
COPENHAGEN – GAC Implementation of the new ICANN Bylaws – Part 2

Sunday, March 12, 2017 – 11:00 to 12:00 CET

ICANN58 | Copenhagen, Denmark

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Dear colleagues, please sit down. We need to resume.

Okay. Thank you all for taking your seats. We have to continue because time is running, rushing, whatever you use in English.

Just one word about the discussion we've had so far. I think we are a little bit more clear, hopefully, after the 45 minutes than in the beginning. And it is tricky. It is tricky. We are in a new situation, and we have to find out what do we want. What of the options do we want to use and how -- in case we agree on those options we want to use, how do we actually concretely do them?

We cannot pursue this further right now because we have two issues left. One is probably rather simple, which is the assignment of representatives in these processes.

I think the key part is what we'll look into now is the topic 2. And just one general remark, basically. People are referring to Tom's paper, This is not -- in that sense, these are not Tom's paper. These were -- we drafted them together, Tom and I. And, of course, I take, let's say, the political responsibility. So, if you

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.

don't like something that is in the paper, blame me. Don't blame Tom. Just to make that very clear. I take the responsibility as a joint effort to try and come up with proposals in the hope that they help us get to something that is operationalized at some point in time. I hope you sympathize with me that this is not a very simple task. So we do our best. And whatever you don't like, blame me. Don't blame Tom. Just to make that very clear.

Okay. Having said this, let's go to the topic two. And also there, again, Tom will go through the document. The thing is this that we could get lost in a number of details that are laid out as proposals in the document. But I don't think that's the sensible approach. Given that we have a case waiting for us to exercise this community -- empowered community structure, just as a way of thinking, what I would like to propose to you is, actually, that we try and agree on the broad lines of what is in the document or modify it, according to you. But in the end we have an agreement on a very broad understanding of how we are going to run through this. And then we can actually use this upcoming proposal for a fundamental bylaw change where I do not think that we have an issue with the substance so that we can use this knowing that what the outcome -- what we want the outcome to be, i.e., that this fundamental bylaw change is possible, is accepted, or not objected to. I think that I'm

assuming this. We didn't have the time to discuss this, but that's what I'm hearing from all over. So that we can actually use this as a test case and develop some very preliminary provisional procedures that allow us to fulfill our role.

And then, after the experience of this, i.e., after the Johannesburg meeting, come back and assess of what we did and how we did and whether it actually worked the way we expected it and then go towards a finite or final mechanism that may be more in the details. So I'm just saying this with a view that we will have to be prepared to, at least, I think, participate in the community forum that is planned. We don't know yet how exactly that's going to be done. Nobody knows that yet. But we will somehow participate in that community forum discussion about this fundamental bylaw change. And then there will be somehow a decision, hopefully, to follow the Board's proposal to do that change, unless there is substantive resistance or objections that may pop up in the GAC or somewhere else.

But, if that's not the case, we can actually use this as a test case. And we'll know more after that experience than we do now where everything is just theory on paper.

So, with these remarks, let me give the floor to Tom to not present his document but our document. Thank you.

TOM DALE:

Thank you, Thomas. Yes. And to clarify Thomas's clarification, if I may, the input from ACIG is exactly that. ACIG is a resource that you're -- or some of you are supporting. And it's a resource of three people at the moment or 2.5 people -- myself, Michelle, and Joe, who is back in Australia at the moment. I would have to stress that on all of our work, particularly on major documents such as these ones, all three ACIG team members have contributed. It is an ACIG effort rather than something that has my personal imprimatur.

And in this case, as well as Thomas said, the GAC chair has had a significant role in the direction and the arguments that are being put.

And, again, this is what happened in Hyderabad as well, that the direction of the discussion was determined by the chair. And we were asked to provide some supporting documentation as an ACIG team. And that's what we did. And you'll recall that led to discussions. And that's how the material was presented this time as well.

So I just wanted to be clear that, because it's -- I think it's important that the GAC knows just what it is you're getting as regards secretariat support. There are a number of people involved. And -- depending on the complexity of the issue. And there will continue to be so, hopefully, if that arrangement is

able to continue. In this case, we've, of course, quite properly had these -- the additional guidance of the chair.

The briefing that we prepared on GAC participation in the empowered community is the one on the screen at the moment. Rather than going through the preliminary details, Gulden, perhaps if you could scroll down a little to where it says, "Advice from ICANN legal," this is something that the GAC requested at the Hyderabad meeting. And, to begin with, I'll explain what the legal advice was. It's fairly straightforward. If you can just go down a little bit further -- thank you -- to advice from ICANN legal.

Some GAC members had requested that we clarify what -- essentially, what the GAC can and cannot do as regards to establishing procedures for how the GAC participates in the empowered community.

The response we had from the ICANN legal area was that the only restriction is that the GAC's procedures should take into account the time frames for community action and otherwise be aligned with the bylaws.

And I will read this out, because it's important that you be aware of the advice before we have the discussion. I think the bylaws were specifically drafted in a manner that would allow

each decisional participant to craft their own internal procedures to guide participation. This is ICANN legal speaking.

So, while there should be an opportunity to raise a petition, for example, to the GAC, the GAC may determine who is properly allowed to bring a petition. I should mention that's not a detail that's covered for today in this briefing document, but for the sake of completeness. Some participants may wish to allow anyone to bring a petition. Others may wish to put restrictions on who can do so.

For example, the GAC might wish to never be the source of a petition to the empowered community so it would be an internal choice if the GAC procedures would bar that possibility and focus only on how to respond and act in the event another participant initiates the process.

Now, I'm just reading that out to -- so that you were clear on the advice that we received from ICANN legal which is the procedures are entirely up to the GAC, as long as they're consistent with the bylaws. The specific issue of decisional participants is a rather detailed one, and it is not immediately required in the case that Thomas has mentioned which is the approval of the fundamental bylaw which is coming up. But I'm just drawing to your attention to begin with that the advice that

the GAC has received is -- gives -- gives the GAC considerable freedom to determine those procedures.

The proposal in a draft form that has been included in this document in consultation with the chair covers the following things: Firstly, there are some suggested guiding principles which recommend, firstly, a flexible approach, given this is an untested system, and to make changes to the principles and procedures as necessary in the light of experience. Secondly, that the GAC will engage with issues that have direct or indirect public policy implications, although a broader view of that may sometimes have to be taken. That the GAC will participate in the early stages of an escalation process with a view to helping resolution of the issue where feasible and appropriate. And finally that the GAC will not exclude itself in principle from participating in the exercise of any community power but will approach each case on its merits. A pause there, Thomas?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Maybe just a word on this. These are not new elements. These are basically our attempt to summarize what we've heard in the discussions on this over the last year or even longer. Thank you.

TOM DALE:

Thank you indeed. That's very important. Clearly. The second set of issues that are included in this draft proposal concern representation -- representation of GAC in the empowered community administration, which is the collective entity of all decisional participants, the GAC and the other SOs and ACs who are members of the empowered community. At the present time the GAC has indicated that the GAC chair will be the representative until the issue is reviewed at the next meeting. The papers -- the briefings suggest that an alternative representative, normally one of the GAC vice chairs, should be agreed by the GAC and that arrangement could be reviewed annually, as an alternative in case the chair is unable to attend. And finally, that a small group of GAC members could support the GAC chair in this new role. And could, with the support of the secretariat, ensure that the GAC receives all available communications and decisions because the -- the information process for these matters, as I understand it, is not completely settled within ICANN yet. So the GAC will have to do its best to -- to ensure transparency of these issues as they come up.

And then we have a series of proposals concerning decision making at each stage of escalation. Stages 1, 2, and 3, broadly speaking, the submission of a petition, the calling of a conference call, and the calling of a community forum. As you've heard from Thomas, the -- the community forum stage is

likely to occur for the proposed amendment of the fundamental bylaw for the next -- at the next ICANN meeting in Johannesburg. The proposal here is that the GAC participate in all of those stages, that the GAC is focused on working with everyone else in the community to resolve a problem rather than exercise a power, if -- if that's at all possible, and the number of procedures are set for doing so. We can go into that in detail in a moment if you would like.

The final stage which is stage 4, the exercise of the community power where the decisional participants collectively make a decision on whether to exercise a power to -- to approve a bylaw change, to approve a fundamental bylaw change, or to -- or to remove a board member, for example, or to reject a budget. The document suggests that this is significantly different from those first three stages. That the views of all GAC members should be actively sought. Where if things do get to that stage, that a consensus GAC position will be sought by all GAC members on the basis of a motivated proposal presented by the GAC leadership, and that any formal objection by the GAC -- this is going back to our previous discussion before the break -- that if there is a formal objection, there would need to be a full discussion in the GAC within the time frame set out in the bylaws but that the GAC -- finally, that if a consensus position is not possible, the suggestion here is that the GAC would abstain from

any decision-making process at that stage. The bylaws do specifically provide for members to abstain. That's a very quick run-through of the issues, the legal advice, and the possible approach. Thomas, thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Tom. And to just try and highlight, the essence of this is that the proposal, based on -- that we present you based on the discussions that we've had so far, is the basic idea is that in the first three steps, which are oriented towards a dialogue towards finding solutions without having to exercise the community power, in the end that the entry threshold for the GAC to participate there should be lower in the sense that it should not be -- it should be difficult or even impossible for a very small number or a single or one GAC member to prevent the GAC from participating in that discussion or prevent that discussion from happening because if the GAC and other -- and maybe one other SO/AC may object, this dialogue may not even be able to happen. So we need to be aware of that consequence.

So the idea is on the steps that are trying to resolve things without having to exercise the community power, we should be in favor of such a dialogue and support this dialogue and be able to participate with others in this dialogue, which is a different

thing from at the final stage in case that we -- the mechanism got there while we would have to take a decision or be part of those who take a decision on accepting a fundamental bylaw or rejecting a budget or whatever it is, that there we need to have a consensus in order to take that decision. And if we don't have a - - very strict consensus. If we don't have a consensus, that would prevent us from saying yes or no or whatever. So there is, again, two different levels. This is the logic of the proposal. There are two different levels, a lower threshold for allowing and supporting a dialogue with a view to resolving issues without having to exercise the community powers. When it comes to exercising the community powers, the rules must be very strict so that, yeah, everybody has a say and everybody needs to be -- needs to feel comfortable with that last step.

So that is the logic that we were trying to develop. We hope that this is clear and understandable. Now the floor is yours to make comments, ask questions, and tell us what you think of this. Thank you. France.

FRANCE:

Thank you. Thank you, Chair. Well, I think the draft we have here is very balanced and operational. And I think the important word here is "visibility." I think it's very clearly explained in our briefing paper. We don't know much about the substance and

the frequency of future use of AC powers yet, but it's a completely new world for GAC. We used to be only an advisory committee. We now are also a decisional participant in the EC. So at this early stage I think our principles should be very much about being future-proof.

An important aspect is that the rest of the community will expect our participation in a timely and constructive manner, so we need to make sure that we can meet these expectations. And in order to do so, I think being able to work electronically and intersessionally is important, especially in the first steps of the escalation process.

I also support very much a proposed gradual approach, with a flexible way to reach consensus in the first steps of the escalation process which would really ease our ability to participate and then have a stricter approach to reach consensus when it comes to actually exercise the power.

So overall, I really support the principles put forth in the paper. I think it's a really balanced way to summarize the discussion we've had so far. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, France. Next is Brazil. Then I see Denmark and the European Commission, Iran. That's what I see so far. Okay. Brazil. Thank you.

BRAZIL: Thank you, Thomas. I would like to have some clarification on why, in regard to stage 4, it is recommended that if consensus GAC position is not possible the GAC will abstain from any decision-making process in the empowered community. We understand that these -- there is -- it would be up to the GAC to decide and the paper itself refers later on, I think it's the second last page, the first paragraph after, "How should GAC decide it's input into EC processes," it indicates there is still a lack of consensus among ourselves on how this should be done. Some GAC members think that the same rule governing GAC advice to the board should apply. So it would only -- we would seek full consensus, but others propose some form of voting threshold.

My question refers to the fact that if we agree that in the absence of consensus we should abstain from any decision-making process, again, we are voluntarily accepting that unless full consensus is obtained, which, of course, we think is the preferable way of making decisions, but we're accepting that we will not have a say in any issue to be decided. So I think it's a matter that should be seriously examined by us. We, of course,

we are trying to deal with hypotheticals and others who don't know what exactly are the issues to be addressed. But we are -- if we accept what is being proposed that only if consensus is not reached we shall abstain, we are from the start saying that unless we -- we have that full consensus, we would not have -- we will not be a participant. So it would be a decisional participant but no -- with no real power-making, decision-making power unless there is full consensus, in the light of the discussions we had before on how we want to deal with this consensus rule and how we should interpret it. So I'd like to have more clarity on this. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Brazil. First of all, one remark. This -- this developing of procedures for the GAC participation in the empowered communities will say something different than discussing different levels of GAC advice and so on and so forth. That has got basically -- they use similar concepts in the end, but formally these two things have got nothing to do with each other. One is agreeing on how we work on the text and the other one is agreeing how we participate in the new structure.

Having said this, again, this is a proposal that tries to give you some elements, possible elements, of how this let's say graduated system could look like. That doesn't mean that this

will be the end version. And what we did is trying to introduce elements that were part of the debate before. And this is something that we heard, at least from some -- some GAC members, that in case the GAC would participating in the final step that there should be a very strict, very strict ways or restrictions for doing that because of some concerns that the GAC would have a role that was not -- it shouldn't have and so on and so forth. So these are just elements that we proposed that could form elements of, let's say, conditions or principles that would guide our ways of participating in the structure. But, of course, we will have to go through every proposal that is on -- here in this paper or in a later version of the paper, whatever. What I'm trying to get from you now is a broad sense of whether the general idea of the logic of the paper as has been outlined by Tom, by ACIG, the Australian -- Tom group --

[Laughter]

That was an internal joke, so sorry for that. And the way France, for instance, has expressed, they seem to support the general direction that this takes, but I don't take France's intervention that they agree with every single bullet point or line in this thing. But it's good to signal where you have concerns, so this is very welcomed because that helps us to get a better sense of what is in the end may be feasible or may not be feasible. But yeah, please tell us what you think about the overall idea and then you

may go into details and tell us what you -- how you like or don't like particular elements of that proposal.

So next one. Sorry for this long sermon, but I thought that was important. Denmark is the next on my list.

DENMARK:

Thank you, Thomas, and thank you for the secretariat and you to produce this paper which we think is a good start. I will have initially some comments and perhaps reaction to certain of the things.

On the first page it is indicated that we have a formal obligation among others to initiate a petition. For me I think we have the right, the possibility to do it, but I don't think that the GAC is under any obligation here. So I think that is important to -- to notice.

As -- as to the guiding principles, I'm a little uncertain what is meant here with indirect public policy implication. I actually only think that GAC should participate and have views on things which have an impact, direct impact, on public policy matters. Whether we should preclude ourselves for exercise all the powers, from our point of view, we have difficulties to see the GAC be involved in spilling one of the board members, to be frank. That

is not one scenario I can see. So that is, at least from our point of view, that we could exclude that possibility.

So my proposal would be to only delete that if we have a statement that we are looking at what is clear or direct policy, public policy implication, then I think that is sufficient. We think it's important that -- that is, the chair will be representing the GAC in this community, so why have it as an annual review? That's only a question.

It is indicating here there is a small group. I'm not sure how this group is going to be composed. Is it free for everybody, then it might not be a small one. Just a clarification on it.

I can see that there's the idea that GAC in a more light way can engage in step 1, 2, and 3. What for Denmark is important is that if we come to the decision part, which we from the outset do not think we should be in, but if we are in it, then we think it should be real consensus, and that is what we understand as full GAC consensus. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Denmark. European Union Commission.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Yes, thank you very much, and thank to you the secretariat for preparing this. We have been discussing in our European group some similar grande ligne, if you like, which are very much consistent with what has been presented here. And I think that this is a very good starting point for discussion. And we will, of course, be discussing this in a bit more detail in our EU coordination group, but I think probably by the end of today or perhaps tomorrow we can also circulate that to you, if that's of use. But it's very consistent with what has been written here. So perhaps better not for you to have one more piece of paper that just confuses things.

But a couple of things, and Denmark and France and Brazil have mentioned this, too, and I'm very sympathetic to the Brazilian consideration and concern about consensus, a consensus position. On the other hand, this is not advice to the board. And we think -- and some of the others have mentioned this too -- that to the extent the GAC participates in this, it has to take a clear position.

And therefore, its position to vote either in favor or against or to abstain from something has to be absolutely clear.

It's not a mandate that the GAC is giving to its representative, which we presume would be the chair. It's a position that has to be taken by the GAC.

So it's a very different thing to give the GAC chair a mandate to say you go ahead and do whatever you think is right. These are very serious cases. And, therefore, we think that it's really important that when the GAC vote takes place, it has to be on the basis of consensus by -- by the GAC.

And if that can't occur within the time necessary, then probably it has to abstain.

But as I think that -- as I said, I don't want to go through all the details again, but for starters, I think it's a very good starting point.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Thomas.

First of all, we don't want to blame anybody, but there is a need for some sort of procedures here.

On the right-hand some column, perhaps in the future we should replace ACIG or AGIC by GAC chair. This is the responsible

person. You as the chair could propose any document to facilitate discussions. So document should be in your name.

Second, whenever you reach outside the GAC in the name of GAC, you need to have approval of the GAC. Otherwise, you raise the question under your name. So you cannot ask ICANN legal committee is there any restriction. We have not given that authority. Why we have to ask GAC, the ICANN legal community whether there is restrictions? The issue is clearly bylaw. But you as the chair, you could do that, but it on your name, but not on the name of GAC. There is no such a blank check and there is no such authority that anything should be in name of GAC.

Thirdly, this document should be a starting point, yes, but there need to be further discussed, and we have to find the modality how to discuss that. It is very, very serious issues, result of a ten months of the intensive discussions, and we could not reach in hasty manner. It's very, very important.

Any of these four steps are important and need to have a written procedure how will be implemented.

With respect to the consensus on the last part, this consensus should be put in inverted comma to see how we come up with the definition of consensus in that regard. We are not talking of the full consensus. We are talking of general consensus, and so on, so forth. So that should be put that.

So we thank you very much. This is the starting point, but they need to be further discussed, revised, streamlined, simplified. However, should be consistent with the bylaw.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Iran.

Just a few comments. First of all, formally, every document that ACIG sends is upon request by the leadership or by the GAC, and in the end it's my responsibility anyway. So it's not -- Tom doesn't -- or anybody else from ACIG, they do not just send around papers that they like, and it's not their views. We ask them normally to make a proposal on our behalf with some guidance from the GAC, from the leadership team or from just myself. But in the end, it's our responsibility as leadership team, and, in particular, my responsibility. So I hope that clarifies the situation.

With regard to the questions that we've asked Tom to ask ICANN legal, that actually was a request from the GAC and, in particular, from the Iranian delegation. So these questions, again, is not an initiative of ours. We've been asked to ask ICANN legal to get clarification on these questions. This is what we did. To make that clear.

And of course we need to further discuss this. This is the beginning or let's say the second time, if you take Hyderabad as the beginning where we had an initial discussion on which we built. Also the paper is building on the Hyderabad paper taking into account the elements of that discussion. And this is not the end of the story. It's still more the beginning of the story than the end. But again, we have to be ready or I think we should be ready. It's of course not my decision but the one of the GAC that we can participate in those steps of this process that will be done by -- by our next meeting. And we need to be sufficiently clear about who does and can do what and how the GAC works until -- until Johannesburg in order to -- if that community forum is planned -- is to be held in Johannesburg, we need to be ready for not blocking this. And in addition to not blocking this, to actually participating.

And just one word to what Megan from the European Commission has said. Of course to me, it is clear that it's not a mandate to the GAC chair. The GAC chair is the one that represents the GAC in the empowered community administration. It's not a mandate to the chair to do what he thinks is right but actually to follow a decision or to communicate a decision taken by the GAC. So this is -- this is very clear. It's the GAC that decides, and it's the -- for the time being, it's the chair that will communicate that decision

formally. But it's not a decision of the chair. It's a decision of the -- or the representative in the empowered community. It's the decision of the GAC.

Brazil.

BRAZIL:

Thank you, Thomas, and sorry to take the floor again on this same issue.

I should have started by thanking you and ACIG for this way, but I think it provides us a very good basis to move forward. I think as already has stated, I think that reflects also some reflections we have had on this.

I focused my previous comment on the consensus that is proposed for final decision-making in regard to the exercise of the community power because I -- and I refer to the discussion we had before on the GAC advice to the board because I think we are more or less in similar situations. And I don't see a reason why we should predetermine and tie our hands to some kind of restriction that may be we may in the future try to address, in a way.

I'm sorry to say, but I think we made a bad decision or accepted a bad decision in regard to the consensus advice to the board and now we are trying to fix it. And I think it's useless, because

the language that was enshrined in the bylaw does not allow flexibility for this.

So I think I'd like to try to avoid the same situation here in which we say unless we have consensus, we abstain. And in the future may come, for example, why also should we predetermine that we are -- will restrict ourselves to some issues and not to others. Even for the removal of a board member, for example. That can be for ethical reasons or for having committed a crime. So why should the GAC abstain from participating it? And why should we establish that only if consensus, we should participate? Because there might be situations in which individual one country or two participants may, for internal reasons, be constrained to adhere to consensus.

So I think we should not be rushed into making decisions that maybe in the future we'll have to revisit and try to fix, and in the end it might be too late as we think is the case in regard to the advice we provide to the board.

I think it's too late now to think about how we can circumvent the objection. Objection is objection, and we accepted the language that says consensus in the absence of objection. So I don't see much reason in going about the language.

So I try again just to avoid the same situation here.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Brazil, and I think you're absolutely right. We don't have to rush with everything. We have to move ahead with at least the part that we'll have to use until the Johannesburg meeting.

And just, again, the discussion about consensus for GAC advice has got nothing to do with the procedures of us here. We can decide that we -- a simple majority is enough for exercising community powers if we want. That's maybe not what we want, but we are free to decide. And that was actually also the ICANN legal answer, basically. As long as you don't go against the bylaws, you can do whatever you want in organizing yourselves. So just to make that clear.

I see that our colleagues from the CCT review team are already there, and we have a few seconds left.

We haven't discussed the -- the third part of this, but I -- at least I hope that it's not that urgent. So we'll maybe continue to solicit comments electronically on that one.

We'll also continue to come up with something clearer and easy, understandable on the advice part of the bylaw implementations.

What I would quickly spend a few seconds on is get a sense of what we do with this, with the GAC participation in the empowered community. So far I have not heard any fundamental opposition to the logic or the outline of this proposal that we will have -- we will basically be in favor of allowing the dialogue on the first three steps, and we intend to participate and that there should be some flexibility in this and that we need to have -- and that we would participate in this up to Johannesburg in -- without having clear guidance on what exactly the process is, but we intend to, let's say, let this happen by Johannesburg with that case that is coming up.

And then in Johannesburg we'll have another chance to -- in case that case -- and that case will go beyond the step of the community forum, because the board is asking us to accept the fundamental bylaw change. So we have to -- in that case, we will have to exercise, also, or define better what to do with the last step of this community power, which in that case is not to prevent anything but actually to allow the board to do something, which is a different case than from -- from dismissing board members, and so on and so forth.

But we'll have time to look at this in Johannesburg or until Johannesburg because that won't happen, if I understood rightly what I heard this morning, that won't happen in Johannesburg, but the community forum will happen. Well, the

community forum is 21 days. I don't know exactly which day of the community forum of those 21 days will happen in Johannesburg, so that may be at the beginning or at the end. We don't know yet.

But if -- Unless I hear an objection from you now, I take it that we are willing to participate in these steps until the community forum in Johannesburg on this issue that is coming up. And we'll proceed with the -- with the documents further in the meantime and set priorities.

Is there any objection to what I said?

Iran, do you object?

IRAN:

I not object. You mix up the two situation. Discussion on this particular -- you mentioned yesterday as a innocence case is different from discussion on general case.

For this particular case, there is no problem. There is no difficulty at all.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. No, I'm not mixing it up. I'm exactly making that distinction.

Thank you.

Okay. With this, let's end this session for now, and the discussion will, of course, continue. And let's invite the members of the CCT review team to the stage.

Yes, Canada.

CANADA:

Yes, thank you, Chair. And, yes, I think we're all in agreement to proceed with the early stages, as you described. So in agreement.

Just would like to associate with Denmark that we do feel, however, that there should be a clear public-policy rationale in terms of the decisional stage.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

That's noted. But we have a little more time for that. So -- But we will have to use that time as well, because otherwise it will be too late.

Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]