
HYDERABAD – GAC Operating Principles (Session 2)
Wednesday, November 09, 2016 – 09:30 to 10:30 IST
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

HENRI KASSEN:

Thank you, Thomas. Thank you colleagues. I would like to invite my colleague from -- co-chair from India, Mr. Santosh, to join me to make a brief presentation.

Yes, thank you very much. Good morning, colleagues, and our hearty congratulations to the election of our chair and new vice chairs. We look forward to receive a lot of support from you, including specific support for the Operating Principles Working Group, since we need that a lot.

We want to briefly get into the -- into the procedure. We have about six slides to go through quickly, or three, depending on what you are -- you are guiding us with now.

As I said, I have Mr. Santosh who will -- who is the co-chair from India who will be sharing the presentation with me. I will do the introduction and the work status, and depending on your guidance, we will then -- he will then make a presentation.

Firstly, the operating work -- Operating Principles Working Group has been working for about two years now in getting our

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.

basic work done, like our work plan and of course before that was the terms of reference and so on. That has been done.

The work summary in the recent, since Helsinki, was that we have been mapping the operating principles to relevant categories following the approval of our work plan. That has also been -- that has also been completed.

We then have been entering into discussions in terms of the procedure for -- for discussing and reviewing operating principles. That was also finalized through -- through the drafting of our work plan, if you want to look at our work plan, then, as endorsed by -- through the email list, we will see that there is a provision concerning working methods and our approach to the -- to finalize the drafting process or to finalize the procedure for reviewing the operating principles.

Then we have then finalized -- we needed to finalize and proposal operating principles working party to GAC for approval. Of course, as I've said, that has been done in terms of the email list, and we are happy to say that that is completed also.

We needed then, in terms of the work plan, to discuss the amendments to the operating principles which require minimum editorial changes. If one look at the first point there, we said that we had -- we had mapped the operating principle into relevant categories. Now five -- four relates to category 1,

actually, which require minimum editorial changes. Then we -- then following, according to the work plan, we will be -- we would followed -- we would follow -- it would be followed by discussion of operating principles that requires a greater amount of discussion, but that would be within the working group.

And then finally, we would -- we plan to present amended operating principles to GAC for approval, approval being your endorsement for those operating principles that enter into the formal modification process of 60 days, and so on.

So that is the work summary. The status is the next -- the next slide is the status, yes. The brief status or summary of the status.

Can we have the next slide, please.

The summary of the status, basically, talks to the work plan. There's a current work status. That's sort of the summary.

The work plan was approved via email list on the 4th of October. The categorization was simultaneously completed because we included it in the work plan.

And we, basically -- in terms of the work plan 1, will take note that there is -- there was target dates and time frames. And then

there was also a method. How are we going to approach our work?

So the next two bullets is we would want to present a new time frame target date slide to the GAC. To take note and to give guidance, since we have discussed it briefly in our operating principles working group meeting on the 7th, but there was no final consensus. And we (indiscernible) that as the co-chairs to present it to GAC for guidance, which will give an indication that we have not been able to meet our targets fully in terms of the work plan that was approved on the 4th of October.

And we wanted to ask the GAC's guidance as a group. In terms of new target dates, we have been discussing issues concerning elections of vice chair and chair that we want to put a target date to, which, in terms of the general discussions, was before the next elections, for instance.

So we will be -- we will be presenting some proposals for new target dates.

And we need the action that we require or we -- that we ask -- require from our meeting is guidance in terms of the target dates for the operating principles committee then to consider and to finalize.

And then the next request would then be to discuss and give inputs on operating -- through the operating working group -- operating principles working group on the minimum editorial changes in the OPSS. We have indicated earlier the categorization was completed on the 4th of October. And it included categories that require minimal or editorial changes.

And those are the ones that we want to present to the GAC.

Just for discussion, since we have not had enough time in our working group to finalize it, in terms of -- and then decide on the specific ones to be presented. So that is a work in progress.

We -- can we go back to the previous slide? We just wanted to also indicate that, when we met on the 3rd of November as well as the 7th, we have been discussing two main things. One is the approach came up again.

As I've said in terms of the work plan completion, we did include some guidelines as far as the approach is concerned.

And we probably, when you take note of the amended target dates and so on, we probably need to look and maybe you give us advice on our approach. Because there are two basic approaches. One is to approve the operating principles, the basic -- or to approve the operating principles as we go.

The second one is to approve them completely at the end. Of course, it has implications. And we can maybe discuss that when you give us permission to present to you the new target dates and the time frame.

Then there's the second method that we discussed was which operating principles should we commence with?

Of course, it saves minimal editorial changes. And we have categorized them. And then the working group has discussed that it's best to basically start with those that require minimal editorial changes. So that would be our action plan going forward.

But, as I've said, we haven't achieved consensus in the working group yet in terms of the target dates, the approach, as well as the text for the minimal editorial changes on the operating principles that is in category 1.

With your permission then, we would want to go over and present to you an amended target date time frame for your guidance as we said.

And then secondly, there is also a slide that will provide the operating principles that require minimum editorial changes which is in a table with the original operating principle and then next to it the proposed change type of operating principles. So

that is what we intend to do over the next sort of half an hour to 45 minutes with your permission.

And I pause here just to get your permission to continue. Because we -- in terms of our operating -- our work plan, we are due to present to you operating principles for endorsement.

We couldn't get that. There was no consensus in the working group yet. So we rather present to you an amended target date so we get more time to work on it with more time. And then we also would like to have your inputs and guidance in terms of minimal editorial change.

May we proceed to present to you a table with new target dates that the committee has not endorsed but has sort of -- but we have discussed it generally. But no final consensus was reached on that.

May I pause for a moment and invite comments or your guidance? Yes, actually, your endorsement. Tell us whether we can proceed or whether you consider the work of the committee and this report to be in order and we close it here. Or do you want to hear more? Thank you.

Good. In the absence of no comments, we accept that you would want to hear more. And I would ask Mr. Santosh then to provide us with proposals from the co-chairs in terms of target

dates that we can go on with our work within the operating principles working group. Thank you.

T. SANTOSH:

Thank you, Henri. I'm T. Santosh from India. So we had two discussions on 3rd and 7th. Seventh was a shorter version of discussion.

And, by the way, we had another meeting to come up with a revised target date.

So can we go to the slide number 3, please? Yeah.

So now what we have decided is we would be circulating the revised target dates today. I mean, so GAC -- I would request GAC to kindly approve this, that is the revised target dates. And the proposals are -- totally there are six proposals. One I have gone through the second proposal is to complete the working group discussions on the different operating principles, which requires on a review process it to be extended until December 15th.

And then on the third item we request that the target date to be extended until February 31st. So the last date of February for finalizing the minimum discussion. That would be before ICANN 58.

So we have a deadline, which is dependent on the empowered committee implementation. So that discussion we would be leaving it later.

And, during our discussion, we thought that the final -- completing the working group discussion on OPs substantive matters would be deferred until June 2017.

And last we are proposing here that the working group discussions are completely to be done by the -- by October 2017.

These are the revised target dates. I hope GAC agrees on this. Any comments? Thank you.

IRAN: Excuse me. I just heard something that I was not in the room.

You referred to something about empowered community?

T. SANTOSH: So this is, basically, to come with the new principles which has been introduced. That is why we have taken it up.

Would Henri like to add on this?

HENRI KASSEN: Thank you, Santosh. Yes. We have a category or a group of principles, or not actually principles, but a category within our

working plan where we set new principles that needed to be added to the -- of course, as part of the new operating principles. And those include provisions relating to the empowered community, provisions relating to nominations and so on and so on, which there is another group working on it also. So we feel that, since we do not want to duplicate efforts, once the group the chair is leading comes with proper text for the empowered community and so on, we can then take that over. And toward the end, before the June 27 meeting, 2017 meeting, maybe those texts that has now been worked on in terms of empowered community as well as the nominations and so on can then be referred to the working group then for inclusion as part of the complete text of the operating principles. Thank you.

T. SANTOSH:

I would like to add to what Henri has said. The new principles to be introduced to the GAC (indiscernible.)

That's why we had them mentioned here. And the new OPs are to be added here.

IRAN:

What I am suggesting is that, due to the complexity and delicacy of the matter, the issue relating to the empowered community should be dealt with at another group and then feeding to you

for incorporation in the principle and not to distraction from normal work. Because that requires a specific background and knowledge and time and many, many other things. So, perhaps, if the concept is accepted, perhaps the chair will guide the little group or whatever start to work on that very complex subject and then bring it here to the GAC.

And after that it will be incorporated in the general principles. So we don't want to bother you to embark on that. Thank you.

T. SANTOSH: I'm sorry. I'm sorry.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Switzerland.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you. I just wanted to support what our Iranian colleague said. And I think it's consistent with the approach we've taken yet until now where we are discussing these very specific and delicate issues in the plenary. Once we have an agreement there and we are clear about what is needed as principles, as guidelines in different levels of documents, we may feed those elements as needed in the operating principles working group.

HENRI KASSEN: Thank you, Switzerland and Iran. Any other comments? Is that then in order that we follow the revised target dates? As suggested, we will be feeding back to the working group committee, the operating principles working group committee, just to discuss and to adjust our work plan then to follow these guidelines from your good self.

Egypt.

EGYPT: Thank you. Just to ask colleagues from Iran and Switzerland whether it would be really easy to -- I mean, to take one part of the operating principles and -- I mean, work it alone. Because I think maybe other members could join the working group for the sake of having a holistic view of the whole operating principles while introducing the new ones. Because I feel it might be a bit difficult to take things isolated and work it. And then maybe we can find redundancies or gaps afterwards. But I don't have a strong position. I'm just thinking out loud and inviting more members to join the working group rather than splitting the work into different groups. Because, even when we try to categorize the principles in terms of how much discussion they need, we found out that, still at the end, they have to be reviewed in light of each other again and in light of the

discussions that are going on whether in the GAC or in the community in general.

So just a proposal that other members who are interested to work on specific parts of the operating principles can do this from within the working group, if possible, of course. Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN: Iran.

IRAN: I see no difficulty that people working together -- in fact, the entire ICANN work together. But as a matter of efficiency, that part is totally independent, totally. I'll give a simple example. The first part of that procedures, empowered community is process of petitions. How a petition is raised, who could caretake a petition or bring a petition, how the petition is further continued.

It has nothing to do with the operating principle that you are discussing. But, once it is finished, bring it up, inserted that. So I still am of the view that we limit that in a separate group and not mix it up with this group. It comes from incorporating (indiscernible)

If we find any overlapping category (indiscernible) but I'm sure there will be no overlapping at all. Because there are specific things empowered community. Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN: Spain.

SPAIN: Thank you. I think that, of course, the participation of GAC in empowered community requires a specific delay. And the GAC has to reach an agreement on how to participate in empowered community, who can put forward petitions, and what thresholds are going to use to decide on them.

But, once all these aspects are tackled and decided on by the GAC, then we could decide which of them should be in the operating principles and which other could be in a protocol or some other kind of document that could be amended more easily than the operating principles.

This is my thought.

HENRI KASSEN: Iran.

IRAN:

What I suggest that we would have in the operating principle one section or chapter relating to the empowered community, whether to say how to exercise empowered community or rules or procedures relating to the exercising empowered community. That will be discussed, agreed, brought to the GAC, and, once agreed, will be included in that chapter of the general principles. But it is a specific principle and almost independent, totally independent on others.

The election of chair, election of vice chair, has nothing to do with that at all. We're talking how to do petitions? What is a conference call? What is a follow-on? What is a vision making? In which area GAC will be involved in decision making? What are the criteria? Whether it should be consensus or whether it should be majority? This is totally different.

Perhaps in something we could take advantage of some principle it contained. For instance, for the one area we could say that, because of the issue of election of the GAC chair and so on, so forth, this procedure is applied. If we take it, it applied to the empowered community. But empowered community is totally different. And I suggest that we would have a (indiscernible) chapter under the rules and procedures relating to application of empowered community. Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN: Thank you, Iran. I think we have taken note of the advice. Of course, Switzerland also indicated that, I mean, it's -- it's what we are now currently doing. The standard, the convention, we have a separate working group on it now and we will -- we proceed with that but -- and the idea is that there will then be a reference in the operating principles because it is a new principle that will be included but maybe not that detailed and that sophisticated as the current working group work on it. But it is remitted. We're taking note as a comment, and it will basically be a topic for further discussion and consideration within the community. Thank you. Egypt.

EGYPT: Just very quickly to clarify what I can see some overlap or a need for coordination but then at the end, if colleagues feel this is a separate task, I'm happy to go this way as well. But, for example, Article 6, it is the conduct of business of the GAC and how the GAC conducts its business, and there are some discussions on decorum as well in this article. There is other articles that has to do with the powers of the chair and what exactly can the chair do and the powers of the chair. Again, I can see this related but, I mean, I'll go with the majority, whatever. Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN:

Thank you, Egypt. We -- we -- we are discussing the second -- the second request that we had. The first one was the advice targets and I think we -- we have not received many objections to that. We are now talk about the approach, the approach and the only show of the empowered community provisions which in terms of our work plan there is provision for the working group to discuss it and, of course, it -- we will have to take cognizance of the -- especially the separate working group on the matter -- the separate group on the matter, but it is something we will have to provide for in terms of a framework within the operating principles at the -- towards the end. And as we propose, it is not something that we will -- it is dependent on the inputs from -- you know, from how the other working group or the other group is proceeding in terms of -- of those provisions. So that is the approach.

And then Egypt also mentioned the other challenge that we picked up and that is the -- the element of -- maybe I was wrong but the matter of whether we -- we deal with the operating principles on a piece-by-piece piecemeal basis or we deal with it all at the end. And in terms of that -- the idea that the -- the idea that the operating principles working group followed was that since we have the additional or the IANA transition arrangements which that may impact on our operations, we need to approve the principles piece by piece so that those

principles can become operational and we can be part of the wider ICANN community. Instead of waiting until the end after two years when everything is approved, then things may pass us by. But there's a discussion and a new proposals within the working group that we should actually look at all is not approved until all is approved. Anything is not approved until all is approved. We -- we must also look at that principle.

So that is what we also basically ask not sort of come to a conclusion and we will probably -- we are inviting GAC to give us guidelines or guidance on that also. Thank you. I have Malaysia. Thank you.

INDONESIA: Thank you, Henri. I'm from Indonesia, not Malaysia.

HENRI KASSEN: Indonesia. My apologies.

INDONESIA: All right. My comment is only short handed because I think what you are doing is very useful for us and very important for GAC as a whole. The problem I see is that the ICANN is changing and it's changing very fast with the transition and with everything. Not mentioning other global development in the Internet site. So I

think and while I believe that first of all, it's perhaps we can make it your -- the timeline can be made faster, just because the work is changing also very fast. Secondly, is that while setting up the operating principles, the final operating principles, we may have the interim result of the operating principles that we may use in the GAC operating activities, in the GAC activities for the operation of the GAC activities. So if an interim result can be set up and perhaps we can even accommodate some of the interim results in the bylaws, either in the ICANN or in the GAC ICANN itself. Thank you.

T. SANTOSH:

Thank you, Indonesia. We would like to show you the original operating principles and amended principles of principle 12, 13, 28. Can we go to the Word document which we have shared to the GAC secretariat?

These are the principles from the GAC (indiscernible) which require minimum changes. So we're putting the original operating principle, that is the current one and the amended one, for your information and for your approval. U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Yes, thank you. Indonesia suggested there might be some acceleration, so I was looking at something, maybe you replied

on that. But perhaps the category 1 principles that need minimal editorial changes, which I think is a total of 11 principles, if I've worked through the articles correctly. Maybe you could bring that timeline forward from 28 February to end January. We've already discussed one, or started a discussion of one, prompted by my suggested amendments the other day. Perhaps you -- you know, that is one deadline you could bring forward.

The second bullet, if you go back to your action plan, I wasn't quite clear what it was, but I presume it's to agree to prioritization of principles, is that right? You had a bullet about discussion about principles requiring discussion. On your previous slide. Thanks.

HENRI KASSEN:

So do you want us to put -- to bring the slide back so we look at it? The slide is basically complete the working group discussion operating principle require minimal discussion before ICANN 58, which is February 28, and do you suggest that it comes -- because of the comments made, it can be brought forward to January 2017 instead of February. And then I think it's the next slide, the next slide, yeah, yeah, that one. The third bullet that talks about complete the work plan -- working group discussion on operating plan requiring minimal discussion, those are the

ones that we are now talking about, the 12 that we are -- that Santosh has just been presenting a while ago.

The second bullet talks about by the 15th of December we will be completing the discussion within the working group on operating principles that requires discussion on reviewing processes. So there's two -- two -- two deadlines, 15 December and then 28 February, for us to get the operating principles discussed. Do you mean -- back to the U.K. Do you mean that we bring the February 28 deadline forward to January or in terms of the discussion of these 12 principles that require minimal discussion? Thank you.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Thanks. Yes, I -- yes, the third bullet, I thought maybe we could bring that forward, if we are agreed on the categories and, you know -- and finalizing the category 1's principles which require minimal editorial change or minimal discussion, which was in your schedule of categories. By January. I think that's possibly practicable.

The second bullet, I wasn't sure exactly what the discussions are going to be about. Was it -- are they about the overall total review of all the principles and what -- which principles need to be prioritized? Is that my -- am I reading it correctly? Sorry if I'm one step behind. Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN: Thank you, U.K. We -- we -- we note. Thank you for the suggestion. Of course, as we say, we are presenting this for -- to give -- to get your guidance and your -- and so on so the working group can get a better direction. The second bullet, just for clarity, is that they -- they -- we were talking about if one look at the original work plan and the categorization we would -- we would -- we were proposing that they are principles that doesn't fall neither in principle -- in category 1, which is minimal requirements, or in category 2, which requires substantive discussion. So that we -- we termed that category 5. So the -- the second bullet was basically time for us to now re-categorize those ones so that we -- we eliminate category 5 and then we work it into the first, second, or third categories. So that is what we intend with that bullet. Thank you. That's by 15 December.

We have two requests for the floor. Iran and then Egypt. Thank you.

IRAN: Can you go back to the slide you were showing with changes, column 2 and 3, please? Yeah.

HENRI KASSEN: Can we move to the -- to the table?

categorization 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. We don't really understand these things. It was not so complex. Sorry. Thank you.

HENRI KASSEN: Thank you, Iran. Egypt.

EGYPT: Thank you, Henri. And I was just going to try to respond to what U.K. mentioned, but let me also very quickly, for the sake of clarity, I mean, explain where the categories came from. We've done two full iterations for the whole principles, and there were comments submitted by all the members of the group. Some comments were all along the same lines, and this is where we saw consensus is easy and we categorized them as straightforward principles. Other received comments which were a little bit diverse but again, there was no substantial difference. So those principles just needed to be discussed and we saw that those could be resolved easy.

Other principles were really -- needed substantial discussion and this was clear from the comments received. So the categorization was based on the comments received by the working group members.

The two final categories are things that have to do with introducing new principles, as Iran and Switzerland rightly

mentioned, and other principles that needed to be reviewed at the very end in light of discussions that are going on within the GAC and in the community in general that has to do with how the GAC would participate in the empowered community and other things. So this is basically the -- the categorization and where it comes from. So the categories mainly are based on comments submitted by working group members and how diverse or how converse they were.

On the approach, as Henri mentioned, and I think this also has to do with the -- with the timeline that U.K. was mentioning, it's important that we agree whether we're going to agree on the principles overall at the very end or agree on -- I mean, category by category or whatever, which I do not personally see very feasible because we will be making different 60 days for each category, and we'll also need to review them in light of each other. So -- and having said that, I'm not sure where does this put us. I mean, Thomas, yesterday you mentioned the coming elections and I -- I don't think if we're going to do the whole thing one time that we can meet this deadline. Thank you.

T. SANTOSH:

Yeah. To the chair.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. If I look into the faces of GAC colleagues, I see that there seems to be quite some confusion, if not desperation with some people to some extent.

We may have to -- to maybe take a step back and digest the experience of the past two years working on this and think about what do we start -- go back to square one and say what do we want to achieve? What are the key elements of what we want to achieve? And then figure out the process and maybe a logic that is as simple as possible so that people can follow, and then we see how we do things.

Of course it is a challenging task. We have a revision of an operating principles, which is basically not so complicated if that would be alone. Then we have the new elements of the bylaws which complicates it to some extent. But as some people have some ideas, expressed some ideas, that can be solved. We can identify things that are completely separate, as Iran has said. There may be things that may have to somehow work in parallel. So some thinking may be needed on how to do this.

With it and with regard to the structure of the work, I think the key question is that we need to decide, probably one of the first things, as soon as possible, is -- and I don't think this is clear. At least it's not clear to me. Do we work on the assumption that

nothing is agreed until everything is agreed? Is that the basis of work? Because that has implications. Or do we identify elements, issues, parts, but then this needs to be clearly separated? Then we say, okay, for whatever reasons, we have to deal with this until it -- for a certain deadline no matter how long the rest will take.

But this needs to be clear, is everything dependent on everything, which is the normal way to do this when you work on a text, or is there a reason that we can't do this because that may take too long and we want to have things changed? And then we need to identify elements that we say, okay, we have to take this out, do this first, or do this in two parallel processes, speed up one, with clear deadlines, with clear identifiable steps, milestones. And not just dates but actually the what and how to get there should be clear. Not everything needs to be written down but it needs to be clear that people have a common understanding what are we trying to do and how are we trying to get there.

For instance, two years ago what we did, the thing that was possible immediately after the elections in Los Angeles, we had an agreement in the GAC that we wanted to change the number of vice chairs from three to five. And the agreement, after some discussions, we agreed that we would not wait until everything is resolved. We would do this immediately.

There was some that suggested that we would also deal with the operational aspects of the elections as a separate prioritized action items that was not agreed, so we couldn't do that, so we had to, like, put this into the queue with all the other things. But we need to have this discussion, I guess, at some point in time, very soon. Do we want everything to be agreed until -- Is there nothing agreed until everything is agreed or are there elements that we want to take out and say we focus on this as a parallel track to the rest, but this needs to be agreed by January, May, whatever. So, for instance, with regard to elections we have something that is clear before the next elections, for instance.

So this is a fundamental question. And I think, actually, time is more or less up. So maybe just a quick feedback on -- on -- on my ideas in the hope that helps. But you need to communicate. You need to say what you think works, say what you think does not work. Otherwise, it's difficult to feel what you want.

So instead of just asking questions, make statements about what you want.

Thank you very much.

T. SANTOSH: European Commission.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thank you, Chair, and thank you for trying to clarify also the way forward.

Just a few remarks. On the categorization, I think the idea was really to organize our work. So it was supposed to be trying to help us and not to get us stuck in different categories, but really just to start focusing our attention and start working on the articles.

One thing that I think is missing in the working of this working group is to have sessions where we really discuss on the drafting. So as we progress, I think it would be really important to have really small sessions where we discuss on specific principle, and in this way we could advance.

On the way forward, I think that, as we mentioned, so the categories give us a starting point. So we said we would start with the low-hanging fruit the actual corrections and meaningful editorial changes. Like, for instance, just to give an example what we have here, so this would then entail -- you know, this could be quickly done, but then in a second iteration we could devote more time in adding elements like the ones that U.K. proposed but this need a little bit of discussion in the group. And when there is no controversy, we just find a good solution, then we can advance.

But then this requires several readings. So you could start with the first initial changes, and this could be approved, because our actual corrections to reflect how the GAC is working now. But then anything that would be sort of improvement to what we currently have would need some additional discussion.

So in -- I think we should have some sort of flexibility. Start with what is feasible now, but then be open and be aware that once we start changing some principles, we need to -- we might need to wait for work on other areas of the operating principles so that after we know where we are going and how the final version will be, then this will be adopted and changed definitely.

But I think that this work will require several iterations, even on the same principles.

Thank you.

T. SANTOSH: Iran.

IRAN: Thank you. I find this discussion very useful. The problem is that the working group start to discuss something without getting any guideline from the GAC. This categorization should

have come from the GAC; that in order to do the work, categorize the issues. But you have started yourself and now, okay.

Now, the question that our chair raised, we could say nothing agreed until everything agreed if the issues are dependent. But the proposed agenda X days before in consultation with member has nothing to do with the election. So why we have to wait for that?

It's quite simple.

So I think we should simplify the matter. And if the issue are not related to any of the issue, there is no impact on something before or after, independent, why not complete that? Item one, that top line proposed by U.K., I think the same timeline you have for item 2, the principle 13. You say that any change should be subject to the chair of the GAC. In what time frame? Two weeks before the start of discussion on agenda? One week? One day? One month?

So you need to put element on that.

So my question -- not question, comment, to the request of the chair, we should not apply nothing agreed on until everything agreed unless two or three are totally independent; then put them aside.

The remaining which have no relation to the others, approve it and make the correction. But having categorization or not, this is something that GAC should give guideline to the group. If everybody agree categorize it and helps, okay, categorize that. If it is complicated, no, don't categorize that.

Thank you.

T. SANTOSH: Spain.

SPAIN: I thought you were before me. Okay. I'm going to answer to our Chair questions.

I think we should approve the whole thing at the end because when you draft a law and when you pass it through the parliament, you don't approve it bit by bit. You approve the whole thing. And it's important to make sure that different elements of an act, a law, in this case these rules of procedure, are consistent.

There are overlaps between different principles or there are inconsistencies between different principles. So it's mandatory to do it -- to do an overall review.

Having said that, I think that the specific issue of the operational procedures for election could be agreed separately, especially if we all agree that for the next election of vice chairs, we should use an electronic voting system. I don't think that that shall need to wait until the very end. But the rest of things, I definitely think that we need to do an overall approval of the changes.

As regards the categorization, I think it's already approved by the GAC. So as Christina said, it's a way of structuring the work of the working group, is to give guidance to the working group as to what to tackle first and what to follow afterwards.

Thank you.

T. SANTOSH:

We appreciate the comments of GAC members. Now, actually, we are short of time. We will have one more comment of Egypt.

Thank you.

EGYPT:

Thank you. Just very quickly to confirm what was said by my colleagues from European Commission and Spain.

The categorization was basically to structure our way and to prioritize how we are going to approach the operating principles. The categories were circulated with the work plan to

the GAC members on the mailing list, and again, they are here and we can revisit the categorization if there is some feedback to do any necessary changes.

And before I hand back the floor, I just want to remind us that for anything to get into effect, it has to stay for 60 days first. And that's why it may be too complicated to approve principle by principle or article by article, because then it becomes very complicated.

So just to note this.

Thank you.

T. SANTOSH: China, please.

CHINA: Thank you. I would like to echo what has been put forward by Gema on the approval of the operating principles, because from my view, in our principle, operating principle, the elements are interconnected and interrelated with each other.

So we may approve the operating principle, the new version, as a whole.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you.

As we see, there's not only confusion but there's still different perceptions of what should need to be done in terms of even the question do we have to do everything together and then agree everything in one or are there issues that can be isolated or have to be isolated.

Maybe a suggestion would be now, given we have a large team - - large leadership team, that we take this to the leadership team, including the co-chairs of this group, and we try and come up with a proposal in the next few weeks on how to handle this in the hope that we -- we try to come up with a clear proposal, and then we'll get some feedback from you electronically. Because it sounds a little bit confusing in many directions for the time being, and we do not seem to be able to solve this right now.

So maybe we really need to have a step back, think through this from scratch, and then see how we can maybe adapt the working methods to make this more -- more easily viable, knowing that it's not an easy task.

With this, I would almost let you go to the coffee break. There's one thing that just is a follow-up to the discussion that we had earlier on the funding of the GAC secretariat. The Swiss

delegation, who is helping to manage a little bit of the accounting of this, has been so kind and put up a little graph that I ask staff to put on -- on the screen so that you see where we are now, so that you can have a -- not just know that this is a challenge but you see a visual picture of where we are now in the hope that that helps you to understand the situation. And so while -- this document will come up in the next moments.

And we were -- I'm having a lot of informal discussion with delegations that are trying -- are in the process on national level of seeking or applying for funds internally and identifying the processes that they have to undergo. So not everything that you see on this graph is -- that is in the very early stage, let's say, of processing is on this -- on this graph. This is a cautious calculation, but this is basically where we are at at the moment. And I hope that will come soon so that we see it because that helps, I think, understand the situation. So I'm waiting for Gulden or Julia to get that draft on screen.

It's coming. It's coming, so you will have the break very soon.

This is it. If you can make it -- Yes.

What is fully green is what is confirmed. What is a little bit lighter green, it is what is very likely to most likely to be confirmed very soon. And then what is very light green is in the making but not -- not confirmed at all. And then the red thing is

what we still need. That's for 2017. And as I said, there are many countries are -- a number of countries are started discussion internally. They may be in the red. But as I said earlier, the red thing needs to disappear fairly quickly. And if -- if we would not get the same level of support that we have gotten, this is something we may have to live with, and there will be a new contract on a lower basis of services. But the dark green things need to be -- Those who are confirmed, what we need is a clear indication by the end of the year what is the minimal money that we will have for sure. So I urge all of us to really do our best internally to get confirmation for 2017 what can you give us, give the secretariat, given the GAC, because this is very important.

So that's all I have to say on this, and now this is the coffee break. We'll meet again at 11:15.

Thank you.

[Coffee break]