
JOHANNESBURG – GAC Meeting to Review Items for the GAC Communique

Tuesday, June 27, 2017 – 12:00 to 12:30 JNB

ICANN59 | Johannesburg, South Africa

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: I just wanted to invite 1.0 to the table but he's already there.

All right. So this is our last session before the break. It may, probably, not be too long. 1.0 will explain to you why. So let me give the floor to him.

TOM DALE: Thank you, Thomas. Other people -- excuse me. Thank you. Just bear in mind -- I've had a USB drive delivered to me. I think I know what to do with it. Thank you.

Just bear in mind for one minute, please. Just a small technical matter to deal with.

Apologies. Thank you, Thomas. We're just having difficulties getting a document from one side of the room to the other by what I think people call the Internet.

The point of this session was to or is to briefly review the wishes of the GAC concerning the possible structure of the communique to be issued by the GAC by close of the session tomorrow afternoon, or possibly tomorrow evening.

I should make clear firstly that in recent meetings, at the request of the GAC, a so-called zero draft has been prepared by the secretariat

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.

and circulated to start some discussion before the meeting. That has proven to be increasingly difficult, if not impossible, to provide a meaningful zero draft for you to look at before the meeting, simply because the GAC members working on particular issues have had workload issues, and the indications for possible advice to the Board, for example, or, indeed, a lot of other issues, it is not possible for the secretariat to -- to take even an educated guess as to what might be in the minds of the GAC members for this meeting. So I didn't try on this occasion. It would not have been of a lot of help.

So just to note that as the zero draft exercises another victim at the present time of GAC work overload, we will work with you to try to find a better means of saving time on the very significant amount of effort that GAC members put into the communiqué drafting. We're always looking for better systems, of course, and I think there are opportunities to discuss this in one or more sessions on Thursday, which seems a long time away at the moment. But in the meantime, the document you see on the screen suggests a couple of issues for initial discussion that may be issues you want included in the communiqué. And the communiqué, to -- again, for the benefit of the significant number of new attendees here at the GAC meeting, is divided into GAC advice to the Board and a lot of other issues. And the GAC advice of the Board section of the communiqué is particularly important because of the status that that consensus advice has on the bylaws, and that is usually given some priority.

The suggestion at the moment in that document is the GAC advice to the Board may include the protection of Red Cross and Red Crescent

designations and identifiers, picking up on some points raised yesterday about the process for that new PDP -- sorry, that resumed PDP that is now looking at that issue and how GAC can become involved in that.

The second one concerns IGO protections, picking up again on some concerns expressed by a number of members yesterday about -- by security rights PDP and also the response of the Board, potentially, as well to the GAC's advice from Copenhagen concerning policy directions for IGO protections in the policy development process.

The third possible issue for GAC advice to the Board is two-character country and territory codes at the second level. The precise details of any such advice I don't think I or anyone else would care to hazard a guess at the moment, but it seems to be a sensible issue to at least note.

And finally, it's not clear on that document but that says Public Safety Working -- Public Safety Working Group issues yet to be confirmed and -- thank you -- it's not clear at this stage whether the PSWG would be suggesting to the GAC specific issues to advise the Board on.

The rest of the communiqué has, as you know, a number of important elements, usually but not necessarily advice to the Board. At the present -- present time, there are suggestions for four issues there. One is a possible GAC statement concerning geographic names at the top level, particularly in the light of what transpire in the two cross-community sessions this week, although one of them occurs on

Thursday so it's a little hard to be -- to be making definitive statements about that.

The second concerns GAC in the Empowered Community. Perhaps just as a statement on the public record as the GAC has made in most of its communiqués recently about its own progress on those matters.

Potentially, something on the issues arising from the cross-community session which is scheduled for tomorrow on ICANN priorities, because as you've heard in quite a number of sessions, there is not just concern in the GAC but other parts of the community concerning that issue. And the GAC chair will be involved in that session, and there may be some pointers for the GAC to pick up.

And finally, GAC working group reports. There is a question there. One or two GAC members -- and my apologies, I can't recall specifically who it was -- had suggested that the GAC could consider perhaps shortening, in some form, the -- what are getting to be quite lengthy reports from the GAC working groups to be included in the communiqué. Of course, that's a good thing because the working groups are doing good work, but in terms of time taken for the communiqué drafting, that's just a question about the format for you to consider as well, whether you want a lengthy report from each of the GAC working groups in the communiqué or published somewhere else.

Those are the matters at the moment that your secretariat, or I.0, has taken a guess at, but of course this is just the beginning of a discussion. And a lot of issues, as you recall from previous meetings,

do come up in both the meeting with the Board and usually the meeting with the GNSO Council as well, but both of those do not take place until tomorrow morning.

Thank you, Thomas.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you.

So, comments?

Argentina and then Iran, please.

ARGENTINA:

Thank you, Chair. And thank you, Tom, for the document. Given the fact that there will be cross-community sessions about geographic names and ICANN priorities, I would suggest that the other title matters' title would go to the GAC working group reports part. And then we can see, evaluate, perhaps, after today or tomorrow if it's worth for advice or not these three items: geographic names, GAC and the Empowered Community, and who sets ICANN priorities.

About the reports from working groups, I think we already discussed this before. We -- I think we were in agreement that it should perhaps be concise and shorter, but that's something that we can discuss.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Chair.

As I have informally discussed with yourself, we need to limit the number of the point we raise with the Board to the absolute minimum necessary, with certain priorities. And number two is that we have to communicate what subject we discuss with them as soon as possible because at the previous meeting they said that they received our reply or our comment, or subject very late and did not have sufficient time to go through that. That was the reason why some of the answers which were given were not satisfactory.

We -- I suggest that we put the two-character country/territory codes at the first item, and then also possibly move geographic name at the top-level domain to the first list. And then with respect to the IGO and Red Cross and Red Crescent, I would like to know that what we want to discuss with Board again, because we have heard some process is ongoing. I'll be repeating the same thing. Has there been any new development that requires to be pursued or what?

The remaining dependent on the time, but the important is that after that meeting is the results should be included in the communiqué. And I suggest that we start communiqué as soon as feasible, but not leaving that on the Thursday afternoon. That would be very, very late.

So we have to start on that as soon as is feasible. I would not say "possible," but feasible. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Iran.

Actually, we have had the discussion on the preparation for the meeting with the Board this morning before the coffee break. This is the first zero draft or what is possible to do for the zero draft of the communiqué. So just to make that clear. We are not discussing -- We have already agreed how we will shape and -- on the agenda of the meeting with the Board. That is done. So this is just an attempt to have an idea what will come in the communiqué, to make that very clear.

Thank you.

Other comments on the communiqué as it stands so far? Indonesia.

INDONESIA:

Well, I just want to propose, as Kavouss mentioned, in the communiqué we may focus only on several points that we would like to raise. The problem is sometime if there are too many things to be put in the communiqué, then, you know, you lost the focus and we do not pursue whatever we want to get the -- the outcome. For example, the two characters might be not getting some special attention because it is -- there are so many other things that is put in the communiqué.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you.

Well, normally the GAC puts in the communique the elements of advice that it wants to give to the Board. Sometimes there are more issues; sometimes there are less issues. But everything will be in the communique that you want to be in the communique, whatever that -- that is. This is just what we so far project that may be part of a communique as an element to help us prepare given that we have limited time tomorrow to work on the communique. But the communique is not -- again, is not the session with the Board. There we have a limited time. The Board has as much time as they want to deal with everything that we put as advice in the communique. Just to make that clear.

We're not discussing -- We're not preparing the meeting with the Board of tomorrow. We've done that this morning before the coffee break. We're just trying to get a sense of what we will have as elements of the communique in order to have a more prepared and structured discussion tomorrow afternoon when we finalize and write the communique.

Iran.

IRAN:

Thank you, Chair. I apologize. I was not here when you discuss. I was in the working group of new gTLD at the -- preparing something. One issue is (indiscernible) fully relating to the GAC and there was no singular member of the GAC at that meeting. And to reflect on what happened. So I'm sorry, I was not here. What is the difficulty, if you categorize in the priority I mentioned, two-character -- the first item? And then go to the rest. Is it difficulty to do that? Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

This is not -- we can discuss the order of things also on Wednesday. We took note of your proposal and this is already integrated in Tom's notes. So there's no problem with it, to answer your question.

Other remarks on the communique? And as we -- as we outlined, we don't have much substance yet because it's like one and a half days, not even, that we're meeting. So obviously this is the short meeting with only four days where things are slightly different from the A or C meeting. So this is what we have for the time being. There may be other things that come up until Wednesday morning that will be -- may be added. Maybe quick feedback from your side on the issue that was raised on the working group reports. I think just to give you my personal feelings about this is, I actually think it's quite useful to have a very short few liners of what the working group did. We could then, for instance, add a link because this will be a PDF in the end that you can have a link to a longer report or more information on the respective part of the Web site. I don't think we should -- I think we should mention something about the working groups, but in a

digestible -- I think we should also contribute to keeping information in digestible amounts. So that would be my proposal, but, of course, it is up to you, what you would like to see with respect to the work of the working groups reflected in the communiqué. Iran.

IRAN:

Thank you, Chair. Forgive me if I missed some point. Did the group or GAC discuss what issue they want to raise under the two-letter or two-character country code with the board? We, Iran, suggests that we request that they go back to the previous arrangement with the 60 days' time limit, allowing the government to reply and not the new arrangement that they transfer the responsibility from the ICANN to the government, which some of them may not have sufficient manpower, machinery to do that, therefore, this is our suggestion and we wish that if the issue has not been discussed we at least briefly discuss among ourselves, what are our proposal under that item. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Iran. We didn't discuss substance in the preparation session, the preparation session for the board, because we had a substantive discussion already yesterday. The agreement was in the GAC this morning as -- that we would focus on forward-looking elements, asking the board about their views on next steps. So you may share your expectation, the expectation of your delegation. That may not be the consensus view of the whole GAC, but you're free to communicate your expectation to the board. That is, of course,

possible. Thank you. Other remarks on the elements of -- potential elements of a communiqué? If you don't have any remarks because this is not -- there's not that much flesh on the bone yet. We don't -- we can also say we save our five minutes and have a little bit more for lunch to compensate for yesterday. And so if there are no more remarks ...

Switzerland.

SWITZERLAND:

Thank you. I was waiting for the end because it's not a substantive comment. I wanted to really commend and thank our 1.0 secretariat for this zero draft in spite of all the spending cuts we have (indiscernible), so thank you very much. And hopefully we can improve that situation.

[Applause]

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Switzerland, for raising this. So that's the coffee -- the lunch break. Thank you.

[Lunch break]