JOHANNESBURG – Election Tool Presentation to the GAC
Monday, June 26, 2017 – 09:45 to 10:15 JNB
ICANN59 | Johannesburg, South Africa

OLOF NORDLING:	Thank you. I'm waiting for the slides.

Oh, this is -- back to the beginning, please.

And I would like to have Julia join me here on the stage as well.

So -- well, you've -- the introduction to all of you is already done. I mean, what happens is that of course we will have the leadership elections, and they're due to conclude at ICANN 60 in Abu Dhabi, and there are then one open seat for the GAC chair, but also let's not forget that there are five vice chairs who are on a one-year mandate.

And the nomination period is starting right now. And we make that clear with an email as well. So nominations are open until the 13th of September.

The nomination, you can nominate somebody else. You can also nominate yourself. Nominations should be of an individual that figures -- is part of the -- the -- mentioned for that particular country on the GAC Web site.

So this is an important message to you all, and we will repeat that, that you will have to verify the information about you as a

member on the ICANN Web site -- on the GAC Web site, and also make the necessary corrections during the nomination period to see that it is really correct. And we'll get back to that again.

Now, it may be very, very simple to make a -- to have the leadership elections if we have -- but if we have more than one candidate for chair or more than five candidates for vice chairs, we will need to have either election of the chair or election of the vice chairs or election of both these types of seats.

And the proposal is to use an online tool which has been tried and tested.

Could we have the next slide, please?

Oh, you're doing it. Good.

So nominations, please provide those to the GAC staff address, which actually covers both the ICANN staff support and the ACIG staff support, so -- but preferably copying the whole GAC when doing so.

We will send a confirmation, to make sure that we have really understood it correctly, so please be clear about what you're -- the nomination, and we will make sure that we have a full understanding of it.

And if it's a nomination of somebody else and it isn't obvious that that individual is actually standing for election, we will also verify that.

And in due course, when the nomination period has closed -- and that's up until the 13th of September -- we will inform the GAC overall by email about the list of nominees for the open position and also make it clear whether elections are necessary or not and also give details, further details, about the election process.

Next slide, please.

So if elections are needed, we have an online system called "Tally" -- fancy name -- that will be used, and it has been -- it has been tried and tested not only by us, in preparing for the upcoming elections here, but by the GNSO, in particular, which has used it for more than six years, both for their elections of various positions or individuals, but also for voting on documents, which they do quite frequently.

So it's tried and tested and we are confident that this will work excellently for the elections in store for us.

Now, the system is based on the electorate identified by email addresses, and this is quite important and we'll get back to that, but we will make the assumption, unless we're told otherwise,

that the representative of the particular member, meaning the first person that's mentioned on the GAC Web site for that particular member, would be the one featuring -- voting for that member.

And we'll be using the email address which is, well, actually only visible to the members of the GAC, but it's certainly up to you, as GAC members, to identify somebody else and/or another email address.

We'll get back to this, but I want to sort of repeat it because this is very, very important that we get it right from the start, so we keep on -- keep on bugging you about -- you know, with information about this.

So please do send such information, if you want to have it by a particular individual that is mentioned on the GAC Web site. That's very important as a representative for that particular member and/or another email address than what we have listed.

There may be reasons for firewalls and others that you want to use perhaps one of your private email addresses. That frequently happens. And we will confirm receipt of any such notification by email as well.

And now we're going to show you what the actual tool looks like in practice, so next slide, please.

This is nothing that you will be really bothered with seeing. This is, rather, how it looks on the production end. It's pretty straightforward. Yes.

Now, this is -- of course the example is taken from a parallel universe where there is a GAC that has a choir and it's due to elect a conductor of that choir and also five deputy conductors.

And we got a marvelous example of nominees. For conductor, we have a certain J.S. Bach. Another is A. Vivaldi. And the third one is G.F. Handel. And of course it's not Antonio Vivaldi because he's dead. This is Andrea Vivaldi.

And for deputy conductors, we've also got prestigious nominees, and seven of them. A certain Jagger, another certain Aznavour, a certain Jones, Victor -- or whatever it is -- Mae, Sibelius, Marley, and Twain.

So it's clear that we need to have an election, then, and this is the way that it's actually programmed into -- into the system.

So next slide, please.

So these are the -- the ballots, the ballot information, and then we have the voter list information that also has been -- well, in

EN

this parallel universe, there are two homonyms named Olof Nordling and tow homonyms named Julia Charvolen that have actually voted.

And what happens next?

This is when -- in the preparatory step for the election. Then when the whole thing is launched, it will present itself like this, when a voter is invited by email to submit a ballot for the election, and it looks like this.

So it identifies what is the election about, when it will start, and when it will end, and the identification of the ballot in principle and a URL, which when it's processed within the ICANN email system, it always looks a bit garbled but it's actually working.

So the voter will connect to that URL and will see the following presentation then, be invited to cast his or her vote. And it's then stated pick one and put mark with a little tag on one of the three candidates for conductor and five for the candidates for deputy conductor.

So I think on the next one that has been done. And then the ballot is submitted.

 But have a close look here because there is something a little bit odd. Pick five, it says, and there are six marks for the deputy conductor election. So let's see what happens now.

Okay. Go back. The ballot choices, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10 are part of a group that only allows five selections. Of course you can have less than five, that's fine. But more than five, well, it will just refuse to accept it. So back again. And what do we do?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (off microphone).

OLOF NORDLING: Okay. So here we go. We eliminate five, box five. That was done. And then submit ballot again, then it works.

And you get a confirmation email in return from the system which identifies what you have voted for. Well, actually, it's only by number so you have to have a reasonable memory or actually print out the information before and look at your emails previously.

So this is basically it. And this is what you will see. This will be the public view of the actual result. And as you may see here, there are two votes for a certain Mr. Bach and one vote for Vivaldi and one vote for Handel as conductor so Bach is the winner for the conductor.

And when it comes to the five deputy conductors, Jagger, Mae, Sibelius, Marley, and Twain will be the deputy conductors. So

it's very, very clear. And it also enumerates all the ballots which will be a lengthy list so you may not want to scroll down all of that.

But you also see if you look carefully here in fine print, there's a duplicate. And this means really that you can go back and vote again and again and again. And it's the last time you cast your ballot that will be counted. So the previous ones will then be enumerated as duplicates.

For each event, of course, you get a confirmation email. So there's a lot of email exchange, but it's also so that if anybody by any chance would have grabbed your computer when you were away and was actually about to vote and take the opportunity and does some mischief, you will be notified that there has been a ballot cast in your name because it will be returned to your email address. So it's an added safety measure, if you'd like, that's built into the system.

And this is really it. And now I think we can go to the very last one, whether there are any questions or comments.

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Okay, good.

OLOF NORDLING: Crystal clear, is that so?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Maybe something to just clarify because that may not have been understood by everybody, so you can redo your vote as many times as you want until the deadline is there. But, of course, only the last one will count, just to make that sure. So if you change your mind and realize that one candidate is turning out to be more what you want than another that you thought before, you may change it. But the last one then will be the one that is valid; and, of course, the previous ones won't count.

And the system is safe, as Olof has said. If by any means somebody else, for instance, while you go to a coffee break or so and you leave your computer open and you just had done the vote and somebody else would use that opportunity which, of course, would not happen, but if it did happen, then you would actually get a message that another vote has been cast. And knowing that it hadn't been you, you can actually then relook at it and if it's de facto somebody else abused your computer, you could again change it. So this is fairly safe. And we are convinced that this will help us eliminate the problems that we had, as I said, in the last election where not everybody was able to vote because some people were not physically present that

very moment where we had the queuing up in front of the urn to put in the ballots.

Just to make it also clear that this tool will be available from a particular moment in time before the meeting up to a defined date during the meeting, and there will be no urn in addition to that. So everybody has a computer. Everybody will use it. And then immediately after the expiration of that time, we'll have the numbers. And that will also, of course, save us a little bit of time because we do not have to do the counting.

Of course, in a case where we would have a tie between candidates, there would then be a second round. And maybe I give the floor to Olof again to quickly say a few words what would happen if there was a tie between two candidates.

Thank you, Olof.

OLOF NORDLING: Yes. If that would happen, it's certainly very possible to relaunch. It's relatively easy to actually launch the whole system. So it can be done electronically on the spot as well.

I would like to add that of course not everyone in the GAC, not every member in the GAC, is represented right here right now. So we will make sure that everyone gets the proper information about a nomination period from the start.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 59
JOHANNESBURG
26–29 June 2017

There is also in the briefing pack that you've received a briefing about the election process and an outline of this particular tool. But we will repeat that a number of times to make sure that everyone is well and duly informed. And we also are considering whether and when to perhaps have Webinars to introduce this to make really, really sure that everyone is well-informed. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. And what is also important -- and Olof has said it, I'd just like to repeat it again -- of course, there is only one person per GAC member delegation that will be able to vote. This is nothing new. We had it with the physical votes before, that it needed to be clarified that the one person is designated that can be -- that can vote. The same, of course, applies to the electronic means, and as Olof has said and will be said again.

It is the first one in the list. If your delegation thinks that it should be another person, that can be communicated, but these things need to be clear and everybody needs to know which one is the person that will vote on behalf of your membership.

Any questions or comments?

Yes, Iran. Thank you.

IRAN: Thank you very much. Just piece of information. We are all representing governments. There is another governmental activity which is called ITU, International Telecommunication Union. The electronic voting was studied one year, and then report was given to the council of the ITU which representing the plenipotentiary, the highest organ of ITU, before the meeting, and the council did not agree with the electronic voting for the confidence and for the security and for many other things, even though from the timing and from many other things, they might have advantages.

This does not mean that we disagree with the voting electronically. Just piece of information.

And now my question to you, Olof, it has been done by other constituency and organ of the ICANN, whether there has been experienced any problem, any difficulty, so on, so forth. We will be happy to see that. And whether if the problem or difficulty occurred in the first one has been corrected. So maybe, in our case, we don't have the same understanding of other people and these things that you can change the name of the voters up to the last minute, and so on, so forth. So maybe that might cause some difficulty. So it would have, at least in our view, some sort of the trial test. If there is some difficulty occur and we cannot remove that, this would not remain valid.

So for the time being, maybe the first one would carry on, and if we see any problem, difficulty, we could resolve, resolve that. If there is a problem with -- which cause some confusion with the leaderships of these very important organizations, then we have to do something.

It's just piece of information. But please, can we confirm that no problems, difficulties, shortcoming, deficiencies has been occurred for other SO/ACs or other organs or sub-organs of the ICANN. Just piece of questions.

Thank you.

OLOF NORDLING: Thank you very much, Iran. And very, very important question and remark, really, because they have asked the same. And as far as their memory goes back among the GNSO-ers, well, it's taken for granted nowadays.

Maybe prior to six years ago when they started to use it -- it's more than six years they've been using it. And as you may recall, they don't only elect representatives and chairs and board members from the GNSO but also they have voting about documents. And they have weighted voting. And weighted voting is a feature which we don't need for the GAC, at least not for the time being. But that is working as well in this one.

So they are confident with this tool, and I think that we should be. Of course, should anything happen, we should be aware that you've seen that it's very traceable. All the transactions in the -- in the system are traceable. They are not displayed publicly as to the originator. But it is traceable.

So if there would be a problem for whatever reason -- and of course the oversight of the whole election will be done by the chair which is outgoing and has no particular interest in the outcome from that perspective.

So it will not be sort of unsupervised ICANN staff making some kind of collection of the outcome. And, actually, it's all done automatically.

So you're right. I mean, if anything -- any mishaps of whatever nature would occur, well, we always have the fallback of going to an urn and collect ballot papers, and so on. But I'm confident that we don't need to do, so...

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yes.

IRAN: Just second question. The course of action that you have explained so nicely would have been better, if possible, be

included in the circular or in a message or in a letter addressed to all GAC members, the procedures; that be properly understood by everybody, by those people that are the heading of the organization for this. They have to know very well what is happening. It is not only that I will report to them. It is better they have something on the written form in the way that you have.

It is a possibility. It is not an obligation. Is it possible that you or someone prepare a letter or a communication sending to all members describing that?

Thank you.

OLOF NORDLING: Obviously, I think we say we will repeatedly inform the GAC. And, well, I think I'm sometimes known as the GAC spammer, so you will receive information in addition to, of course, these slides are perfectly available.

The briefing document, which is also very useful, gives a short outline of what is in store and a timeline for it. So -- but it will be enhanced with more detailed information, in particular for the steps that we are entering into right now, which is the nomination period and the period to review the information on the GAC website to make sure that this is consistent with your

representation right now, and also identifying any voter for the future that would be different from the first one or an email that would be different from the first one managed under respective member name -- member country.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Olof.

Let me check on my list.

MOROCCO: Maroc.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yes, the delegate of Morocco.

MOROCCO: Thank you, Olof, for this presentation. I wonder regarding the application, where is it hosted? Who controls the application?

Thank you.

OLOF NORDLING: Thank you very much, Morocco. It is an internal system, and it is based on the ICANN server. It has been developed by ICANN. That's all I can say about it.

There is no external connection. You don't have to leave the ICANN server, so to speak. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: CTU.

CTU: Thank you, Chair. I guess a little clarification in terms of if there are any second round voting required. The eligible voters in the second round will be the same as in the first round. It's not going to be limited to the persons in the room at the time?

That's one thing. And I would also suggest that some sort of report on the election is also done. That would indicate -- well, I guess all the countries who voted. So there will be some -- not necessarily formal, but some sort of reconciliation between total votes and the votes that appeared in the -- in the results.

That's just two suggestions.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Maybe two things. First of all, what has not changed is that with the analog voting, it was the secretariat and the

outgoing chair or vice chairs, if there were any, who were, like, overseeing the -- the counting process, and you basically needed to trust those. So when I was elected, it was Heather, the previous chair, together with the vice chairs at that time, whoever was not up for election.

And this is the same here. The secretariat and, for instance, I will be able to see who voted what. So in case that somebody would have a doubt that his vote would not be corrected, we can actually go back and see and check whether your vote is the one that you have -- have given. So in the end, there's always an element of trust because this is a secret vote. The votes will not be published, but the leadership and the support will make sure that if somebody has a question, we -- we can confirm, basically, the information to you individually. That's one thing.

The thing about the second ballot, I think it remains the same like previously, that -- because in case we have to have a second round of elections in case there is a tie, it will be limited to those who are present because otherwise how to inform people that are somewhere where it's maybe 2:00 in the morning? Because the second vote, like it would have been done previously if there's a second vote, that will be immediately after the result of the first vote, will be a second vote. And that will be difficult, then, to have another open-ended vote.

But that, again, is something that, in terms of process, has not changed, because we -- it is actually in our operating principle and that hasn't been changed; that the second vote will be only with the ones that are present in the room. So that is, again, nothing new, if I'm right. Or no? Olof and then Milagros.

OLOF NORDLING: Very correct.

So to respond to the question from the CTU, it's possible to make a list of the voters. It is. And whether to do it or not, I mean -- or -- I mean, the chair has said this, that following the same procedure as last time, that it wasn't done like that. So that remains to be seen. There is a possibility.

When it comes to the -- the electorate for a second vote, it means a bit of handy-craft in setting up the electronic system, the tally system for that. You have to go through those members present and identify the emails of those present. That's what you need to do, but that's the way it's going to be done. It's -- Well, at least it's a bit quicker than doing it with an urn.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Milagros.

MILAGROS CASTANON: I presume that the second vote, it's only in case of a tie; right? But I -- I really don't think it would be fair for the people who are not present not to be able to vote on a second turn. And I would say that because normally the people that are present do not represent not even half of the number of members of the GAC.

Say, for example, today, we are not even half of the number of countries present. So I don't think so. I think if we are going to have a second round of voting, we should be ready to do it the same way we did it on the first -- the first round.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Milagros.

First of all, we have -- we don't change the procedures by what we say now from before. Before you had the possibility to vote by email before the meeting. Then there was like a dead period where nothing happened. And then those present were voting physically here.

If there was a second ballot, it was only those present that could have voted. That was the procedure. It never happened. We never had a second ballot.

And we went through this when discussing the modifications on the -- in the opening -- "in the opening" -- in the operating principles, and so we all agreed that that will not change. So if we change this now, we have to change the operating principles and we have to -- And the thing is that if you -- if you do another open election for everybody, you would have to verify all the emails of everybody, not just the ones in the room but actually -- and it's basically not feasible.

But as I said, we are not changing anything from the established situation in the opening -- in the operating principles. If we would do the second vote open again to everybody, that would be a change and that would significantly delay the second -- the second vote. So this is the situation that we've -- that we've agreed, and we've discussed this before. And this is as it is in the operating principle.

We would first need to change the operating principles, and that would take another 60 days, and so on and so forth, to do what you say, just to be clear about this.

Thank you.

Germany.

GERMANY: First of all, thank you for the presentation. Maybe I missed something, and that's a really poor question. Is there possibility to abstain if you don't want to wait for -- actively for one person? Is this possible?

OLOF NORDLING: You can actually abstain in two ways. One is to actually send in your ballot without any markers. You cannot have more than one marker per -- for the chair or more than five for vice chairs, but you can have less. You can send in that, and your vote will be counted or your ballot will be counted.

You can also abstain from even hooking up to the electronic system. And that will just mean that the number of ballots counted would be less. One less compared to the previous one.

So, yes. The answer is yes, you can do it, and, yes, you can do it in two ways, to abstain.

So it's up to you. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I skipped Singapore, so please excuse me. You have the floor.

SINGAPORE: Thank you very much, Chair. And thank you to Olof for the presentation. I think it was very clear.

A couple of things. One, on privacy and confidentiality, I believe that extends not only to the selection of candidates in terms of the voting but also to whether you vote or not. So the idea of having a listing of countries who voted, I think that would in some ways violate the private -- the confidentiality aspect of the voting. I think it's sufficient to tabulate the number of votes cast, number of votes -- eligible votes cast and the number of votes each candidate has acquired.

Two, without trying to obfuscate the issue, I see abstaining a little bit different from nonparticipation. And, therefore, were I were to submit a blank vote, I would have been deemed to have voted, but I have abstained in my voting. If I didn't log into the system at all, I would have been deemed to have nonparticipated.

And hence my question, not linked to any of the above. Is there a particular point in time where the voting records will be expunged from the system in order to preserve the overall confidentiality? I realize you need to keep it for a certain time in case there are disputes, but is there a timeline in which we will press the delete button and all of that will go off the record?

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Singapore. First of all, the situation that you describe about just giving the numbers but not giving the list of names is the practice that we've had so far, and unless there would be strong push for changing it, I would assume that we keep on going on with this practice.

On your second point, of course confidentiality is an important thing. This is a secret ballot, it is not an open ballot. And the ones, like it has been before, the ones who surveil this ballot, of course they are bound to keeping whatever they see confidential like it has been before with previous.

To what extent -- And also that it is -- we trust Olof and ICANN that whatever the system has as information will not be visible to anybody that shouldn't see it. To what extent that will be deleted completely is something that maybe, Olof, you know, but I don't.

OLOF NORDLING: It's usually relatively easy to delete information from a system, so I trust that that is possible. I haven't asked the question specifically, but I'm very confident that if that's a requirement, that we have a purge date of all that information, that we can -- we can satisfy that demand.

I will verify that, of course, but let's first of all see if this is a very strong requirement that we should purge it after, let's say, a month after the election or something like that.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: France.

FRANCE: Thank you. France speaking. I think it is very important that our rules regarding confidentiality, especially in terms of electronic data, be respected. I'm not sure whether we can have some further information regarding the full expungement and how the vote will be assured. How can we assure that the person who votes online will not be identified? I think it is one of the basic rules that we have confidential votes. So I think it would be important to guarantee this.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: For those who voted via email at the last election, they sent an email to Michelle, I think, from ACIG and she received the personal votes from those who voted prior to the meeting and then she deleted, I suppose, those emails. But the privacy doesn't change. On the contrary, I think it will be enhanced with this system as there will be no physical ballots that need to be, of course, destroyed. There won't be any votes ending up in a

dustbin or anything so there won't be any risk of those votes getting out. I don't know if Olof wishes to add anything further.

OLOF NORDLING: Absolutely. We could, of course, completely delete the data but we could also have a completely anonymous system, meaning that even the administrator, the moderator, will not be able to identify who has voted what. So that would require, of course, a much more elaborate tracing system. But that's not what we're suggesting. We suggest that it will be impossible to retrace the individual votes in the event that there were some kind of issue. Especially because this is the first time we're doing this, I think we should have some kind of monitoring system in place. But you should trust us, such as we used to trust the person who managed the electronic voting system before.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: -- system did not work, we will chase Olof wherever he will be with his four grandchildren and we will tell him off in front of the four grandchildren, so he would never, ever risk that to happen. So I think we will -- we are confident this thing works. I see two more hands up, the Netherlands and Iran, and then I think we should go for a coffee break. And Morocco.

ICANN 59
POLICY FORUM
JOHANNESBURG
26–29 June 2017

NETHERLANDS: Yes, thank you, Chair. Just a question, I don't know if it was said during the beginning of the presentation but just two questions. How many times has it been used and B, have there been any, let's say, accidents or incidents because that's -- to know whether the system is reliable and well functioning, but in short only, thank you.

OLOF NORDLING: Making just a rough assessment on the number of times the GNSO may have used it, I think it's a good count between 50 and 100. And it was tried and tested with the GNSO for -- in the beginning. And whether that -- and developed together with them because they have a rather complex voting system for the various ways they have elections and voting for documents. So there were probably some mishaps during the testing periods, but once it's up and running, and as I said, it's been up and running for more than six years, people not really have forgotten when it actually started, but it's more than six years ago. There have not been any missteps of any kind.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: And just to add to this, knowing how controversial some of the discussions and elections in the GNSO are, they would never, ever, ever, ever, ever, ever accept a tool that they wouldn't trust because there would be too high incentive to actually challenge

it, so that is to us something that is giving us some confidence. Iran, please.

IRAN: Thank you, Chair. I'm sorry to raise this question. First of all, of the new bylaws, the role of the leadership of the GAC becomes more important. So we should be everything crystal clear.

Second, did we have any problem to change or we just follow the innovative idea á la mode of others? Because others have done, we should do that. Did we face any real difficulty during the last 15, 16 years?   Did it have any complaint, any misunderstanding, any lack of confidence of the election raised? So unless there is good reasons, still electronic is electronic and we have seen that. Not many months ago. What the situation is everywhere, so on and so forth.   So there should be good reasons, valid reasons, that the existing system doesn't work at all. Because constituency A has done that, we should also do that is not convincing totally. But unless these are given. So I think a lot of things that currently we could not see doesn't work. It may work well, but it may not work also. It may have difficulties.   Difficulties of hacking, difficulties of many other things. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. We have discussed this for many times now, and the reasons why we modified the procedures from the last elections have been also discussed and also re-discussed a number of times with the discussion on the operating principles. So I will not repeat this. Just to tell you that, for instance, the sending of emails to a person in the secretariat can also be hacked or emails can get lost, and so there is no -- nothing in the world, unless you do it yourself, you can check to 100%. So there's an element of trust that is in there. In the previous election, if the past chair and the people sitting in that room where they counted the ballot would have wanted to falsify or whatever, how you want to call it, to cheat, they could have done it theoretically. Apparently that has not been the case. So I don't think we should -- we should -- we could go on forever, unless we just try and use it, and then I suggest we have a -- a discussion in Abu Dhabi after we did the vote. Maybe there's only one candidate, five candidates and we don't have to go for vote at all. Maybe there are 3 candidates for the chair and 15 for the -- for the vice chairs. We'll see. But maybe it's like one gets all of the votes but five and then if things are clear anyway, in case we get to a tie or close to a tie, then I think it's good that if people want to know whether their vote has been correctly recorded we can actually go and check. And so we don't really see something that would be problematic or that would be of any kind of higher risk than what we have been doing so far. So

if you allow, I would like to give the floor to Mr. Morris. And then I think we should go for a coffee break. Thank you.

TAIWAN: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, everyone, again. I'm Morris Lin from Taiwan. And actually we support the (indiscernible) of electronic voting system. However similar country already thought about a confidentiality of the voting result. So we -- we suggest that we shall have some -- some solution or mechanism to make sure the vote is a secret vote. And the mechanism may be we suggest we can have a third independent party to check the result or instead of just some specific group of persons. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Well, as Olof has explained, there are two ways. We can either set the system up in a way that those that are the surveillants on the elections can see who voted for what and can -- in case someone wants to know whether the votes have been received that way actually answer a request from any individual who wants to see did you really get what I vote. If we can see the names, then we can answer such requests. If we set up the system that also those who survey the election don't see the names and it's completely secret but then, of course, we can't verify if somebody comes to us and asks us like, can you confirm

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 59
JOHANNESBURG
26-29 June 2017

to me that my vote has been received? Like this, of course, we can't. So these two options we can leave it up to you. Our proposal would be that for the first time that -- and as I said before, in the previous election whoever sent an email to Michelle Scott-Tucker, Michelle Scott-Tucker, of course, knew who sent the email because she received and it the others knew it as well. So we -- by proposing that the -- those who make sure that everything is running smoothly can see if requested to go back, we will not go through all the lists and say ah, he voted for her and her. We won't do that. But just that we have the opportunity, the possibility, if somebody wants to be sure and wants to ask us, we could give that confirmation. But, of course, there again, you would need to trust those people, that they don't lie at you and they don't cheat. But that has been the same before and that is the same with every election on national municipality level. Again some trust is necessary otherwise you can't have secret elections. Otherwise, you would need to stand up and do it physically in a way that everybody sees it or do it electronically. But whenever you want to have it private, there needs to be some confidence in the system, whether it's digital or analog, that things are properly done. Morocco, you had the floor, and then I think we can stop, or should stop. We can always come back on this issue on Thursday, if we want, but I think it is -- at some point in time we'll just have to let it go. Thank you.

MOROCCO: Thank you, Chair. I would like to go back to the matter of who's eligible for voting on the application. As you know, all countries have more than one GAC representative. And the countries have the sovereignty of choosing who will be voting. So I would suggest that an email be sent out to all members asking them to appoint one voter, one elector.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Morocco. Once again, during our last election Secretariat sent out various emails informing all delegations and asking them to appoint one person who would be entitled to vote. After such designation there would only be that person who would be able to vote. There's a deadline before which that person needed to be appointed and past that deadline there was no longer any possibility of changing the designated elector. But we will definitely be sending out an email stating what the deadline will be to appoint the elector, the person authorized to vote. After that deadline, once again, there will be no chance of changing the elector. But that in no way changes the procedures we've used in the past. Thank you. In that case, I don't see any further questions, no hands raised. Congo.

REPUBLIC OF CONGO:	Thank you, Chair. Thank you very much. I apologize for going back to the matter of confidentiality and security. As a point for information and as a note to add to your knowledge, I would like to say that as governmental members, when we vote, we certainly represent our government's viewpoint, so it is important that sovereignty -- that that viewpoint be taken into account in terms of our sovereignty. So for our sovereignty, it is important. I would like to say that because in our case it is unacceptable for us that a GAC member government such as us say why we voted for one matter or another, why we did not vote in such a way or such. So maybe it would need to be confidential so that there are no questions. So could you tell us how one member could know what another member voted in the past because we've had our votes challenged in the past. I think that challenges are freedom of speech within discussions and within our work. Thank you.
CHAIR SCHNEIDER:	Thank you. I think it is clear that only the voter could communicate with the monitors of the voting procedure and ask them to check whether their vote was recorded as it was cast. But there is absolutely no possibility for a representative from any country to ask monitors what their colleagues voted. That will not be possible. It's never been done in the analog system as well. So there will be no change. It will not be allowed. No

one could ask what another GAC representative has voted. And that will not change, not in any way.

That being said, we still have four more minutes for our coffee break. I hope we can seize them. So I now invite you to have coffee. If you have any questions, we can ask them whether bilaterally or you can also raise the question once again on Thursday, if we have time. But now's the time for the coffee break. Thank you. And do not take too much time because we will need to go on later. Thank you, and see you soon.

So let's give each other ten minutes to be clear. Thank you.

[Coffee break]