
HYDERABAD – GAC Operating Principles WG Meeting
Thursday, November 03, 2016 – 13:45 to 15:00 IST
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

HENRI KASSEN:

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, colleagues.

We are running a bit late in our short program, but welcome to our session. My name is Henri Kassen. I am the co-chair for the Operating Principles Working Group.

My India -- Oh, I am from Namibia. And India, Mr. Rajiv Bansal, could not make it today because he has got some critical or important official commitments in Delhi but he will be here tomorrow and for the next session.

So this session is essentially just to -- to review where we are, what we have done and what we need to do for Thursday. Our intention is to present a number of principles for adoption by GAC on Thursday.

So welcome once again so that we can quickly look at our -- our program.

We have until 1430 -- up to I think -- 1500 we have a local outreach activity, so I suppose up to quarter to 3:00, just to give us time to get to the other -- other -- other matters.

We are just waiting for the secretariat to put on discussion, agenda discussion. We can look at that. And I just wanted also to remind -- to remind the colleagues this is an informal Operating Principles Working

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.

Group session, just to review progress and to plan briefly for our -- our -- our discussions on Thursday.

Is it? No. Tuesday. I'm a bit confused. My apology. Tuesday the 8th.

We have the agenda on. And we can look at the agenda.

The first point, welcome and attendance. Well, I think it's an open session. It is a -- just a preparatory session, brief one.

The updates on progress with our working -- our work plan, and topics for discussion for sessions with the GAC. It's essentially new issues that came up through our discussions. And -- Can we move up the agenda, please?

Yes. Then of course the way forward. We have presented a plan of action to -- to GAC in the intersessional period with some target dates, and we unfortunately have ran a bit late on our target dates as we have set them. So we just wanted to review -- to look at maybe an amended timeline, and then especially category 3 targets, in terms of the five categories that we have.

So the proposed basic agenda for the 7th is also listed, or the first session is actually today, I think. Is those, the update on category 5, update on category 1, update on category 3, and the way forward in terms of amended timelines. And then we will be having a second session as is indicated. I'm just trying to review it. I know the one on Tuesday the 8th is the final one where we will be giving our recommendations.

There's a second session on Monday the 7th, which is listed as the first session here. But today we have a review session. Then we will be having a first session briefly on mopped the 7th. And then of course on Tuesday the 8th, we will be making presentations. And then Wednesday the 9th, we will have a second session on the operating principles in terms of -- in terms of proposals for -- for adoption.

As I've said, the idea is we would want to present a number of principles to -- to the -- to the GAC for adoption, and adoption will then mean that it will then go into the formal adoption process of giving 60 days and (indiscernible) and comments, the formal process in terms of the current principles of GAC. So we need the GAC endorsement so that it goes into the adoption process.

Thank you very much.

So that's the agenda. Let's just -- I'm looking at -- We have listed those three points, which is some discussion with GAC. We know that there's a lot of discussion about diversity, working groups, and then the empowered community. And there's also discussions about the GAC advice, and so on. But it will -- we can then -- we can include it, I think; many of the discussions will definitely form part of the review of the operating principles because I'm looking at diversity, which is discussed in relation to the representation on leadership and even within GAC itself. They will look at diversity, instead of regional or geographic representation, we talk about diversity. So that -- that is something that came out, but we will -- we will definitely look at it.

Any comments? Mr. Kavouss, Iran.

IRAN: Yes. Sorry. I tried to draw your attention or attract your attention to a questions I have.

I have look into the operating principle. Unless you have it somewhere else, where is the elections?

HENRI KASSEN: I was trying to get my thing running.

The elections is part of -- of category -- Let me not speculate, but I think it's category 5, which we want to move up to category 1. But I just -- just give me a minute. Let me just also get myself -- get my --

IRAN: We discussed that?

HENRI KASSEN: Currently, the elections will have to -- as indicated, will have to be done in terms of the current operating principles.

In terms of the procedure in the -- in the operating principles for adoption of -- of new principles, the time frame will not allow us to -- to have any amended process for our elections at Hyderabad, because the -- those -- the principles -- the principle on the election still stands as it is in the -- in the current principles. There is no final approval as far as I can recall, yet, although we -- we will have to -- to follow the current principles.

IRAN: Sorry; I'm not suggesting that we do something Hyderabad for the elections, but the elections procedure is very vague. It's very vague in several instances. It's vague in respect of the geographical division, it's vague in respect of number of the vice chair, in respect to several other things.

I'm not proposing you do something or we do something in Hyderabad, but perhaps because this burden is given to yourself, you might kindly consider that putting for future that we discuss that before the next election in one year.

Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN: Thank you.

So we -- you then -- you then basically suggest, which I think there's general consensus, that we move the -- that the election procedures up to be -- to be basically part of the current category 1 proposals so that we can get approval for it from this meeting. Is that --

IRAN: Yeah. We don't want that anything we do have any impact on election at this meeting, but I would like to clear the election for the next election in 2017.

Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN:

Thank you. Noted.

Any other comments?

We -- Of course we have -- we have presented our plan of action that provided the deadlines for certain activities, and therefore -- therefore, we will be discussing it in terms of the agenda that we have as far as the way forward, and then we can look at our action plan.

Any other comments on what -- what I've said in terms of introduction?

Thank you very much.

There is also -- I think as some of the -- some principles that we want to -- to renew or to highlight, and one is that we -- we are proposing that we would want to, as it were, adopt the principles as we go. That means that we will be presenting category 1 principles to GAC on -- on Wednesday, and we get endorsement by GAC for that, and that will then go into the formal adoption process, not to be re-opened, and it will then start to take effect once the 60 day, once the objection, once -- it takes effect. And that will also be in line with what our colleague for Iran has proposed, that at the next -- at the next elections, for instance, the provisions on elections would have been adopted. It went through the formal process. It is endorsed, and it forms part of the permanent principles of GAC now. Not -- We don't need to re-open it when we discuss maybe principles about the membership. We don't review it.

So that is -- that is the -- the cardinal principle that we want to -- to propose, since we want to have certain of the principles that is not very controversial, we want to have those ones adopted and finalized. As we move on, as the colleagues may be aware, we have about five categories of principles that we have proposed in terms of the approval process, and they are, I think category 1 is on the list that we have -- that we have now on the -- on the -- on the agenda or on the screen. They are called the green category. And somewhere, in terms of our discussions, the green category in terms of our review require minimum, minimum discussion, minimum inputs because it -- it -- it is -- it's basically the current practice, and throughout the years there's not been major difficulties with them.

For instance, in terms of the agenda, if we look at the -- at the screen now, there is principle 12, PR 12. A proposed agenda for the meeting shall be communicated to the members prior to the meeting. Those are straightforward principles that we -- we thought as the working group, don't need to be discussed and analyzed and so on. We can just basically propose it for adoption and then it's get it over to the proposed new text. Then it is done.

So the green category, we felt that most of the -- the principles listed there, which we will go through quickly so that we can just have a feel of it, is the ones where there is minimum -- where we expect minimum discussions. Then we also have category 2, which is -- which requires a bit more discussion. Category 3 which requires substantive discussion. Category 4 which is new issues, like the empowered community, et cetera. And category 5 is principles that, like the

preamble, which needs to be done at the end so that we can capture what we have discussed and decided in the -- in the -- in the preceding principles.

So -- so that is the -- that is the layout.

Maybe the secretariat can scroll down the recommendations text just to get a feel, slowly, in terms of the colors, as I've said. Maybe scroll down on this one, Madam. Slowly. There's green. Go on. Green, green, up to principle 53.

Go on, go on.

And then blue is now the ones where we need some -- some discussion. That is category 5. We felt that some of the -- the -- the articles in category 5 can be elevated to category 1 for quicker discussion, quicker endorsement.

Please scroll down more. So blue is category 5 which requires some discussion.

Scroll down, please.

Scroll down. Thank you.

This is just to give an idea to the -- to the members to -- just an idea of what we mean by the color coded categories.

Scroll down, please.

So the blue, as I've indicated, requires some discussions. We want to update it to include some of the blue into the green.

Then category 2 -- (indiscernible) confused, but category -- must be category 2, is membership. This is substantive discussions. There's the election of chair, and so-and-so. Probably we look at that and maybe move it up to the green as proposed.

And then category 3 is new -- new ones, which is empowered community, and so on, others. And then category 4 is the red ones, which is basically the preamble and so on that we will be coming back once we have completed.

Thank you very much. That is -- that is the -- the schedule that we would want to look at.

Can we move back to page 1, the green category. And then we can possibly have initial comments.

I saw colleague from Brazil, yes, wanted to comment.

Yes, please.

BRAZIL:

Yes. Thank you very much for this introduction.

I'm wondering, although this category 1 principles may seem uncontroversial, whether -- and since there's a target to -- to have the - - them endorsed in this meeting, whether it would perhaps be more appropriate to submit them to the GAC, to the GAC list, prior to the -- to the session where we -- where the GAC is asked to approve them.

So this is something actually I -- a suggestion I made to the list prior to the Hyderabad, and I think maybe it will give GAC members a chance to review them prior to the discussion here in the plenary.

Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN:

Thank you very much. I think that's an excellent idea.

There is also a suggestion, and we have -- I have consulted the -- the GAC chair on this one. Unfortunately, I couldn't have a discussion with the committee members. I mean, this can now serve as -- as information that I want to give through also. And that is that we would want to -- to start a simultaneous process. Now -- a simultaneous process of discussing critical -- some of the contentious principles, like membership, for instance, parallel, so that we can start getting them, you know, on the agenda, start getting them into the discussion papers, and so on.

And since we foresee some protected discussions, we thought we will -- we will -- we will bring some of them in some critical ones that maybe the committee can agree so that we can start discussing in parallel. But then we have a category like the green that is for adoption, as -- for adoption by GAC, and then another subcategory or another group or another block of principles that we will be discussing that is critical for -- for -- for approval following the IANA transition issues concerning -- concerning the empowered community, concerning nominations to other bodies and so on.

So just some of them that we may identify as critical that we can already start to discuss and put on the agenda, although maybe not for adoption. But I do agree with the suggestion by Brazil that will make I think consensus and agreement very easy in terms of the non-contentious group of categories of principles to be circulated before our meeting on Wednesday the 9th. It's the second session on the principles. Or perhaps before Thursday. Let's -- before Tuesday. I don't know why I always read this Thursday. Before Tuesday, the -- possibly this afternoon even that we can prepare that. But it's a very good suggestion. Iran, please.

IRAN:

Thank you, Chairman. I don't think so, it is a good suggestion. I have no problem if you don't discuss it, but I have problem if you submit it for the definitive approval. I give you reasons.

Read number 30, the Chair shall not normally vote. Very good. However, in the event of the tie, the Chair shall vote as a casting vote. Suppose -- just I apologize to Switzerland -- suppose at that meeting the delegation of Switzerland vote and we have ties and then the chair is from Switzerland is vote also? Does that count as two votes? I don't think so. You should mention that unless there is no single -- unless the chair is the single member of its own country, that is correct. Maximum. Usually they don't vote. In any conference the chair will not vote. They would either give the vote to somebody to vote for his country or have one other delegation. But the way you've written here is that if Switzerland vote and then there is a tie, the chair who is from

Switzerland also could have another vote. So that is one country has two votes. I have no problem, you take it as it is for the time being and go to the more important element which is new, but I do not agree to submit it for the definitive proposals.

Number 2 has the exact same thing. You say communicated to the meeting prior to the meeting. One month is prior to the meeting. Five months is prior to the meeting. Six months is prior to the meeting and one day is prior to the meeting. You should say how many days or how many weeks are the meeting. So either we don't open the book but if we open, we have to carefully look at that one.

So my suggestion to you is that leave it as it is. Don't submit it for final approval. Go to the elements which are new and discuss them in order to be prepared. So that is that. Otherwise I could not agree with this because there are several deficiencies in that. Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN:

Thank you, Iran. I -- I -- I see the idea or the discussion that the proposal is not to submit it to the wide -- the whole GAC before we can maybe have time to zoom into it as a committee, and then the way I listened is that even on face value the green category like 30, for instance, may generate some discussions and then we may say as a committee, you know, I think this one needs some more discussion. Then it is not part of the package that we will present to GAC. So -- but if we give it beforehand, I think it may then create the expectation that this is what the committee finally proposes for adoption. And it may then lead to more discussion and make -- and then it will make

consensus a bit challenging, I think. But Brazil, what is your view on this?

BRAZIL:

Thank you. To be honest, I didn't quite understand the comment from our distinguished colleague from Iran. Actually we -- what we are proposing is that, you know, since there is an expectation for the GAC to adopt certain changes, like the so-called low-hanging fruit changes to the principles, so I think it's quite reasonable to submit it sometime before to the GAC plenary to consider them. So, I mean, that's basically the suggestion. I don't know what -- perhaps if this committee hasn't agreed about some of those principles, then it's perhaps not belonging to Category 1 and should be moved to another category. But those who are, let's say, rather uncontroversial for this committee, I think they should be submitted right away so that we can on the session on Tuesday, whatever, we can quickly reach an agreement within the whole GAC plenary.

CANADA:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It's Canada for the record. Apologies, I haven't had a chance to go through this document in detail but if I could just seek clarification on a couple of things. Is the text in the right column on the screen, the proposed new text, is that identical to the existing text in the principles? We're not actually proposing modifications at this point. We're just seeking the GAC's sort of approval or endorsement of the way that we've classified the

principles in terms of the colors that they would fall under? Is that -- is that correct? Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN:

Thank you. A quick reply is that the way it is set out is the current principles is listed under the first column and the second proposed new text is, the majority of it is blank and we -- we want to move the text on the left to the right. This is just a draft, a working draft. It was circulated about an hour or two ago. Unfortunately due to time constraints we couldn't discuss it earlier. So -- but it follows the initial proposal that was made by the ACIG but in terms of the scheduling, it is just a document for -- to -- to promote or to discuss and the text that is on the left hand is basically the operating -- the current operating principles text, and since it is green, we feel that that is non-controversial so it will basically be moved just to the -- we will just basically propose it as the new text. Although in terms of the column there for new text, proposed new text, there are a few entries there which is exactly the same than the one on the operating principles on the first column because when I read through the document, the initial one, it basically is highlighted to say this is the current practice. So we feel that since it is the current practice, it can just go to the new text. But we must also remember, this is a working -- a brief working session of the operating principles working group. So the working group members has got an opportunity now to also guide the discussions and guide what we need to submit and what we don't need to submit. We will not be having another session except, according to the program except on Monday the 7th which is also just

about half an hour. But we will have to work intersessionally, we will have to work on the mailing list on this so that we can get a set of principles available already that we can endorse on Thursday -- on Monday for submission then to the whole GAC. I do -- I do appreciate the -- the suggestion by Brazil that we should, as a working group, agree on those principles that are non-controversial finally. These were circulated to the working group members time and time again, I think, and the working group members have made -- have not made any major comments except I got one from Mark who says he supports the action plan and the categories and so on.

Now, in terms of moving the non-controversial category principles, working -- or operating principles to accept that as the text for any new principles, I think this is what the -- the working group committee members today and maybe before -- before Wednesday must decide on.

So as Mr. -- as the colleague from Iran indicated, maybe principle 30, principle 12, there are still questions. If we do not agree, as the distinguished colleague from Brazil said, if the working group do not agree that these words or the words prior to is clear and we need to amend it, if we don't have a problem with the principle we move it away and put amended text. But if we don't, then we just leave it. We move it down to Category 2 for substantive discussions later. So that is the idea to move with the work of the committee. So if it is controversial, this is the committee members -- operating principle committee members that now proposes that either we look at the non-controversial principles for proposal, for suggestions to GAC for

them to adopt. As I have seen there's been some highlights or some comments on certain of the principles that seemed not to be completely clear. And we need to look at that perhaps. I have Egypt.

EGYPT:

Thank you, Henri. Just to share my understanding and in response to Canada too, I believe the green Category 1 is defined as either principles that we will leave as is or principles that need minor edits. So it's editorial. I cannot really tell what's the difference now because I can't see a column -- the right column completely, but probably there is something proposed here that is not in the original.

I also think that the committee members already agreed on the categorization. We didn't have the discussion on how things are going to be modified, and I think this is what we're doing here with the whole GAC members. And, of course, I see the point mentioned by Brazil that if a document will be discussed here, maybe we should have shared it in advance. But at least I understand that committee members already agreed on the categorization but nothing more yet regarding the text that need discussions. Maybe the text of Category 1, the green one, we have agreed that it is editorial or the Secretariat had already proposed some edits, and I believe those were also endorsed by committee members. But I remain to be corrected by other colleagues. Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN: Thank you, Egypt. We have colleague from France and then Spain. (indiscernible) .

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Hi. This is Cristina from European Commission. Just to say that I share Manal's understanding. I think that this working group has advanced in the mapping exercise. So we have mapped the different categories of principles, and this gives us a good basis to organize our work.

In terms of the first category which we called in this group a low-hanging fruit, it was also my understanding that we would limit our work to minimal editorial changes. On the other hand, I still think it could be a useful opportunity to, as we are reviewing these operating principles, to have an in-depth look and see how these operating principles could even be improved. But we have to start somewhere. So first category, low-hanging fruit, minimal editorial changes. Fine. As far as the other categories are concerned, I have some doubts on whether we will be able to, whenever we reach a consensus, then go to the GAC and have those principle adopted in -- in bunches of principles. So I see that it might be better maybe to have a full overview of the final principles for all the categories before we have an adoption and then an implementation of the new principles. So fine for the minimal editorial changes, but when we open a discussion and we see all the others, I'm not sure we'll be able to get notification as we go. I hope I made my remarks understandable. Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN: Thank you, EU. Spain, please.

SPAIN: Thank you, Henri. I think we have to define what are we going to present to the GAC in this meeting. If I go to the briefing prepared by the working group, I see that the objective for this meeting Hyderabad is to start the process for modification of the GAC operating principles, starting with Category 1 principles. And maybe some others that were in category 5 on India or someone else's proposals moved to Category 1. So we should frame the principles that are going to be presented for -- for the GAC not to be adopted now at the Hyderabad meeting. The Hyderabad meeting will take a decision to kick off the process for modification according to the principles about tradition. The principles are not going to be modified here, but in 60 days time, during those 60 days, members will have the opportunity, and not only the working group members but all GAC members will have the opportunity to go through the new text and propose amendments to the one that is being presented.

So I think the main objective for this meeting would be to frame the discussion to say principles that are going to be presented to kick off the process for modification, are numbers, whatever. I don't see right now the screen. One, two, three, four. And then we will have the next two months or more to discuss about the wording of the -- of the text. But what it could be important is to frame the discussion here, not to go into the details of the wording.

So I think that could be useful.

Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN:

Thank you. Thank you, Spain.

Yes, I -- as I've indicated in the beginning, it's in -- in -- in line with what Spain has just also highlighted, and that is that we would want to get the full GAC to give us an endorsement or to frame the categories that will basically go into the approval process. And that means that -- that the -- once -- once the GAC endorses the idea and the plan and the principles, the initial ones, we will still have 60 days, the normal process, where it will be any member of GAC who can then raise an issue and say but we don't think this principle is so in fact. We need this principle not -- to take it back for substantive discussions later, somewhere. But there will still be, after either -- after GAC has looked it and say, good, the committee proposes these principles, we agree that we will -- we agree in principle that we will put it into the approval process of, you know, it being submitted to all the members, there's 60 days to comment, and so on. And then once the time frames have passed, the principles will then have to be finally approved, and it will then basically be a closed set that we have signed off. At -- Possibly at the next, at ICANN 58 we will have another category, another group, or we will give feedback as a committee, but it will start as Spain has indicated. We frame what we're going to present to GAC on Thursday - - on Tuesday and Wednesday, and then we can then get the GAC's endorsement. Or we can submit it beforehand and then it will be easier, then, for us to get such endorsement to continue with the -- to

the -- to continue with the amendment process based on the current principles.

I have -- I have noted also what Spain have said -- sorry; what the U.S. said in terms of the approvals, if I'm -- if I'm -- if I listened correctly; that is that the editorial ones, changes like those ones that are mainly included in category 1 is fine. Maybe it doesn't have substantive content or substantive changes. Those ones we can present as a -- as a -- as a group of principles for GAC endorsement for approval. And then when we get to the category 2 and 3 where there's substantive discussions, we -- we possibly should -- should present them, but then the final GAC approval will then -- or the final approval will then depend on -- on -- on the full endorsement of the whole set of principles instead of piecemeal. That's the -- I have highlighted in the beginning also that we want to have the principle of approval on the go so we can keep time with -- keep track and be updated with the process of the IANA transition. So if we wait for everything to be approved in -- in the next -- maybe in two years or three, a lot of -- a lot of things have happened in terms of IANA and we need to make our inputs, we need to -- to make our voice heard. And we say, yeah, but our principles is not approved, we cannot do anything. So that's why we said approval on the go so that we can keep track with the progress that is made within the wider ICANN.

But it is noted, I think as far as the committee is concerned, it's a principle that we can possibly then test with GAC later also.

Thank you very much.

There's comment from the gentleman there, and then from Egypt.

TAIWAN:

Thank you, Chair. I am Morris Lin from Taiwan, and thank you for your -- for the (indiscernible) and thank you for your explanation.

And, actually, I support the procedure of the -- the approval procedure. I think it's better to take care of the easiest part first. So I support to discuss the category 1, of course.

But I -- I think most -- many of us know the document until today or recently. So I hope we can get the document and the information earlier so we can be well informed and we can have a more substantial discuss here.

And, for example, for the category, I see the Article 4, which is about membership. And the membership is belong to the category 2, which need substantial -- substantial discussion. However, I think membership issue is not so controversial. Why is it put to the category 2?

So in my opinion, maybe the membership should be moved to category 1. However, because I wasn't informed until today, so if I know the -- know the discussion document earlier, then I can explain my -- our opinion earlier.

So my suggestion is we -- I hope that we can get the document earlier. And then I have a question about why the membership issue belong to category 2.

Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN:

Thank you, Taiwan. It's noted. It's noted. I -- As we explained earlier, I think our apology for the late document. We -- it is a document, I think, that -- it's a document that we have been discussing within the working group, Operating Principles Working Group, and this is also a session -- a special session of preparations for the working group to put together a proposal to the GAC by Thursday -- Thursday again -- by Tuesday.

So I -- I do agree that there are many GAC members that might not be fully aware of the intricacies of the committee discussions except for the operating principles working plan that was submitted. But the details in terms of the categories and the proposals for changes has not yet been shared with the wide -- with GAC widely, since we are still working within the working group today and so that we can get a direction of what we're going to submit.

So my apology if you possibly were not part of the working group, but you can -- and therefore not have intimate knowledge about the -- the proposals that was adopted by the working group.

We, as a working group, will make a proposal to GAC, and then it will then be an open discussion, and hopefully with the -- with the agreement of the committee, we can maybe go to GAC earlier so that exactly the issues that you have raised, distinguished colleague of Taiwan have raised, we can at least share some of the information

beforehand. So by Tuesday, then the wider GAC is more fully informed.

May I give the floor to Egypt.

Our time is running out, unfortunately. We have another -- another point concerning -- that we wanted to discuss concerning the way forward in terms of the timelines, but that is now for the committee members. I think maybe we will then circulate -- we will then arrange on the -- on the mailing list to meet with the committee members and share information with the committee members so that we can maybe address the issue of the way forward.

Egypt, please.

EGYPT:

Thank you, Henri.

Sorry. Okay.

Actually, I was going to propose that we circulate the table that was on the screen, and apologies if this has already happened because I didn't look at my email first. And maybe if we start discussing the principles, things would be more clear.

I understand that we have till 3:00? Or am I -- No? 2:30?

HENRI KASSEN:

About quarter 2:00 to give people time to get to the buses and so on.

Thank you.

EGYPT: Okay.

HENRI KASSEN: Are you finished, Egypt?

EGYPT: Yeah, thank you. Sorry.

HENRI KASSEN: I just want to clarify. You say to circulate this table earlier. This is to the wide whole GAC or to the committee members?

EGYPT: No, I'm sorry I wasn't clear. I was going to suggest we circulate it now right away and start our discussion. I thought we have more time than what obviously we have. So I -- maybe I withdraw my suggestion. Sorry.

Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN: Thank you, Egypt.

I just wanted to indicate that I did circulate it to the GAC -- to the GAC operating principle list, the GAC OP mailing list before the meeting,

maybe about a half an hour before the meeting. So check your emails. The members of the Operating Principles Working Group will have it, and then we can then take it from there and perhaps work out the strategy today and maybe tomorrow, in between, on the side of the formal meetings.

Thank you.

I have U.K. and then Iran and then Spain.

Thank you.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Yes, thank you, Henri. And thank you very much for all the work and management of this important process.

I just have the feeling now that we're kind of one step behind because there was the period to comment on the categorization, and I think we are there with the categorization of the blocks of principles and so on. This is a working group session. On Tuesday and Wednesday, they are GAC plenary sessions, aren't they, as I understand it.

So I don't think it's a good working method for the plenary to be the forum for discussing possible changes to these low-hanging fruit, as we're describing them in category 1, because as Iran noted, there may be some quite important editorial changes to make, and I'm not sure it's for the GAC plenary to discuss proposals for amending. For example, with regard to the agenda. The agenda should be prepared in consultation with the GAC membership and with a view to finalizing

in time for circulation to the GAC membership one month before the meeting.

And that's quite a -- I've introduced quite a few substantial editorial changes, if I could describe them in that way.

So perhaps as a way forward to get back into step, perhaps, how about we look to the first session on Tuesday, which is half an hour, I think, as a working group session to consider proposals for minor amendments to these category 1 proposals. And likewise, for the second session on the Wednesday. That could be a working group session to cover the rest of -- it's a longer session. I think it's an hour, isn't it? To cover the remainder of the category 1 sessions.

If we aim to do that, I think that would restore the momentum here.

And then perhaps intersessionally, after a period of 60 days, then it's for the GAC plenary to consider and respond on whether to agree to these editorial changes or to keep the text as currently written.

So by the time we get to Copenhagen, we've moved on from category 1, and we'll have a process in train for the next category, category 2.

Is that a way forward? Rather than present from this working group to the plenary on Tuesday and Wednesday the simple fact of categorization, which is probably not enough to sustain two separate meetings, but to work on the basis of the -- of the GAC switching to working group mode for the Tuesday and Wednesday sessions to discuss possible amendments to the category 1 articles.

Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN:

Sorry.

My apology. We have to wrap up. Time is catching up with us. Thank you for your comments, U.K.

I do think that we can develop that further. It's just the dates a bit -- a bit -- a bit confusing. It's not Tuesday and Wednesday. It's Monday and Tuesday we have. But that's the schedule. Monday, Tuesday, and then Wednesday we have another one.

I have two other -- two other colleagues that wants to discuss, and then two more. And with that, we can probably close the list. And then Olof has got just an announcement. I've noted, Mr. Chair.

Let's go to Iran and to Spain, and then the colleague at back there, then the chair. Thank you. That concludes, then, the discussion list.

Thank you.

IRAN:

Thank you, Chairman.

We have start at quarter to 2:00, and now it's a quarter to 3:00. If we did not have this sort of confusion, we would have made a lot of progress. I'm not criticizing you. We are criticizing ourselves.

However, I don't think that if you should distinguish member of the principle or not. You have to distribute entire GAC member. Put it in the list, and people look at that.

I'm not member of the list, but now I see a lot of problems here. Considerable problems.

I don't understand what is this column at the right side, what is the left side. I see the text was exactly the same. If it is exactly the same, why you put it two different column?

So I don't continue discussion, Mr. Chairman. Put whatever you want to put for discussions on the mailing list of the GAC, and then if you have particular suggestion, as an order of priority because of the events of transition, so on, so forth, you propose that as a priority. And then whatever you have before and not change, we could take it for the time being and go to those issues which are urgent and important as you mentioned.

Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN:

Thank you, Iran. We will take that under advisement.

Spain. Thank you.

SPAIN:

Thank you. I think that it may be ambitious to try to get an agreement by the whole GAC on the five categories, which principles fall into each

category, at this meeting. So I would concentrate on identifying the principles that could be in category 1, which is the category including the easiest principles for amendment, because they only need editorial changes. So the working group will need to have an agreement on which principles fall into that category and then present them to the plenary to kick off the process for modification.

I think if we manage to do that at this meeting, we'll at least -- we at least get some result of this Hyderabad meeting.

Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN: Thank you, Spain.

Then -- Sorry. We have the colleague at the back and then the Chair.

AUSTRALIA: It's Australia.

HENRI KASSEN: Australia. Thank you.

AUSTRALIA: Thanks.

I'd just like to propose perhaps an alternative way forward, and that we consider separating the work into principles that we all agree on. So have a set of high-level principles that are sort of fixed or difficult to

change, and then underneath that, all the procedural issues which we can update as necessary.

I just think this is a very complicated series -- complicated work stream, and perhaps we could simplify it if we just separated it out a bit.

Think about what the principles are, and then agree on those, and then all the procedural issues could be dealt with separately.

Thanks.

HENRI KASSEN:

Thank you.

At this point, we take note of the suggestions. We will be consulting within the working group then.

Thank you for that, for your proposal.

Mr. Chair.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Henri, and hello to everybody. I think it may not be fully clear to everybody what it is that is going to be presented in terms of substance to the GAC, and maybe the suggestion made by Mark to declare the next -- the next meeting on Monday as a continuation of this working group meeting, of course, everybody in the GAC is invited to participate to get a clearer sense and maybe use the time in between to make some electronic exchanges to know what is going to

be presented to the GAC, what is going to be asked from the GAC in terms of decision or discussion, and also I would advise you to check with the timeline in the work plan because in the work plan it says that discussing proposals for amendments to operating principles starting with Category 1 and Category 5 should have started on 1st of October. And the way I read this at least was that the concrete substance would be discussed and not just the definition of the categories itself. So maybe some clarification and revising of this would be -- would be useful so that we are clear when things come to the GAC where we are, what the next steps are, and what consequences may be -- learning consequences of this quite complicated exercise could be. Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think -- Thomas, I think that that has concluded, I think our brief discussion. We have received a lot of suggestions and valuable comments that we will share with the rest of the working group committee and we will then -- there is a -- a suggestion supported by the chair of GAC now that perhaps the next session, two sessions Monday, Monday, the 7th of November, from 11:30 to 11:45, 15 minutes, from 11:00, sorry, no, no, 11:30, as a short session maybe to continue with this, and then on Tuesday next week, the 8th, we have another session from 9:30 to 10:00 which was supposed to -- 10:30, which was supposed to be the session where we make recommendations to GAC. And then a similar session on Wednesday the 9:30 -- the last day of ICANN. At that session then we can then make the proposals. So the next two sessions, the proposal is to use it as continuation as prep for our committee, working

intersessionally -- sorry, by email, not intersessionally. Working by email on the email list from now on and then use the Monday 45 minutes or 15 minutes or so for continuation just to see where we are with the categorization and what we are going to present to the -- to GAC, and then also using the session on Tuesday which is a bit longer also for this. I will take it to -- I'll discuss with the committee. We will be circulating on the list and get your views. I thank you very much for your valuable comments. Thank you for your inputs, and thank you for your presence. We appreciate it. We appreciate the inputs also. Just have a last -- a final announcement by Olaf in terms of the next session or the next activity. Thank you. Thank you very much.

OLOF NORDLING:

Thank you, Chair. And this is an announcement for all of the GAC representatives that have signed up to the visit to the Hyderabad T-Hub this afternoon hosted by the governmental Telangana, state of India. There will be buses departing at 3:00 p.m., 1500, so in 5 minutes from outside the lobby entrance right outside here. So enjoy it. And we start tomorrow at 9:00 in the morning.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER:

And sorry to interrupt. Just one thing. The session on Tuesday, which is called, if I'm on the right -- on the right version of the agenda, GAC working group recommendations for discussion and decision, this is not meant to be for this particular working group because that has two slots. This is meant for the other working groups that have no slot on their issue. So please keep that in mind. That Tuesday session is

not for this working group because this has two slots for itself. All the others have no slot and will have to share that particular slot. Just to make that clear. Thank you very much.

HENRI KASSEN:

Thank you, and with that, we adjourn. The meeting is closed then. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]