taken into account for protecting names or -- and the like.

I forgot the U.K. Sorry, Mark. So you have the floor.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Just to say that we undertake to respond as fully as we can. We do have a number of overseas territories, as Olof already indicated.

And also, within the U.K., there are islands which have their own governments, such as Jersey, which we will have to consult. I think we are already consulting, actually, as well.

And the point I just wanted to make, I think this exercise is a very important one, underlines the importance of being a GAC member, you know, because I don't know what's happening for countries and territories which aren't represented on the GAC. Is that an issue that somebody is dealing with? But it's great news that Mauritius and Kiribati have joined most recently to bring the membership up to 152, but there are countries in all regions which are not represented on the GAC. And those colleagues who -- even in this region. Ecuador, I think, is not on the GAC, for example.

So it will be helpful for colleagues who have immediate reach to those countries' administrations to convey this as an example of why you

need to be on the GAC, because this is an important decision to be taken on protection of country names and so on.

So I just underline that aspect of this exercise.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you.

Well, in fact, this is a discussion that we've had earlier, and also ICANN and the GDD, those people working on this are aware of that and there are channels, if I'm not mistaken, that, via diplomatic missions, that non-GAC members can nevertheless be notified about request for release of country and territory names.

Any other further questions or comments on this item, on this list?

Spain.

SPAIN:

Very small procedural point. I've read in the briefing prepared by ACIG that the list once compiled will be published in the public area of the GAC Web site. The list includes in the last columns some email addresses. I wonder whether email addresses could be kept out to avoid spam and so on.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: I see that Olof is waving, so, Olof, please.

OLOF NORDLING: Well, yes. And the idea is to keep the email addresses that have been provided for contact purposes on the contact list that will then be provided to the GDD staff and not be present in the published list. Well, the names may still appear there, but the email addresses, as we realized earlier on, they need to be kept out of the public area of the Web site.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Olof.

Other comments and questions?

Is there a hand up somewhere? I don't --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: China.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Too many heads between you. China. Okay. Thank you.

CHINA: Thank you very much.

Good afternoon, everyone.

First of all, we'd like to see -- We participated in this work before. We support ICANN to establish this formal mechanism in order for ICANN to receive the positions of different governments. Before, China has already replied regarding this form, and now we are doing further research on this topic.

At this point, regarding China and the .CN, how will we open that? We were still under discussion among ourselves. And related other forms, we hope that's not going to be open at this point at the second level.

So .CN, so we hope is not open at this point.

Thank you.

Sorry. Another point to add. At this form, the form that on the Internet, we didn't see where we provided -- we're not sure if we didn't see the most updated list.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

As he has said earlier, this process is about the country and territory names. It is not about the two-character codes of the countries. That part of the process is already over. That was last year in 2014 where there was a mechanism for this and all of you may have the details. So this process is not about the two-character codes. It's only about the names. The other process has already been terminated.

Thank you.

OLOF NORDLING:

Indeed. I mean, it was conceived in 2014 following the RSEP request that ICANN received regarding release of two-letter codes, and then we realized that this was not entirely to -- well, the GAC didn't have time enough to handle these notifications, so there was a renewed modification of it that took place at the Singapore meeting. And then there was notification of the individual requests of the individual countries. And, well, unless there be additional such requests that are forwarded -- that may still happen, I suppose -- that process has been concluded.

So this is a second step regarding only the country and territory names and regarding the question whether the most recent list or compilation of the entries have been distributed.

The last one I call v4 for version 4, and that was sent yesterday. There have been entries since then, so there is a version 5 in preparation, but it has not been prepared yet and, accordingly, not sent out yet, but that will happen.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, yes. To recall with regard to the two-character codes, you're right, it was actually -- the process started in 2014, but after the request of the GAC that the original 30 days' notification period that was given to deposits, that that was not enough, it was in Singapore this February that the Board decided that that would be extended to

60 days, and those who already had their 30 days, 30 more were added. The ones that hadn't started yet were 60 days from the beginning. And as Olof said, if new requests -- in case new requests would come in, there would again be a 60 days' notification period for governments to react.

I hope that clarifies the question.

Netherlands, please.

NETHERLANDS:

Yes, thank you, Chairman.

What may be a suggestion is to put both issues in a kind of issues paper by the secretariat, because we hear a lot of information. It's, I think -- and we hear a lot of about different processes for the names and for the two-letter codes.

I think it would be very much -- it's saving also time for discussion if we put it all on very short briefing paper, and then we don't have any misunderstandings anymore, I hope.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Netherlands. We note it. And there has already been some briefings, and they will be -- secretariat will update them and circulate them again in the near future.

Thank you.

Other comments? Questions?

If this is not the case, then I think we can end today's first afternoon.

Yeah, yeah, yeah. We forget about five times to say two things that -- Now, thank you for flagging two things. One is to remind you to sign on the sheets that have been circulating and the ones that are on the walls in order to get the prize that you're offered for getting yourself on the record as participating at this meeting. And the other thing is -- and maybe, Tracey, would you want to come up and present this? We have received an invitation that some GAC members would be available for making short videos about why they are participating in the GAC, and so on and so forth. This is in line with the open forum or is one of the elements that is linked to the open forum in terms of means of communicating to others, non-GAC members but also other parts of the ICANN constituency, what the GAC is about and why members in the GAC participate in the GAC, but I give the floor to Tracey for the details.

Thank you.

TRACEY HIND:

Thank you, Chair.

Yes. Out of the GAC open forum discussion last year in December 2014, it was agreed and it was one of the recommendations that a range of GAC members do a short video, and it is a short video, and that that video be facilitated by -- be videoed by a ICANN professional communications person who would be asking questions to the GAC

member. The GAC member would be videoed, and that video would be placed on the ICANN Web site.

The questions or the subject matter that they want to talk about is basically as a GAC member, what is it that you do to prepare for these meetings? How do you consult with your various stakeholders within your governments where you come from, and how do you come to these forums able to participate fully on behalf of your government and get value out of them?

Secondly, how does your government perceive the value that they get out of the GAC and the public-policy contributions that the GAC makes. So how does your government perceive that, and why is it that the GAC process is of value to your government?

And thirdly, once you're here as a GAC member, what is it that you do to get the most out of the meetings? And this latter part will help newcomers, in particular, new members.

So those are the three questions that the interviewer will be asking you; that it's not things you won't know, and do you think -- you can have some time to think about it now. ICANN have asked me whether or not they -- They're aware that we've got early starts. They've asked me whether or not they can film people Tuesday morning, Wednesday morning, potentially Thursday morning, and they're looking for up to five volunteers, ideally from diverse regional backgrounds, genders, languages. You are able to undertake the interview in your national language, not just in English, so don't be put off if you're not a fluent English speaker.

And so what I would really like to do is ask if you would like to be part of these videos, which is all about the value that GAC brings to ICANN and the value that GAC brings to national governments, and will go up on the ICANN Web site, but only if you are happy with it. If you participate, be please confident that if you don't like the video and you don't like what's on it or your government has not given permission for that information to go up, it won't go up on the Web site until you do give that permission.

But if you would like to be part of that process, could you please email the GAC secretariat expressing your willingness to do so such that I can get in contact with you and liaise with ICANN. And, yeah, the first five people that are keen to do it and that are able to participate in a way that they're confident that the government is okay for them to do so, we will arrange for some videos.

I think that's all I've got to say on the matter. Have I missed anything?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Tracey.

Questions? Comments?

And of course -- Yes, U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Sorry, just a quick question, Tracey. Maybe you indicated it. It's quite brief, this video interview, is it? Like three minutes, four minutes, five minutes?

TRACEY HIND: Yes, it is. It is only going to be a short five-minute video. The filming time will probably take about 15 minutes elapsed time.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Other questions?

If there are no more questions, then volunteers?

Make yourself noticed to Tracey. It would be good -- What was the number? Something like five?

TRACEY HIND: Five interviews.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So if we get 20, we'll start an auction. If we only get two or three, then we start to think about other incentives. So, yeah. Feel free to.

With that, I would like to give the floor -- wait a second -- to Tom first and then to Olga for a few announcements.

Yes, Tom, please, go ahead.

TOM DALE: Thank you, Thomas.

I really do hesitate to introduce the term online voting again after the discussion earlier this afternoon, but I have to do so in a context that is not related to GAC procedures.

The major registry provider AfiliAs, which you may be aware of, did want to make a short presentation to the GAC concerning some new gTLDs, which I'll talk about in a moment, but we could not find time in the agenda. However, they have offered to provide some information tomorrow to interested GAC members about what they're doing.

AfiliAs is one of the backers of a new registry arrangement which is introducing the new top-level domain names .VOTE and .VOTO. That's .VOTE and .VOTO. They are interested in using country names within those two domains, .VOTE and .VOTO. They are looking to introduce protections to help governments, elected officials, candidates, and organizations get information to voters, such as voter registration information, candidate materials and referendums and things like that. They have a number of existing governments as customers, and they would like to explain their plans to any GAC member who may be interested.

If you are interested in asking AfiliAs questions about .VOTE and .VOTO, they will be outside tomorrow in the area outside the room with an information table, I think, and they'd be happy to answer, in the breaks, any questions that GAC members might have, if you're interested in .VOTE and .VOTO and the sort of procedures that they have in mind for dealing with governments as users of those domains.

The second point briefly is just to review before the end of the day what I understand to be the issues for inclusion in the communique so far. Those issues are firstly in relation to the operating principles, I'm not sure that the GAC may wish to include its decision to make the change for up to five vice chairs. It can be included. Of course it's not advice. It's just a statement of fact. So at the moment I would propose to include that as a fact that the GAC has agreed. I'm fairly sure that there's no point in the GAC including the fact that it has not agreed to make any changes, so we won't draft that.

Secondly, from the session on safeguards, at the moment that will have to await discussions with the Board, but my understanding is that text will begin to be prepared and will take account of the drafting that was done in the draft reply prepared by Thomas to the Board and also the more recent letter from the Board concerning antidiscrimination provisions. So some sort of text clearly is intended to be included in the communique. At this stage, my understanding is the United States and the European Commission will be working on that further in preparation for the meeting with the board, but of course that's not until Wednesday. So at the moment, it's a marker for inclusion of some text on safeguards.

In regard to IGOs, the GAC indicated that wording about the GAC continuing to work on resolving the differences between the GNSO and GAC advice is to be noted in the communique, and my understanding is that the OECD on behalf of other IGOs is working on some text for that.

In relation to country names at the second level, my understanding would be that the discussion this afternoon has been mainly about implementation matters, so I'm not sure that there is material for inclusion in the communique, but I'd be happy to take any further feedback on that.

At the end of today, that's my understanding of issues for inclusion at the moment. If there's any corrections, please let me know.

Thank you, Thomas.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Tom. And actually, just one word about the offer by Afiliis. That's linked to the discussion that we just had on the country and territory names on second level. It's also an offer for them to exchange experience about the use, and so on and so forth.

TOM DALE:

Yeah.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

So this is not a promotional exercise. It's an exercise to contribute to that discussion that we've had.

And -- Yeah, about the communique, it actually raised a good point. We didn't discuss whether or not something should be reflected about our work on the list. What we may do -- It's just thinking out loud. What we may do is include an informative line that we are working on

this list, that there is progress on this list, and that we may think about introducing the deadline of the 15th of July for information of the others in the communique, if you wish to do so.

Olof?

OLOF NORDLING:

Oh, just very, very minor comment, but of course there are two parts to the communique. There's the advice to the Board, and I doubt that what we have right now regarding country names would amount to anything like advice to the Board, but it can certainly be mentioned in the other parts of the communique as something that has transpired in Buenos Aires.

Thanks.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. So would you agree that we have one or two lines on this in the informational part? Not in the advice to the Board. In the informational part of the communique.

I don't see any objection, so we'll -- that will be in the draft that you will see.

Okay. With this, let me hand over to Olga -- Ah, U.K.

Sorry, Olga.

UNITED KINGDOM: Sorry, Chair. I just want to announce something for Commonwealth colleagues. Perhaps after Olga, then, unless you want me to do it now?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Since you have the floor, go ahead.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you. I just wanted to inform GAC colleagues representing Commonwealth member states that I'm convening a short meeting on Tuesday at 12:30 till about 1:00. It's an open meeting so anybody can actually sit in, but it's intended for the Commonwealth members to get an update on this year's cybersecurity conference, Commonwealth cybersecurity conference in London, the Commonwealth Cybersecurity Initiative. Thirdly, two Commonwealth events at the IGF in Joao Pessoa in November in Brazil. Further up the coast, Brazil. And also, as a sort of open session, really, for Commonwealth colleagues to reflect on this week's GAC agenda.

So I think I can use this room at 12:30 after the GAC plenary has finished be. I'm all right, Tom? If we just stay here for half an hour on Tuesday at the lunch break? Maybe we need confirmation of that. But as I say, it's an opportunity for Commonwealth colleagues to get together.

The Commonwealth telecomms organization would normally chair but they're not able to make this meeting. They're observers to the GAC. They're not able to come so I'm chairing on their behalf.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. And Julia has raised her thumb, so if we get this right, you have the room here for that half hour.

Thank you.

Olga, floor is yours.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Thomas.

And this morning I sent you an invitation by the federal authority of ICTs of Argentina, recently created. We are inviting all GAC members, observers, and of course the staff to a cocktail in the ministry -- in one of the buildings of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs which is a historic building. It's Palacio San Martin. It's a short distance from here. You're all kindly invited. We hope you can join us this Tuesday, 7:00 p.m. until 9:30 p.m. So you are kindly invited to that. But for that, I need your confirmation and your ID number. So I will be bothering you this night and tomorrow to make my list. Some of you have already sent it to me, so that's fine. I have my previous list. I have like 20 names and IDs, but I have to make it more complete because it's a building that is usually needed by the President and by other ministers, so there are some security measures that we have to take care of.

So you're kindly invited, and I hope that you can join us on Tuesday.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Olga.

Unless somebody wants to make other announcement or ask questions or make comments, we would stop for today and then use the time to prepare for tomorrow. Those who haven't already learned the draft proposal by heart, please look into this until 9:30 -- 7:30 where we will meet, hopefully, all of you in that small house over there.

Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]