

---

HYDERABAD – GAC meeting with the ICANN Board  
Monday, November 07, 2016 – 13:45 to 15:00 IST  
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:            So with this, I think we can and have to move to our meeting with the board, which is also a little bit squeezed time-wise this time.

So, please, members of the board, come up as there are as many seats as there are here, and take your seats so that we can start.

Well, actually, like -- it looks like there are women on the ICANN board, just to clarify that point, in case that wasn't clear.

So, I don't know, maybe we just have a quick round of introduction, at least so that you know the names of the persons on the table.

So also maybe for new GAC members that are not familiar, if just everybody would say his or her name in five seconds so that we know who we are, starting with Bruce on the right side.

Thank you.

BRUCE TONKIN:            Bruce Tonkin.

---

*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.*

---

BECKY BURR:                    Becky Burr.

CHERINE CHALABY:            Cherine Chalaby.

STEVE CROCKER:                Steve Crocker.

MARKUS KUMMER:               Markus Kummer.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:                Chris Disspain.

GORAN MARBY:                  Goran Marby.

STEVE CROCKER:                Let me note that Bruce and Becky occupy one seat. Bruce is a day away from disappearing and Becky's a day away from being officially seated in that same seat.

But we treat them all the same.

---

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Maybe, just quickly, if the other board members could say their name.

STEVE CROCKER: Maarten, do you want to lead off?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Maarten Botterman, incoming.

RAM MOHAN: Ram Mohan.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Asha Hemrajani.

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: Lousewies van der Laan.

STEVE CROCKER: And a couple more.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: They're hiding over there.

---

STEVE CROCKER: Ron Da Silva, Akinori, Jonne, and Lito.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And Rinalia and Jonne.

STEVE CROCKER: Oh, Rinalia's hiding in there, too.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. We have circulated draft proposed agenda some time ago, and we have spent some time right before this short lunch break to revise it in the light of the last few weeks and of our discussions so far. So we shared it with you just about a half an hour ago, but it's on the screen. It's a proposal to discuss from our side these issues.

We are aware that there have been -- two questions have been posed to us by the board, which is something that we appreciate, because this is the first time that a request also comes from the board in terms of what you would like to get from us.

So I don't know if maybe somebody from the Board could quickly refer to these questions and give a little bit of an explanation of the background. What are you trying to -- because we looked at them before, but that we understand

---

correctly what you're trying to hear from us. I don't know whether Goran or who will, Steve, will be in a position to explain that.

STEVE CROCKER:

I think I want Chris speak to most of these, but you mentioned that we're a little squeezed for time, and maybe there are some of these that we could discuss in more depth and others that we can be kind of short about. We have a resolution on our agenda for the board meeting tomorrow morning, if I can remember what day is what here. I think Tuesday. Tuesday, good.

That applies to the two-character country codes at the second level. I got that wrong the last time I tried to address it.

And so I don't -- I don't want to try to tell you exactly what it says because it's all laid out, but I'd like to sort of not discuss that because it will be done tomorrow and you'll all see it.

And on the .WEB, I'm not sure that it's appropriate -- I don't know what one would say here, but it's not exactly in litigation, or maybe it is. There's multiple things going on. But I think our preference would be not to comment on it.

---

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Actually, I was referring to the questions that we received that were sent to the GAC. There were two. One was -- I don't have them in front of me right now, but from out of my memory, one was related to transition and what the GAC thinks it needs so that it works for us. That was one question. And the second one was related to what needs to be done in order to --

STEVE CROCKER: Yes.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: -- improve confidence and trust in each other, in the model, and so on and so forth. These were the two questions.

But what we can do for the sake of time, what we discussed, is we can take these as cross-cutting questions that we should take into account when we go through these so that we refer to - - to what we need in terms of follow-up of transition and in terms of strengthening trust and confidence when you go through these things, because there are some elements that of course --

STEVE CROCKER: Excellent.

---

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: -- are cross-cutting.

So if that's okay. If you allow me, I'll just make a quick introduction to each of them and then we will have discussion.

Starting with the first one, this is a rather simple and obvious thing. We have taken note of your response on our question when the GAC would receive the reply to the advice in the Helsinki communique. And we note, and of course understand, that you have had some very important, fundamental, and urgent issues to spend your time on in the past few months.

I just want to let you know that this is problematic in the sense that if we are to give you advice on issues of public policy and then we don't hear from you whether the advice has been accepted and maybe, ideally, how you plan to implement it or whether the advice has been rejected, but we see things moving on, things progressing without this important element as we think in a multistakeholder model -- and one example, we'll come to that later with the two-character codes, country codes, where we gave advice, and we don't know, has it been rejected or has it been accepted. And there will be a decision tomorrow that may somehow be related or not to the GAC advice.

We have to find ways that these things work, also time-wise, because otherwise we see it very problematic that we can actually -- and you -- we can both live up to our functions. So

---

that's basically an urge that we may try to find out tentative timelines for responding to each other. And whenever there's a reason that this is not possible, that we inform each other, but that we have some kind of clear expectation on the timing.

We know that everything is important, but I think the government -- and urgent, but the governments -- communication with governments should not be perceived as on a lower level of priority than other things that get done in time while ours is not.

So I'm just signaling to you that I think this is something that we should find ways to improve.

I don't know whether somebody wants to comment on this or whether we can just take note and go on to the next item.

STEVE CROCKER: Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Just, first of all, to apologize. We should have responded. The reasons have been explained, and apology for that.

We will get back to you on it as soon as possible. It is a priority.

---

CHERINE CHALABY: Yeah, can I just add to this? Thomas, as you know, when we had the NGPC, our entire focus during that time was really responding to GAC advice, and we had a total focus on that and it's top priority for us. This is, I hope, is an exception, and we apologize for that, so please take it as such; not that GAC advice is not a top priority.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Cherine, be careful what you say. If you say the NGPC was mainly focusing on GAC, I'm not sure whether others would like that, but I get your point, of course. Jokes aside.

I think we can move to the next one, which is something that is popping up in different ways more and more all over the place. And I think at least from the GAC side, we would like to spend maybe a little bit of time on this one, which is discussion on the mutual understanding or a common -- ideally common understanding of the respective roles of the Board and the GAC with regard to, also, expectations and ways to work together. And we have had -- witnessed various examples, and some of them are actually listed below, where some of the challenges that we now face may be, to some extent, at least, be based on different understandings of roles and procedures and actually powers or not powers, or functions or not functions of the different parts, to start from our side, is that according to the

---

bylaws, it is the role of the GAC to advise the Board on matters, public-policy issues, matters related to law, international law, national law that are relevant for governments. That governments have a duty also towards their citizens and inhabitants and businesses to signal issues in that regard. And that the advice is directed to the Board. And the Board would then respond to -- to the GAC whether or not it has accepted the advice or not, and how to implement or, if not, what to do, how to meet and see to find a mutually acceptable solution.

Now the question is many times I realize that the expectations from the GAC side about what the Board can do is not hundred percent identical to what the Board tells us that they can do in terms of things like the Board -- in the Board's perception, the Board doesn't do policy, but this is the supporting organizations that do the policy. And in case that something is conflicting, what are the procedures or what are not the procedures.

But formally, in the -- according to the ICANN bylaws, you are our partner in the sense that we address the advice to you, like does the SSAC and the ALAC and others. And we then have to count on you to basically take the elements of -- of the recommendations that you get from the policy development, match them with the expectations and the advice of the GAC and see to what extent you, as a decision -- final decision-maker in this organization, think that what is, in the end, in the global

---

public interest, to quote that famous or make reference to that famous word that is about ten times in the bylaws.

So this is the understanding from the GAC side. And of course we try to engage with all the other elements and parts and constituencies and subconstituencies to the extent that our schedules, our resources and theirs allow. But our understanding is that this is the key channel, the formal channel, that we have. And sometimes we -- we realize that our expectations do not seem to have been the ones that the other sides, the addressees of the advice, have when they reply. And also question about how to interpret GAC advice, and so on and so forth. How to understand GAC advice, which from the nature of the GAC's understanding of its role is to give public-policy advice on a rather general public-policy level, according to what has agreed in U.N. -- in the U.N. summit that I won't go into detail, is that we should refrain from technical and operational detail. Leave these to the private sector. Let parts of this organization. But expect that we get a shared understanding of the public-policy issues that are at stake, and then we -- basically our expectation would be to hear from you how you would address these public-policy issues in your -- with your leadership, in your responsibility in the ICANN organization.

So I'll stop here, but I think we've had this discussion started already, so I'm building on some discussions already. But I think

---

it would be good to hear from you how you experience this, also in the light of the recent discussions on some issues that keep popping up for years and we do not seem to be able to constructively move ahead and keep turning in circles and basically identifying the elements that would need to be developed in order to break these circles.

Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you. We're going to -- We have a line-up of in-depth response for you. And the first batter, as it were, is the expendable Bruce Tonkin. If he screws up, we'll let him go.

BRUCE TONKIN:

Yeah, thank you, Steve. And I share the frustration, I guess, with the chair of the GAC and the members of the GAC that we do seem to have some issues that just go round and round in circles and don't get resolved.

What I'd recommend in those situations is to actually come back to the purpose and mission of ICANN and tie it back to that, and tie it back to principles, and then try and move back into the issue.

---

So I think if I -- if I look at this particular topic of two-character country names, before we start talking about what protections there is reflecting back on the mission. So the mission of ICANN is to ensure the secure and stable operation of the Internet's identifier systems. So certainly anything we do, we want to make sure it protects the security of the system, and that we protect end users in the use of that system.

The other thing that's a key commitment that we have made in our bylaws is that in carrying out these activities of managing the Internet's identifier systems, that these activities need to conform with relevant principles of international law and international conventions and applicable local law.

So I think that's -- you know, that really frames how we should have a debate about a topic.

And then another comment I would make about strings. It's interesting, we have far less discussion about IP numbers because, really, people don't care too much about whether there's another six or seven or in what order the number appears in the IP address. But naturally when we're talking about strings, they have semantic meaning, and people have a lot more buy-in, if you like, around liking the particular string of characters that refers to them.

---

But I think if we start at the principle level, there is no exclusive ownership of any string of characters, whether it's one character, two characters, or 63 characters. I'm not aware of any law or convention that gives anyone exclusive access to a set of characters globally.

There are protections to strings of characters that are embedded in law for specific purposes. So, for example, Red Cross is a string of characters. There's an international treaty that relates to -- that incorporates protection around the use of the term Red Cross, particularly in the situations of war and other situations. And that international treaty is then encapsulated in international law, and from that international law ICANN can then take that and say what's the appropriate -- how do we comply with that national law.

To give examples of particular country codes and the many uses, another general principle is that the shorter the string or the characters, the more uses it has. So one character has far more uses than two characters, which has far more uses than three characters. And when you get into a 63 character word, then it's probably the number of uses becomes much narrower. So naturally when we're talking about two characters, people are far more sensitive because that applies to many uses. And I'll give a specific example.

---

I heard -- If we look at NG which is the country code for Nigeria, NG is also a very common name in, certainly, Asia and Australasia. In fact, if you go to the website ng.com.au, you'll see on the website it says that's our family name and we welcome communication from people that share that same family name, which I believe is in the many millions of people.

So they -- If your name is -- has the name Ng, I'm sure you feel like you own the name, but there's many other people called Ng as well, so it's not exclusive.

So I think those are the principles I'd like to just be clear on. We're looking at the security and stability of the identifiers, we're obeying national law. Nobody for any string has exclusive access, but what we want to make sure we do is avoid confusion. So we don't want a person to be confused into thinking a particular website could be used in terms of a phishing attack. And I'll give a specific example.

There is a new top-level domain string called VISA, V-I-S-A, which is a name of a company in the U.S. that provides credit cards.

Now, also the term -- the string VISA has a meaning in the context of travel documents for access to different countries. And clearly if you had a string that was ng.visa and that site was set up to collect the credentials or personal information of people and being -- deceiving people into come to ng.visa, it's

---

the official government site, put in your personal information, that would be something that we'd want to prevent because that's clearly something that would impact consumers.

So we want protections around the use of strings and the avoidance of confusion, but at the same time, there's nothing wrong with a string like ng.com.au when it's talking about the surname or family name of the people called Ng.

So just start at the principles and work down when we talk about these problems.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you, Bruce. That was extremely helpful.

I think there's another level of the -- in which to understand the question, which is a more general one. But let me -- let me ask Markus to respond and then maybe we'll come back.

MARKUS KUMMER:

Yes, and thank you. And we had, yesterday, part of that discussion at the BGRI meeting with the GAC. And one of our conclusions was we sometimes don't speak the same language, and that's why it's important, actually, to understand what we mean. And the BGRI has made an effort towards understanding better what actually GAC advice means, and at the very practical

---

level, we held a first call, actually having -- between the Board and the GAC, trying to find that out. However, we concluded yesterday there is room for improvement. And I think two major comments. We should not go into substance when we have this kind of call but really limit ourselves to question: What do you mean when you say this?

And the other concrete suggestion that came out is maybe it would be helpful if the Board sends out questions in advance of the call in order to prepare the call.

But we agreed to hold another call after this meeting, and then, hopefully, we give the advice in time ahead of -- give our response to the GAC advice ahead of time for the Copenhagen meeting.

STEVE CROCKER:

I listened to your question, Thomas, and you emphasized that the formal relationship is between the GAC and the Board. I was wondering if what you were also including in that was to limit what happens when advice comes to the Board. And I essentially suggest that the Board ought to sort of sit in a session, make a decision, and get back to you as opposed to reaching out to people in the organization or into the relevant supporting organizations or advisory committees, and so forth.

---

One of the -- one of the issues from the Board point of view is that although we have very capable people with lots of experience, we're not constituted as a primary subject matter expert. And if we operate in that mode, then that eliminates the recourse process that the Board is fundamentally constituted to do.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Steve.

I think we -- we obviously haven't consulted the answer to this question, but from I understand -- with the GAC, but what I understand from our side is definitely not the idea that you need to talk to us exclusively on our advice because that's what we have in the bylaws.

Of course any communication is not only welcome but is -- is improving the result, like what you say. And so this is why we, on all papers that you receive from us, we commit to engaging at an early stage, at the earliest stage possible with everybody. And of course we assume that everybody else does the same.

And, for instance, we appreciate the papers that are coming from the GNSO for a few meetings now, with their responses to GAC advice, because that helps us understand how they read what -- or they understand and read and react to, from their

---

point of view, to what we think is public policy. And we get some sense of how they consider -- would consider implementation, about how they consider contributing to this.

So this is -- in the end, every communication helps us to better understand each other. Of course our resources is limited and we can't have 8 million people talking to 8 million people 24 hours a day so we need to have some channels, but it definitely is not -- It was rather a request to see how do you see this particular channel that we have in the bylaws in the whole set of communication channels in ICANN, not by -- but clearly not being the intention to say this is the only one we have and -- or we should have.

No. Just to be very, very clear on this point.

STEVE CROCKER: Let me call on Cherine, and perhaps I'll come back.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thanks, Steve. So, Thomas, it is absolutely our responsibility, the Board, to respond to GAC advice. And as you know, that when the advice is -- is not against a policy that has come up -- for example, from the GNSO -- it is easier to answer straight away.

---

What we don't want to do is also be in the position of actually creating our own policy at the Board. So when the situation comes and we receive an advice that is inconsistent with a PDP or something else, it is our responsibility, a), to communicate clear with you, but also due our due diligence and understand where the gaps are. And that takes -- takes a while. It's not as easy when the Board finds itself in that middle position.

So what we don't want to do is actually be in the position of changing a policy but we need to understand the advice fully and connect and do our due diligence and come back on that. But it is our responsibility to come back to you, definitely.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I think we fully agree.

The problem is, of course, as you say, things take time. But then when we realize the decision are taken at a moment where there hasn't even been time to respond to an advice from us, not even a case that was rejected to go into a procedure to find a mutually accepted solution, we acknowledge that discussing and exchange with the GAC takes time. But everything else should also take the time that it needs to come up with a solution.

---

But maybe I'll just give the floor to one or two GAC members to express their views. That is not only me that is talking, because that actually hasn't been the idea.

I see Iran and then Nigeria, if I'm right.

Thank you.

IRAN:

Thank you, Chairman.

You mentioned a practical case, then advice of the GAC comes to the Board, and on that issue there is already a PDP which may not be consistent with the advice, or advice may not be consistent of that PDP. So this is the problem.

Now, how to resolve the problem? There are two ways to resolve the problem. The first way is that, maybe other GAC members do not agree with me but this is my view, that GAC should be involved from the very beginning in the development of the PDP and inject its ideas, problems, difficulties in order that PDP, when it is developed, go into the first public comment, include that, and if it goes to the second public comment, include that. Therefore, the instances that this problem will appear will be reduced. This is one case.

---

Second case is the case that we have. IGO and PDP. We heard from the two vice chair of the NGSO that we don't change our PDP unless it is proved that our PDP is wrong. And what we can do at this stage?

He says that there is a mechanism to trigger the revision or the review of the PDP. Who should take that mechanism? They say that only because of that, either GAC or Board prove that our PDP is wrong. Is it a proper course of action? Or for this ad hoc issue you have to find another solution to see what is possible?

I don't think that this is a proper action, you go and prove that they are wrong or we are wrong. I think it doesn't solve the problem. We should see what is possible. And the only possibility, still, it is our view, Iranian view, that you get together with GAC and the GNSO in a tripartite meeting and try to resolve the issue in a matter that we don't have it that this in this case. But the main issue that in future GAC should be involved more and more in the preparation and development of PDP is an important element. We reduce this matter. But when we are stuck in somewhere like this, we have two years waiting with IGO, every meeting of the government, and in ITU, (indiscernible) Council and so on, so forth, or meeting with Tarek, everybody says IGO, IGO, IGO.

---

So we have to find something. Something without confrontations.

We saw a little bit a radical position from our GNSO colleagues which may be right or may be not be right. But we don't want any confrontation. We want solutions. And this time it is up to the Board to call both of them in a manner, tripartite, not you to act as a judge but a facilitator to resolve this problem.

Thank you.

BRUCE TONKIN:

Thank you very much for that suggestion.

In fact, we just received the same suggestion from the GNSO council. So those are completely aligned. They had suggested that they would like to have constructive sessions that they could talk between the GAC and the GNSO on such matters. And certainly asking for the board to support the setting up and scheduling of that type of activity.

So the GNSO completely agrees with you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, that's good news.

---

CHERINE CHALABY: Kavouss, on the two points you mentioned, we are aligned, I think. And I think the right way is a collaborative approach that you mentioned. That's the right way to do it. It's unfortunate that it's been so long. But we will learn together. And I think as Bruce said, the GNSO made similar suggestions. So I think we will figure out -- a way out of getting that -- that tripartite arrangement done.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Before I give the floor to Nigeria, just one word. Again, I said everybody agrees that early engagement of the GAC is useful. But this only works if the workload is digestible. And there we again on this track of discussion in -- James, the chair of the GNSO, tells me it's even impossible for some part of the GNSO to follow with the workload. And they are not the only ones. We have to deal with other issues, and they have to deal with other issues. So being inclusive also means giving people the chance to participate and not just say everybody's invited, but to actually make it physically or time-wise possible to participate.

The will of the GAC is there to participate. But our resources are, like everybody else's, limited. I just wanted to make that point.

---

Nigeria, please.

NIGERIA:

Thank you very much. I totally agree with what my Iranian colleague stated.

I would just like to add that dot NG right now is in use, and anywhere you see dot NG, you know is for Nigeria. So we'd just like to say that it should be reserved for us at the first and second level. And at the same time, before it can be used, we feel we should be contacted first before it should be delegated to any other person or country.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you.

I think we have this as a third item. So please take note. And I think we will try to deal with the two character codes in a few minutes separately.

U.K., you wanted to say something, Mark.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Yes. Thank you, Thomas. And welcome to the board and everybody who's here.

---

Just on this first issue of moving to more transversal working so that we're not in silos, you know, the GAC intervening at a late stage after policy development has taken place, we are now moving to a modality which means that the GAC can work with the GNSO from the earlier stages on policy development.

So looking ahead, we're going to obviate the incidents of this kind of disconnect, if you like, and dysfunctionality within the ICANN community, whereby you get GNSO position firmly developed, and the GAC advice not coinciding with that, as we now are in.

But in the current situation, you've got GAC advice and a disconnect with GNSO policy development outcome. And I think we really look to the board to provide direction on resolving that. If we can have joint discussions, three-way discussions -- and we've had that in the case of the Red Cross, Red Crescent, and Red Crystal issues, GAC, GNSO, board representatives on the same call -- that's -- that does happen, and that's good. That's -- it achieves shared understanding. But when there's a fundamental problem of reconciling positions, we look to the board. That's a perfectly legitimate functionality of the board, to resolve that situation through providing direction and guidance.

Thank you.

---

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah, I think, Mark, that's perfectly reasonable. And we, again, I think from the board's perspective, what we can help is set up the right forum and facilitate it properly. And one of those things is making sure that the topic's framed properly, and that picking up on your point, Thomas, that there's an appropriate briefing paper that's available some weeks before such a meeting that's not 100 pages, that's relatively short, a few pages that clearly sets out why this issue is in scope of ICANN, what the boundaries of the issue are, what the positions are of the two sides, and help facilitate that discussion.

I want to be careful that the board doesn't see its role of try to pick a winner. But we can certainly help in scheduling the time and facilitating the discussion and making sure the discussion is focused on what's within, you know, the mission of ICANN.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Looking at the time, I think it's -- it would be time to move on. I think it was important to continue this discussion that is not finalized, of course, the BGRI, the Board-GAC Working Group on dealing with advice, is continuing. We also look forward to see where you are with the register of advice that allows you to more

---

systematically process and track the processing of the advice. This is an important technical element that may be a useful tool, such as to place that again, maybe if you do it sooner rather than later have some update on that one.

We have already started or heard some elements from Nigeria and from others about the two-character code issue. And I just - as I said, one of the elements that we have given advice to the board since Los Angeles 2014, so it's actually exactly two years. And it's difficult for us to understand the -- as I said, the logic that if we give advice that hasn't been answered, so we don't know whether it has accepted, and if so, how it's going to be implemented or rejected. And then we understand that there's a decision to be made on this without -- somehow doesn't really -- the logic of this proceeding is a little bit difficult for us to understand.

But maybe let me give the floor to one or two more GAC members so that we hear, like, different kinds of flavors of that feeling, not just my aggregation of that feeling.

I see Spain and Iran and the E.U. Commission.

Thank you very much.

Spain, please go to the next microphone. Thank you.

---

SPAIN:

Thank you, Chair.

I just want to say briefly that I mentioned in my comments to the public comment period on the measures proposed to mitigate the risk of confusion that the board should synchronize the assessment of GAC advice with the evaluation of the mitigation criteria to avoid the situation in which the board takes decision on the proposed measures before addressing GAC advice.

I don't know whether the board has acted this way or not, because we don't know the content of the resolution that you are going to take tomorrow. But in any case, I think that maybe the timing has not been very fortunate by deciding on both things the same day.

On the other side, we are now in a new framework in which the bylaws have enriched the content of article 12 on GAC advice. And I think that although the GAC advice on this issue is previous to the enactment of the new bylaws, the new bylaws apply to the decision made on GAC advice. So the requirements on the (indiscernible) you need to read GAC advice, in case you reject it. And the rationale, you have to give, and also they need to engage in a good-faith consultation in case you don't accept that advice, could apply.

And, finally, I would like to say that I made a quick search on the Internet about the name dot NG, dot COM, dot AU, and it

---

happens to belong to a company named Fung Shin (phonetic) PTY Limited, based in Australia.

And dot COM, dot AU, it's a second-level domain for commercial entities in Australia.

I don't see any "N" or any "G" in the name of this company. Fan Shin PTI (phonetic) Limited.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. Iran, and then European Commission.

We have to be -- try to make brief statements, because otherwise, we will not be able to finish all the issues. Although the last ones are shorter ones. So don't worry.

But we have to, nevertheless, try and be brief.

Iran, briefly.

IRAN:

Thank you, Thomas.

As Bruce mentioned, like spectrum and orbital positions, the two letter or three letter, there is no permanent ownership for anybody. However, there should be some sort of arrangement that the people be not affected by that. We should take

---

practical approach. Objection that we don't want to use may not be practical approach. We should go as we have specified.

Some group of countries, they have no problem at all. The announcement will be made. Even they don't need 60 days. They have no problem that their country code name to be used at second level. So far, so good.

Other country, they said that, yes, they may agree, but they required a specific agreement. If you put that in the resolutions, that countries who specify that, in order to allow for the delegation or use of the country code at the second level, they should negotiate with those country and having the specific agreement or explicit agreement with that countries, I'm sure that people would be logical and nobody need to -- we should block anybody, we should work together. But we don't want to have this issue of tacit agreement. Many developing country, unfortunately, because of resources, they miss that 60 days, and their lack of reply will constitute agreement, which they don't like that.

So please, kindly, accept this explicit agreement and put it somewhere. I don't it is harm. It is in many other constitution, convention, and many other things for use, such as use of the spectrum. And orbital has the same thing. We have implicit agreement; we have explicit agreement.

---

Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: Is Cyrus here?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Until he comes up, let's take the European Union as well. And then we hope to wrap up this issue and go to the next one as well. So European Commission. Sorry. European Commission.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: It's okay, as I have said before, we're both. Two for the price of one here.

Thank you very much. I just wanted to make a proposal. And it combines the question that you put to us with the issue that we're raising here. And that really is, in this particular case, where we have a board resolution which is arriving tomorrow, none of us know what's in it, and we have prior GAC advice on it, would it not be useful in our augmented accountability environment to have more transparency about what the content of such resolutions might be? There must be ways and means of giving advance notice or being more open about what kind of implications there will be. We can only presume that the board, in its wisdom, will take into account all the GAC advice that's

---

been made. But what we would like to avoid, of course -- and I'm sure you would like to avoid it as well -- is that we have different positions from different groups, such as we have in the case of IGO, and then the board is put in a difficult position, which you've already mentioned.

So I just try to package it in one future, optimistic, all working together in the bottom-up, multistakeholder environment that we have.

Thanks.

STEVE CROCKER:

Understood.

I'm a little uncertain -- which I shouldn't be -- as to what the timing is for the posting of the resolutions compared to when we have a meeting about them. The board gets them in advance so that we can read them.

Is somebody from board operations here?

Cyrus is there, but -- or legal?

Have we posted the resolutions for tomorrow?

The agenda?

---

UNKNWON SPEAKER: Lisa says they're posted almost immediately after the board adopts them.

STEVE CROCKER: But not before?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No.

STEVE CROCKER: That's an interesting thing.

We'll visit that -- we'll -- E.U., we'll revisit that.

Cyrus, would you like to respond to the other aspects?

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you, Steve. And thank you, distinguished colleagues from the GAC.

We have been, of course, receiving advice from the GAC on this topic, since you mentioned, I think, Thomas, the Los Angeles meeting two years ago to date. We believe that actually the board has accepted all of the advice that we've received on this topic. And on the staff side, we have actually followed through in terms of conducting the advice -- following the board's direction to the staff.

---

All the advice that we have received from the GAC on this topic have been predominantly focused on process improvement, and all of which that we've actually pursued and implemented.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you.

I think we have to leave it at that for the time being.

I think the GAC advice is fairly clear. And we, of course, will react in case necessary on whatever the resolution will say.

Kavouss, one more minute on this one, please. Thank you.

IRAN:

One more minute.

In GAC 56, we have changed that advice. And we now two group of countries. So I don't think that we should remain on the two years ago, because that was some sort of misunderstanding, that explicit agreement and tacit agreement. So our latest advice 56 need to be taken into account, distinguished Namazi.

Thank you.

---

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Well, I'm not sure it's changed. It's just spelled out more clearly that some are willing to release things; others want to have at least a notification. But the common thing is that we all want every country to be able to decide themselves on how to do it. And that's nothing new. You can read that in early advices already.

So let's please move on to the next one. Already there we have had some discussions at various earlier stages. And I think we -- given from what I heard from Bruce, we may not have to spend that much time on the IGO, issue of the IGO protection. I think we've had some issues about -- about statements that have been made that have then been clarified. I hope that the, let's say, working out the history of this process is terminated in the sense that there are no more assertions or accusations that are not based on facts and that we can look forward and try and find a solution that is acceptable to all in a process that is acceptable to all, that everybody signs up to, that is not -- that is transparent, that everybody knows who is in, who is not in, and people have access, and the rules of the game are clear to everybody and shared with everybody. This is, I think, the -- the shortcut of all the discussions that we've had so far, at least from my perception. Maybe I give the floor to one or two other GAC members to complement, again, to the flavors of this

---

discussion to, yeah, give you some feeling about what is important for us to move this thing forward on IGO protection.

Or do you think that the way I summed it up -- is everybody so tired of this year-long issue that you don't want to complement?

Okay. Then let me turn to -- Switzerland is jumping in. Thank you.

SWITZERLAND:

Thank you. Thank you, Chair.

And as there seems to be agreement, I would like to express our satisfaction with that.

However, I think that's important to have a very swift time frame to resolve this and to have assurances that whatever compromise is arrived at, it is implemented faithfully by the process that is needed, which we perhaps may not know from the GAC side.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. Any response from the board side on this issue?

STEVE CROCKER:

No. Understood.

---

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Any further comment from anybody in the room, basically, on this issue?

So we agree that we try to be forward-looking, we try to be solution-oriented, taking into account of all the formal procedures, but with the solution in mind and not only the procedures in mind. But the procedures need to be clear, they need to be transparent, and accepted by all. And then we hope to get to a solution fairly quickly.

Okay. Thank you.

The next item is similar, but not the same. It's about the Red Cross that, as has been said, has a different legal basis. But the intentions behind the protection are the same. It's about preventing abuses of these names and acronyms through fraudulent action. And the U.K. has raised a hand. So please go ahead, Mark.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Thomas. Well, both Bruce and I have touched on this earlier on in this meeting. This is one of those long-running

---

issues that's gone round and round in circles, as Bruce was describing earlier.

The call between the GAC, the board, and the GNSO on the 27th of October, which I took part in, indicated there was a shared understanding that this is a distinct issue from the IGOs, one we've just discussed, because of the legal basis under which there is protection for Red Cross, Red Crescent, and Red Crystal identifiers.

So there was a shared understanding. It was very encouraging, after a period of frustration from the GAC side, I feel, about lack of progress and resolving the issue of instituting permanent protection.

So we feel, really, this is the time for the Board to act in a way which is going to finally resolve this issue at this meeting, following -- on the basis of that shared understanding that we understood is now in place. Perhaps -- perhaps it's for the Board, I would suggest, to instruct the GNSO Council that this correction, if you like, in respect to the PD- -- of the policy, the GNSO policy, should now be -- should now be instituted.

So that's what we're really looking for. An instruction to that effect, based on the shared understanding between all the three parties.

---

Grateful reaction to that proposal.

Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, U.K. Any reactions from the Board side?

Based on the signals that we received that this is basically about to be resolved and on good -- is there anything that you can add to that signal that you gave us on that call?

BRUCE TONKIN: I think, Mark, we take on your suggestion. The board meeting is only tomorrow, so I mean, I guess we have a bit of discussion in the board meeting. But I think the principle of what you're suggesting is to at least be able to note that there's this shared understanding of what the law is in that area and to ensure that the GNSO policy takes that law into account.

You know, I think the concept sounds right. I'm not sure whether we'll actually get a chance to resolve it as a resolution tomorrow.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you of the Switzerland.

---

SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Chair. And on this issue related to the Red Cross and the protection of its names, especially of the names of the national Red Cross societies which are not directly linked to the issues related to the IGOs, I would really urge the Board to take swift action on this as this would really send a signal that we can deliver to the community and set a good atmosphere for the discussions on the IGOs.

Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Thomas.

I'm concerned that we might be not understanding each other, and I want to try and clear that up, if I can.

The response of Bruce, I think it was Bruce, to the intervention of Kavouss was in respect to generally we agree that the concept of getting the -- and I'm paraphrasing you, Kavouss -- the parties getting together is sensible and a good idea, but it wasn't intended to be an indication that that's necessarily what would happen in respect to the IGO acronyms.

---

Let me set out what I think the situation is, and then we can discuss it, if you would like to.

The situation is that there is a proposal that was put together by -- and I hate the term but we'll use it -- small group, and we expect that we may get some comment from the GAC on that in your communique.

Meanwhile, over in the GNSO, they are in the process of completing a policy development process in respect to curative rights, and we obviously expect that they will complete that process.

The Board -- the Board took away from a call that was a couple of weeks ago, which some of you were on, a clear indication from both the GNSO and the and the GAC that this may well be a clear case where Board action is required, and the Board accepts that this may well be a case where Board action is required, and on that basis is waiting to see what the outcome of the PDP from the GNSO is and what comments or advice the GAC may have in respect to the proposal from the small group.

That said, we met briefly with -- we met with the GNSO before this meeting and said to the GNSO that we thought it would be an excellent idea if they -- if their group -- the group that has the recommendations in the PDP are -- spoke to the IGOs and the GAC or the individuals concerned and discussed with them the

---

proposals that appear in the GNSO PDP, and any differences that there may be with those that appear under the curative rights headings in the small group proposal.

I think that sets out where we are with this. And the Board stands ready to take action in the event that that is necessary, once the processes that are currently under way are completed.

Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Switzerland.

SWITZERLAND: While we -- Thank you. While we digest the intervention from Chris, I would like to kindly ask the Board to react to my proposal on the Red Cross national society names which are independent of the curative rights protection.

Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I think it would be probably best to take that under advisement, as you'd already said, Steve. We'll talk about that. the point is well made and taken.

---

STEVE CROCKER: The short answer is -- I think you want us to respond here now.  
The answer is no, but we hear you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you.  
  
So we take note and move on to the next item.  
  
Iran. Very briefly.

IRAN: Yes, very briefly, let me share with you our understanding. I don't think that the Board could give any instruction to GNSO nor to the GAC. They could facilitate the discussion between the two, provide is it's (indiscernible), but not give instructions, because both have approved the PDP, the recommendations.  
  
Giving instruction to say what I agreed I now withdraw, so I think rather than say give instruction, we say facilitate the resolution of this matter in order to mutually accepted by both parties.  
  
We provide advice to the Board. Board does not provide instruction to us.  
  
GNSO provides recommendation to the Board. The Board does not provide instruction to the GNSO.

---

So I think we should replace "instruction" by facilitating, providing guidance or maximum -- even guidance is too strong. Providing ways and means -- sorry, ways and means to resolve the problem in a satisfactory manner.

That is the case. I'm sorry, the word "instruction" is not correct.

STEVE CROCKER: I apologize if that wording crept in there. It's not wording we would typically use. We do give instruction, but only to the CEO.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: If I may. If I may. Apologies.

If -- The straight answer to the question about facilitating is -- is, I believe, that -- that if the Board can help in any way, that's fine.

What I was being -- what I was specifically talking about, and I think (indiscernible) was something different, was taking action. And taking action means the Board making a decision.

So as far as facilitation is concerned, we stand ready to help in any way that we can. But in respect to taking action, we will wait for the processes to complete themselves.

---

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you. But I think we all agree that a very important role of the Board is facilitating things. But there may and there have been instances where, at the end of whatever facilitation process, there was no consensus. And then somebody has to take a decision. And maybe we all have to go back to the bylaws, but I think it's the power of the Board to either accept or reject recommendations that come from SOs and/or accept or reject advice that come from ACs.

And in case that they're conflicting and if they are resolved through facilitation, that's the ideal case. If not, then some responsibility and powers lie with the Board. At least that's how I read the bylaws.

But again, we are back on the first thing about mutual understanding of our roles.

I see our CEO and president of ICANN, Mr. Goran Marby, has raised his hand so I'm happy to give him the floor.

GORAN MARBY: Do you have to say my full title when -- every time?

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Actually, it's the first time that I'm doing it, so I had to do it once. I will stop it now, but I had to do it once.

---

GORAN MARBY: Then you have to know, it's president and CEO. It's the other way around. Very important.

[ Laughter ]

And I see the transcript says I'm a dentist, but anyway.

[ Laughter ]

When it comes to facilitation, the Board can instruct me to facilitate any discussions. And I will take it up with the Board to see if they would like to instruct me to do a facilitation between the parties in this one.

But as has been pointed out, it is neither the Board's or the organization's role to instruct or participate in the policy-making process.

Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: And a comment about -- tackled or at least talked about several times, what happens if there is a lack of resolution and things come to the Board, and everybody is expecting the Board it make a decision. And implicit in that model is that we have a binary choice to make. It's either one or the other. We pick one winner and we pick one loser. That's not a productive and

---

sound system. We can do that under some extremes, but our strong preference is to look for more constructive approaches. In which case, the decisions, such as they are, are less crisp but often more useful, trying to find one way or another to bring parties together, find one way or another to dive in and untangle the parts that are shared versus the parts that are different, and find constructive ways to reframe problems, and a number of other things that we all understand are cooperative ways to proceed.

So I do understand the pressure of trying to bring things to the Board and say, "We've gone as far as we can, they've gone as far as they can. You have to make a decision."

It would not be very many times that we did that, if we did that, that you would say, oh, my goodness, this is a broken system, we have to fix this entirely, or go back to the empowered powers of the community -- the powers of the empowered community and say dump the Board and get control of the Board in some other way.

So setting ourselves up -- and by "ourselves," I mean everybody, not just the Board -- for a direct confrontation in which the guarantee is that there's going to be a substantial set of people who have put a lot of work in and find themselves unhappy with the answer is not the best way, in general, for us to proceed.

---

So I like much better the discussion that we had earlier about early engagement, substantive engagement on the topics. And then I also appreciate the comment that, Thomas, you made about what the workload is and the pacing of that and whether or not the pieces all fit together. And that's a sensible discussion to have.

Certainly in the post-transition period, one of the topics that is very important, although it doesn't have a fancy name, is trying to allocate the resources and set the pace for things so that we can all operate in a sensible, comfortable way. We've all been in overload mode, working 7-by-24 for a couple of years. That's unsustainable, and it's unsustainable for the Board, even. But for the -- for the employees and for everybody in the volunteer community.

So all of that is going to take a little while to sort out, but it is very much on all of our minds. And any constructive suggestions are very welcome.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Steve. I think you run and open doors with the GAC in the sense that we all prefer sustainable and accepted solutions rather than quick solution. And so this is -- the full support to the idea and the commitment of the Board to

---

continue to facilitate processes until there is an acceptable solution.

And the thing is that it has just happened that during such processes, decisions have been made, or if not decisions have been made, facts have been created through other side channels or effects that then have basically rendered the resolution process useless or -- So you would -- we would strongly support, I would say, but we would expect and support you to withstand pressure to find other channels to take solutions or take decisions or let decisions and actions be taken.

So -- but I think there's full support for -- for taking the time to finding acceptable solutions.

I don't know, Switzerland, your pen was -- no. Okay.

So I think we have to move on. We have three minutes left. But the other ones are fairly short. The last ones take less than a minute, so we have more than a minute for number 6.

This is basically a question that sums up several items about participation, inclusiveness, diversity, how to operationalize diversity in all constituencies. It's related to the work of Work Stream 2. It's related to our work of our working group on so-called underserved regions. And basically, it's a -- it's a question to the Board how do you try to secure active participation or

---

encourage and foster active participation in the institutions, policy development work from stakeholders, from all stakeholders from all countries worldwide in all processes. What more needs to be done to achieve this?

So maybe a quick reaction on how you try to foster diversity in all processes of ICANN.

STEVE CROCKER: Some of this is in Work Stream 2, yes?

CHERINE CHALABY: Rinalia wants to -- Did you want to make a comment on that?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Cherine.

The Board has been and continues to be supportive of efforts to enhance engagement and diversity at ICANN. The expectation is that that would result in enhancement of participation of stakeholders in policy development.

Now, there are initiatives in place that's oriented towards outreach, engagement, capacity building, and it's all happening across the region with stakeholder engagement, governmental engagement, end user engagement, business/industry engagement.

---

Whether or not it's effective in bringing in participation from stakeholders from all countries remain to be seen, and we need to look at the data.

The last time that I had seen data of participation in policy working groups was through the ATRT2 PDP study. And that was completed in 2013. So I think that we are due for more data gathering moving forward.

In terms of whether the Board is satisfied with what's in place, I don't think that we'll ever be satisfied until we see evidence of robust policy engagement and balanced interest representation.

Thank you.

ARGENTINA:

Thank you. Thank you to the board for being with us this afternoon. I'm Olga Cavalli, representative of Argentina. And thank you, Rinalia, for your comments. I don't have data but I have been participating in ICANN for ten years so far, and what I still see is a gap in between participation and relevant involvement in the development of policy.

And I think there is a gap to work with, and I think that the GAC could play an important role. The GAC representatives in each country with other members of the community, but especially in involving those ministries and areas of the government that are

---

involved in the national policy development to get more engaged within ICANN.

So that's something that the GAC could work with the Board and other areas of ICANN to improve.

Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you. And Sally, Alice, from the African Union Commission, I haven't seen your hand for some time, so please take the floor.

AFRICAN UNION COMMISSION: Thank you very much, chair, and thank you, Board, and thank you, Rinalia, for those comments.

I want to acknowledge that the GAC has a working group that is looking specifically at this challenge, the underserved working group, Underserved Regions Working Group, and yesterday had the first session that's focusing specifically on building the capacity of Asia-Pacific members, which was really successful. And we began to explore some of the reasons and some of the challenges that we see in terms of participation from underserved regions, especially from governments.

We've also been working very actively with the government engagement team, Tarek and his team, and the government

---

stakeholder engagement, and we've developed a work plan that we are hoping that the ICANN Board will actually put resources. And when I say "resource" here, I don't necessarily mean travel support. I think all we want to see is a more sustainable approach to address these challenges. And one of it could be ICANN partnering with other organizations that are already doing some of this work. For example, the UPU, ISOC, you know, the ITU, in terms of implementing some of the activities around ensuring that we are enabling diversity in this area and enabling meaningful participation in Internet governance generally but specifically in ICANN.

So we are -- And today we have a HIT session that's going to explore these issues much more broadly with the ICANN community and we'll come back with further recommendations.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yes, go ahead.

BRUCE TONKIN: I just wanted to just expand a little, or a suggestion for you, Olga, that you mentioned the role of GAC reps and getting more engagement, I guess, from within government.

To the extent you can, it's also helpful to in your knowledge members from the private sector within the countries as well, so

---

Internet service providers, business users, noncommercial organizations, to the extent -- I realize you don't have control over it. But at least getting awareness within each country of -- in some of these areas would be great, too.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

I -- France would like to get the floor. And then we need to move on and spend 30 seconds on each of the last ones.

We have to close. So, France, you're the last one on this.

FRANCE: I will be speaking French.

I would like to listen to the board's opinion regarding diversity included in workstream 2. When you mentioned diversity, everybody said this is important, that we have to move forward. The subgroup of the CCWG has already started working, and they have already discussed the creation of a structure, long-term structure, to move forward on the topic of diversity.

Many of those coming from different regions in the world are interested in that and want to have more representation.

I would like to hear the board about what you think about those structures.

---

Thank you very much.

ASHA HEMRAJANI:

This is Asha Hemrajani, from the ICANN board.

I want to thank the GAC representative from France who mentioned that. I have -- When I was participating in Alice Munyua's session yesterday on the Asia-Pacific GAC countries and the Underserved Regions Working Group, I had made that specific same point, that we need more participation in workstream 2, even though the workstream work has already started. There are ten subgroups. There is still a chance and opportunities for people to submit their names as participants and observers. And I also want to echo what Bruce just said, that we -- if we need more -- if we want diversity, we need support from the community. So it would be really good if GAC representatives could encourage businesses, ISPs, as Bruce mentioned, intellectual property lawyers, all -- from all parts of ICANN's community, to come and put their names forward and participate in ICANN.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you.

---

Lousewies.

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: Thank you very much for those questions.

I work with the board on the topic of diversity, and it's very important that in this subgroup, we have more participants, because this small group has a lot of work to do. So it is important that the results -- that the outcomes may be supported by the whole region.

If we are a small group, we won't be able to move forward anymore in this really very important topic.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much.

Maybe I'll ask Olga for 7 and Mark for 8 to quickly -- one is a request for information, and the other one is a piece of information that we give.

So maybe, Olga, could you quickly explain what we ask with regard to .WEB.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Chair.

---

During the last weeks, we have received several news and communications about the .WEB auction process and outcomes. In relation with some sources of information, there seems to be a lack of transparency and accountability in this issue. So for the sake of clarity and for understanding the whole situation, it would be good to have some comments from the board about it.

Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER:

I'll -- I truly do not understand the comment, because there's been a huge amount of documentation about the process. The process is a step-by-step, careful process. Today -- I don't know about this very day, but this week, it's my understanding that the chartering organizations are considering the draft charter that was produced by the chartering group, and that if it's accepted, that will cause the creation of the Cross Community Working Group on Auction Proceeds, and then that group will come into existence. All of that has been laid out extensively.

So I don't know where the disconnect is.

And then on the amount of funds available, we have put out a very special presentation or documentation of those funds. They're managed separately. They're reported explicitly. So I

---

am actually not understanding what the -- what the disconnect is, where the problem is.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I think it's about this particular case that is being discussed. And we are trying to find out facts, what's happened, has everything happened according to the rules or if there are other things that have happened that are not the way they should have been. And we struggle to find the right information. Just maybe we can follow up on this electronic- -- this is just ask for information on a particular case. We understood from before that you don't want to comment on this right now.

STEVE CROCKER: Now I understand.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: But we are looking for facts to understand what is going on in this particular --

STEVE CROCKER: Just to be clear, we're talking about the issues surrounding the .WEB auction, which we all acknowledge is a very substantial portion of the total, and it's a lot of money in its own right.

---

So that's under dispute. And there's -- and it's all going -- different parties are involved, and they're doing various things. We're not going to comment on that.

We have looked at the mechanics of where the money is and how it's reported and so forth. That money sits on our books the same as anything else. And -- but it -- and both the process of working out what the auction process -- I mean, what the disposition of the auction proceeds is going to be on the one hand, and the resolution of the .WEB matter on the other hand both are going to take a substantial amount of time. I have no idea which is going to be faster than the other. I don't want to place bets on it. But those will be reported. Each of those is going to be a ponderous process.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. I think that's understood.

The message is just, keep us informed. We want to find out what is going on.

And then, finally, Mark, just very briefly, and then we have to end up the -- end up the meeting.

Thank you, Mark. U.K.

---

UNITED KINGDOM: Good, Thomas. This report by the Council of Europe on community-based applications for new gTLDs in the current round is now out. It -- it's an in-depth analysis of problems that were experienced by applicants. It'll be submitted to the PDP Working Group on Subsequent Procedures and to the CCT review.

The GAC will be reviewing the recommendations contained in this report to correct the problems on the current round in the subsequent procedures. And so we will be likely providing advice to the board based on these recommendations at the next meeting. So it's a heads-up on this report. As I say, it's a substantive analysis. Please look at it. I've got a few spare copies -- hard copies. We can provide the link.

STEVE CROCKER: We look forward to it.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

And sorry for taking up the time. Thank you, all. It was a very constructive meeting.

---

Just one thing. When will we have our call with you to talk about this? In how many weeks? I cannot let you go before that. Two, three, four? Or four months or five months?

Two, three, four?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Two, three, four. I'm not describing what comes after the word four. Two, three, four weeks.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Can we agree on four weeks maximum?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sure.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**