
ABU DHABI – Joint Meeting GAC & ALAC
Tuesday, October 31, 2017 – 14:15 to 15:00 GST
ICANN60 | Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Okay, while we are installing the people here, thank you. I think the 30 seconds are up for the technical break, so we are on the record again. For those who are new in the GAC, we have quite some new people, new GAC representatives with us this time. So these are our colleagues from the ALAC which is another advisory committee to ICANN, like the Governmental Advisory Committee; it is an advisory committee that represents the internet users or some internet users. And let me give the floor to our colleagues here from the ALAC to quickly present themselves as I said. We have a number of new people and they may not know you all, so thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Thomas. My name is Alan Greenberg. I'm chair of the At-Large Advisory Committee. And I have with me several but not all of our leadership group and our liaison from the ALAC to the GAC, and I'll let them introduce themselves, starting at Yrjö.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Good afternoon. Yrjö Länsipuro, ALAC liaison to the GAC.

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.

HOLLY RAICHE: Holly Raiche, ALAC.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Tijani Ben Jemaa, ALAC vice chair.

ALAN GREENBERG: And do we have the rest of the leadership team around the room? We have Andrei Kolesnikov waving his hand over there at my far right, your far left.

Maureen is the incoming leadership team, currently liaison to the ccNSO, Maureen Hilliard.

We have John Laprise who is incoming ALAC from North America. There's someone at the back there who has a hand up, but I cannot see who it is. Ah, I still can't, sorry; my eyesight is not very good. If someone else would like to introduce -- ah okay, we have Ricardo and -- fine okay, I see no more hands. Alberto and Seun Ojedeji is somewhere.

Okay, we're a very distinctive, a very diverse bunch. And glad to talk to people individually after if there's a break after this, I'm not sure. We have a long agenda. Perhaps we should start and see where we go.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Okay, so yeah, let's move ahead. Agenda point one, I think is also something that is of mutual interest to both of us for various reasons. So it's the new gTLD subsequent procedures work, i.e. the work on future rounds or a future round or whether it's round or square, I don't know, but the new gTLD releases that may be coming.

One issue of course that is of high importance for governance is country and territory names that we just had a discussion on with the ccNSO. Because it's also of course something that is very important to them. And we just wanted to -- we are interested in hearing from you in particular to what extent the country and territory names are discussed in the ALAC. And also, about your participation in Work Track 5 of this new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP.

For us it's clear that the public interest related to these names should be duly taken into account as one of the elements that is very important. And yeah, maybe we stop here and listen to your views or your deliberations before, we then go to the issue of community based application.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, the short answer is we will be participating. We have contributed a co-chair or co-leader. The only proviso we put on it was to reserve the right to reject or approve the results. It's not clear that that has a lot of impact, but we feel it's very important that we will be naming a number of people to the group. Even though there's not a formal membership process, we will be naming five people, one per region, to make sure that we have a level of regional balance from the people who are committed to participating.

We are also quite interested in making sure that we have a diverse diverse range of positions on it. Because the positions within At-Large are not necessarily uniform with regard to whether we should have absolutely sovereign control over names at a government or regional level. Or you know, we should have a completely open free for all. I don't think we'll find people -- well, there may be people at either extreme. We'll see. But we feel it's important that when it comes back to us, we want to make sure that all of our community has had a voice in the process.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I think this is useful information that you will also -- despite not knowing exactly how things are going to run, but you intend to send a number of people that should somehow reflect various ways of diversity. Yes, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: I think one of the really big issues aside from the many of those thjat were raised within meetings with CCTLDs there's an awful lot of confusion because there's now a general public understanding of how the system sort of works. And the changes that may or may not be made can introduce a level of confusion. From a public inter-perspective, it's certainly one of the concerns we'd have. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Any questions or comments from the GAC on this issue? Nigeria.

NIGERIA: Thank you, chair. And I wanted to come back earlier on but because of the time we had, and because I also saw it was on the agenda for this next meeting.

Essentially, I appreciate your, you know, your [inaudible] about how we got to where we are on this issue, which is well known. But my point is, why should we try to create a problem where there is none.

If there was seven gTLDs before now with the three character and we have about I would I'd say 240 known country regional

territory names on this ISO list with three characters already known and in use, so why because of a simple example of [inaudible] which is just one, or even assuming they are even other coincidences with the seven that were in existence; we should be brainstorming about how to resolve the issues of just that one or the seven as opposed to potentially creating challenges with the over 240 that are already in existence if we do not reserve them for the respective countries and territories. I hope that was clear. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. If I may quickly react to this. Well, this Work Track 5 is not only -- it's about all kinds of geographic names. So it's about the names that are on the lists or three letter codes. It's not even clear whether that is part of the mandate because it's not a name, it's a identifier, but leaving that aside; so it's also about names of our mountains, rivers, cities that are not capitals or anything else. So the whole working group is -- that's a broad range

, and with regard to the three character codes, there are diverging views. Some would want to use them. Some would want to leave them unused in this space for different reasons. There's need for discussion. And so there will be a discussion, has already been a discussion and the discussion will continue because there's

different expectations and different wishes, what to do or not to do with these. And these need to be resolved.

I hope that answers that question at this stage. Further views on this one? Otherwise we'll move to community. Iran.

IRAN:

Thank you, chair; perhaps it's not only the need. It may be some sort of desire of some people, they want to have that.

Somebody came to me and says that they want to have something IRAN. And when I said, "Why?", he said, "We want to create tourism for your country." I don't understand that. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Iran. If there's no more requests for the floor on this item, I propose we move to the next one, which is something that has been at the core of intense debates in the first round of new gTLDs.

We've discussed this earlier already in earlier sessions, but I'm sure you have also spent a lot of time discussing what worked well, what did not work well with regard to community based applications and what your learning's from the first rounds should be in the ALAC's point of view and what you would bring

in or advice ICANN to do with regard to community based applications in the next rounds, so it would be interesting to hear from you how you see the issue of community based applications.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I'll be glad to give you my opinion; these are not necessarily ALAC opinions, but I'm sure we have a few other ones in the room. ICANN talks a lot about the public interest in its bylaws and its articles of incorporation. There are people who have said over the years we have focused more on industry and the domain business more than public interest. The community TLDs, and specifically the priority community TLDs, were given in the first round was from my point of view rather amazing that we said, "If you can establish that you are a community, you get absolute priority over anyone else."

Now, because of that ,they then set the bar very, very high to make sure that people didn't pretend to be a community just to get priority. And we ended up in the situation where it was an admirable concept which wasn't exercised very much because of that. And I strongly support the concept that we should favor communities. We need to make sure we understand what we mean by communities and, you know, is a corporate entity, should that be a community? Should it be limited to nonprofit?

There's all sorts of questions and all are sorts of different opinions on it, but I think it's a discussion that we must have in depth.

I believe it's essential that At-Large and the Governmental Advisory Committee participate in that discussion because we are the ones charged with the various aspects of the public interest. And we have to make sure it is served. So I personally believe that we should go ahead with it. We may want to expand it. There's also been questions of, in addition to priority over the non-community applications, should we give other privileges, rights, lower prices, whatever, to community TLDs?

And I think it's a good discussion we have to have. And I'm delighted that the GAC is working on it and we certainly are interested in it also.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Just before giving the floor, I think one of the key issues that we realized in the GAC's discussion with the GNSO is that it may be less a question of the lower fee to a filing application but rather support that reduces cost in the development of the application and the actual sustainable setting up of the TLD itself. And that would also not be an entry for gaining in the application phase but actually be real support and maybe real facilitation.

Holly, I see your flag; Milton's flag was up for some time but now it's gone, but nevertheless, I think you may speak.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I think one place to start is the terrific E-paper that was written about that and [inaudible] really a number of difficulties starting with a definition that wasn't workable, it started with the structure where the economics [inaudible] was or was not in control. And that did actually lead to some confusion as to whether or not they were [inaudible] rights.

I guess I would start with that paper and just go right through chapter to chapter because everyone of them highlighted some of the difficulties. That said, I think it's a terrific idea but I think it needs a lot of work to make it work well. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, and what we understood from Jeff and Cheryl is that the definition is at the core of a number of follow up problems, and also the question is whether not for profit community, which is a cultural or linguistic or some form of identity based community whereas industry based association communities may be something that may require different procedures or different schemes. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just to follow up on that; I think we have to be really careful on how we draw lines because in some situations you might be a genuine community body but have to incorporate, or another situation in fact you are really not community but you haven't incorporated. So I think the definition has to include both the structure but the recognition that the structure may or may not actually indicate the nature of the community.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Absolutely, it's not just a formal, legal structure of the applicant, but it's also its functions and purposes and so on that need to be taken into -- Tijani, I think you also want to respond to the --

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Thomas. I think the biggest failure of the first round of the new gTLDs was the community applications. It wasn't only because the bar was put very high, it's also because we had two panels giving two different results of the evaluation of the communities of community applications. So in all the levels it was a failure. I remember you spoke about the support. I was on the [indiscernible] and we put the possibility to have support for the communities. But we had money for 14 applications.

Only three applied and this is another issue. And among these three, only one was -- one if you want. And at the end it was dropped by those panels because they said it is not a community application.

So it is a very big issue. I think they are working on and I join the group very now. And I hope that at the end we will find the right solution. Without the community applications, the new gTLD program will be only as I said before, a rich program for rich persons. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Any comments or questions from GAC members or the people in the room? Yes, Mark.

UK: Yes, Mark Carvell, United Kingdom. I'm very much in sympathy with ALAC colleagues on this. And I think we are identifying some of the key issues to focus on in order to institute the corrections to the failures and deficiencies in the current round, both in terms of who is eligible to apply to be a community based application, therefore have priority in situations of contention with commercially based applicants for the same stream.

In terms of process deficiencies, which Tijani has highlighted, in terms of inconsistencies, lack of appeal for decisions taken by the evaluation entity and lack of communication. You know, there are many problems. And these were looked at by the council of Europe actually. And I know colleagues in ALAC are well aware of their report which the GAC forwarded to the CCT review team and to the subsequent procedures PDP Working Group.

That report was based on a lot of analysis, interviews, looking back at the experience of individual applicants. So a lot of case analysis was undertaken. And so, a lot of issues. Yes, it's quite a big work agenda.

We discussed with the co-chairs on a possible starting point for the definitional issue. And I think that was encouraging. And on the ALAC call, which you invited me kindly to join, to discuss CBAs, we talked about the definitional issue and where we, the GAC and the ALAC, could look at that jointly. I think it was a proposal from your liaison, Yrjo, that we jointly look at that issue of definition. And there is, as I say, a kind of -- they called it a straw bunny I think was the term, a first attempt by the PDP Working Group on definitions, and types of community.

Those that are representing a group of like minded people with a common interest who want to advocate their objectives through a top level domain, and then we also talked about, as you Thomas

I think referred to, entities which have a common sectoral or economic or similar interest, representing a broad range of interests in a specific sector. Are they a community? I would argue that they are. But that is something we need to look at as well.

So it's great to hear your views at this discussion. And we have a lot of basis for continuing our exchanges on this. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER:

Yes, thank you, Mark. Looking at the time, I think we need to move on. But these two issues is definitely something that will keep us busy for the next periods to come given that they are some of the core elements of the work on future rounds.

With this, let's move to the next item which is about lowering barriers to an informed and inclusive participation in ICANN's processes. As we've already informed you earlier, and we have since Helsinki where we had a Cross Community Session about setting priorities in ICANN and the digesting workload which is one of to the elements, one of the barriers for in particular those who do not have enormous resources to follow and participate in ICANN's processes compared to others who may have more resources.

The other aspect is that the work that is done that ICANN, with the support of all of us, is making sure that processes and documents and discussions are presented and communicated in a way that people take less efforts to understand where they are, what something is about, what the process is, how things work.

And we discussed this with a number of stakeholders at several locations in the past ICANN meetings but also intersessionally, and it seems there's a growing awareness that this is an issue where something needs to be done. Also in relation to the discussion about volunteers, it's getting more and more difficult in many aspects of ICANN's work to find volunteers, to keep them on board, because it is simply sometimes too much work and difficult work.

So this is a whole, let's say, cloud of issues that led us to, in our last bilateral call between the ALAC leadership and the GAC leadership come to the conclusion, "Why don't we address a statement, a joint statement to ICANN, really seriously, concretely flagging this issue, raising the awareness that something needs to be done, something can be done to improve the situation, to enhance informed participation at ICANN," and we decided to draft a document together that has been shared with the ALAC and that I have shared with you, unfortunately only

early this morning, but I don't think the issue is very complicated and we've discussed this now quite a number of times.

So maybe the document can be put out on the screen and I won't read it out. I hope you have read it or you will read it. It basically makes the point that ICANN is an open and transparent organization that invites everybody to participate, to make his or her voice heard. But that there are barriers to an inclusive and informed participation -- some of them are structural -- and that we are trying to make concrete proposals in how these barriers can be lowered.

They will never -- there's always a threshold of course and there's always a limit to what you can do, but more can be done, more should be done, and there's some low hanging fruits and some more midterm things that can be done. And if you look at the text, then we basically make the point that if ICANN wants to really do everything it can or ICANN should do everything it can to allow for an inclusive and informed participation, in particular also for those who are non-insiders who don't have the resources to follow up, be daily part of ICANN's work.

And it proposes a few issues; one is that in particular documents should be presented in a way that they are easily readable in the sense that you have an author as a standard, you have a date, you have an addressee, you have a reference to the process that this

is -- so that allows people to identify where does a particular document, a particular piece of information or a particular part of a process belong to, and you don't have to spend hours or phone three colleagues in order to find out where something belongs to, what is the latest version or is there a newer version, and so on so forth. So really facilitate, help people save time and energy to concentrate on the issues instead of focusing on finding out whether something is relevant or not. That's one of the elements.

Another element is that ICANN has, for instance, procedures to allow for those who are not able to work on ICANN issues on a daily basis to catch up and come in and make their voices heard. For instance, the public comment instrument is something that is a good tool.

The problem is also there, if the documents are written in a way that people don't understand what this is about, if you receive 200 pages full of acronyms, full of references that are only understood by insiders, it is difficult for the wider community to understand and be able to decide whether an issue is relevant for them and to make meaningful contributions.

So what we would urge ICANN to do is to spend more energy in trying to, whenever they communicate documents, issues, processes in particular, in times where community input is expected, that they would use simple key elements, highlights of

simple key elements, infographics, maybe videos or tools that allow people to understand what something is about and then how they can look in a graduated [inaudible] into substance.

And of course, this is not something that you get for free. It requires some awareness when you start formulating something, when you start using acronyms, when you start naming processes like implementation, recommendation, team and then implementation oversight team and so on, that maybe these names are not ideal but you should actually use names that people can understand what the substance or the process that these refer to. And, also, to develop graphics or things that distil down the essence of something.

But we have actually the experience that this can be done. We have all witnessed that during the transition, the work of the CCWG on accountability, but also the CWG on the IANA transition. It has been possible to breakdown very complex concepts and ideas into understandable schemes, into understandable core elements.

So what we are basically asking is that this is done in a more regular, more structured way so that in particular with regard to common periods more people can make their voices heard and more diverse interests can come in.

The third element is the fact that this, to encourage and facilitate people to make their voice heard, to make contribution is one thing, but you also need to train and empower the people that are processing this information, that are working in the processes that they have a wider range of backgrounds, of horizon, of experience, that they are actually able to understand and take duly into account and process the input that is coming in, into the next versions of documents into the processes.

So these are the three elements that we are concretely asking ICANN to do. Plus to in general think about what else can be done that we have discussed together and we'd like to propose to you. Maybe I'll give the floor to Alan to say how we work together and what we propose to you all jointly as the next step. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. At-Large has an interesting responsibility; we represent the interest of Internet users. At last count, there were about 3.7 billion of them. When we say things like that periodically, people say, "How do you communicate with them?" And we assure them that we write emails to everyone of the 3.7 billion everyday and read all the responses; that's a joke. We represent the interests of users. And that means we need people around who understand what users need in their own environments, and things change.

It's hard to find people who can dive into ICANN. We have conduits that can get to people, but you have to be able to send something to them they can read quickly and understand. So we are totally aligned with what you say.

At the same time, ICANN is working on some very complex issues and we are writing specifications that have to be written with a great amount of precision so they are interpreted properly, and ultimately, they are never going to be understandable to the layman. So yes, in accountability we drew a lot of pictures, but we ended up writing 200 pages of bylaws at the end. And the bylaws are the parts that also count and someone had to read them.

We can't set our expectations unreasonably, but we need ways of people getting into the system, and a few of those will get really serious and learn what all the buzz words mean, but if we can't attract them in, then we have a real problem. So although we need to be pragmatic, we really really need to make some changes in how we -- I'll be maybe not humorous, lure them in and trick them into getting into the system so that they can be productive workers as we go forward.

I'll make a quick comment; this document was written over the last several days first by Yrjo. Thomas did a revision, I did a minor revision. It needs to be cleaned up if we want to make sure that

it's going to be well understood by ICANN. So I think all we're asking for is approval in principle now, understanding that over the next two or three days -- I mean, I'm optimistic we can finish it this week.

I'm not 100% sure, but I think whether we include it in your communique and our input following the meeting, or do it a week later or a month later, I don't think it makes a big difference. But I think the concept of us issuing a joint statement -- and currently it's called a statement; at the end it says advice. I personally would like to see it as advice because that compels the board to consider it and respond. So I'll leave it at that.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER:

Just a quick remark on the timing. I think it would be preferable to finish it while we are here because we know how things are intersessionally and it's very difficult to, so I would say before Thursday evening, we should try and get this done.

And so this would be my idea of the timeline. Because it's much easier; I'm sure we can clean it up or improve the language in the next 24 hours, and then re-present a draft version. So let me stop us here and have the views from ALAC and GAC members on how you see this, whether you support this initiative to issue a joint statement or advice as ALAC and as the GAC. Thank you. I see

Iran and the US. Let me take notes. Okay, Iran, you asked first. Keep your hands up, we'll take note.

IRAN:

Thank you, chair. Certainly we support that, however, ICANN is in the last stage of the Work Stream 2 preparations of the final report of the CCWG public comments, gathering public comments, charter organization replies sent it. So a very, very busy period. And the sort of question that you have raised which all of them legitimate to be answered but all of them involved resources of the ICANN. Budget and so on, so forth.

So I think before we take any action, we need to have reactions of the ICANN at some time that among those you have sent under the common or joint statement, which one of them could be done at what frame of time. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Kavouss. Just a quick reaction. ICANN set up to you a logo -- I can put the logo of ICANN and a space for a date and I can do this to you in half an hour. And if you want to have something nice, maybe it takes a week. So the first thing is the very low hanging fruit for instance, the rest may take more time. We don't tell ICANN to do this by tomorrow, it would be a statement or an

advice for them to do. We don't give a date. Sébastien Bachollet in the back please, and then the US.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sébastien Bachollet speaking -- to commend ALAC and the GAC to push this issue. From my point of view it's something I was struggling for since 10 years within ICANN, and it's very good to push that. I have three suggestions. The first one is that you apply to your documents the same things that you are asking and putting a resume, a short statement at the beginning. Next, that the board members don't need to read all of the documents, but just the three lines, you say what what we need to have.

The second is that I would like you to add something about plain English. It's something we need -- if we want to be understandable and even if we want to have a translation of those documents, it need to be first translated from technical English to plain English, and ICANN English and [inaudible] part by us. And I really think that there are a few elements we need to improve in the document, but I will not do [inaudible] here. Thank you very much.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I think these are valid suggestions. By the way, I added the date in the version that I assigned to the GAC because

there was no date in the final text, so of course we will apply. But this is only a draft, it doesn't have a logo or things. We will put the ALAC and GAC logos on top, and so on and so forth, and practice what we preach. But this is now about the format, I think and the point about the plain English is definitely a very relevant one. US is next.

US:

Thanks, Thomas. We certainly aren't opposed to this conceptually. I think it sounds like a very good idea. But unless I'm mistaken, this is the first time that we've actually seen the draft as of this morning.

Just in terms of expectations particularly if there's GAC advice or advice included as part of this, I just want to make sure that it's clear that while we're happy to consider this, we weren't prepared for this to be GAC advice coming into this meeting and just wanted to, before we get too far ahead of ourselves, just to make sure that we're not absolutely committed to trying to get this done; we can certainly try towards that but I just want to make sure we have enough time to consider this properly. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you US. Basically, there's two ways of doing it. We could either say this is advice; if we declare it to be advice, then it will be joint advice, or we can declare it a statement and then we could think about formulating advice in a communique that may refer to this statement and single out the main items as advice in our communique.

So there's different options to do this. Question is, first of all, do you think that is necessary and important to give this signal to ICANN about something with many of us have been struggling for quite a long time, and then what is the right form. So this is something that we can look into.

Again, I was just advised that as it is not very complicated in the sense that at least I think it is very clear what we are trying to say, that we use the time while we are here to finalize the message in whatever form you think is the right one Egypt.

EGYPT: Thank you, Thomas. And I also fully support those efforts and thank ALAC for working jointly on this with the GAC. I just wanted to highlight that lowering barriers to participation also includes other aspects, other than just informed participation as you rightly mentioned, the pace of work, the workload, cross community prioritization and other issues.

Frankly, I have skimmed very quickly across the statement and I don't think those are mentioned in the statement. So, if this is the low hanging fruits as you mentioned and other aspects will be tackled at a later stage, this is fine as well. And if they are already in the statement and I overlooked them, I apologize in advance, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I don't think they are in the statement and I would really be worried about trying to make the definitive statement about making ICANN a friendly organization to all in one single statement. I think there are a lot of aspects, you've identified some of them. I think Sebastien or someone said something about using clear English, but we also have to look at translations and there are a lot of aspects to this.

And I would keep the ambitions low; there's nothing to prohibit us making another statement about other aspects and we may even want to add a sentence somewhere saying this is just one part of making ICANN accessible. This week is a little bit too busy perhaps to try to do something a lot more ambitious, although I totally agree with you, we need do it.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. UK, and then Iran.

UK:

Yes, thank you. Mark Carvell, United Kingdom. Yes, there are many issues related to strengthening the model and then showing and maximizing participation. So this is, as I understand it from a first take, is focusing a lot on document management, and communication, and information sharing, and so on.

On that particular aspect, I think we're all in an age now when we are besieged by email traffic and documents heading our way. And I really -- and this is what I say within our ministry; if you want my attention, you've got to get the heading right. And that implies to document and also to the email. So this heading expresses what it is and what is expected of you.

So I don't know if it's in here exactly, but headings of documents and that expressed the purpose so that immediately you can switch on to what you really are going to help contribute to so it stands out and you know exactly what it is that's turned up in your inbox.

So the heading for this for example, is not really quite there, I thought. Maybe a statement on strengthening inclusive and diverse participation, something like that. To capture, you know, the problem that we're addressing and what this is about.

The other point that struck me from a first take was then, I think usefully refers to innovative ways in the paragraph on the second page. But I don't get the sense that in this age of rapid technology change and so on, that this paper expresses the need to look at how new technologies can actually help here. And I'm thinking of virtual meetings, that kind of thing. Not just Adobe Connect, which is a bit occasionally problematic for me and has been for you, chair, I know when doing calls.

But maybe the message here can be, you know, somebody starts to examine how technologies can help with this process of enhancing cooperation or making sure more people are aware of a document or communication and know how to react quickly and effectively. Thank you. Suggestion, thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Again, I would repeat what Alan has said; this document will not solve all the problems or all the challenges, but it's an attempt to at least improve some of the challenges. And so I think we'll take note. We will try to come up with a next version by tomorrow.

And focusing on some of the aspects, trying to do the best we can, it's a beginning of a discussion or processing of an awareness that will not be the end; and of course, we can see what we will have

as innovative ways to communicate in 10 years, but we don't want to wait 10 years to start seizing in particular the low hanging fruits and invite ICANN together with us to work on the high hanging fruits.

So this is the idea, to get the ball rolling with a statement that goes in the direction that it's not perfect, it's not covering everything, but it's something. Thank you. Iran and Indonesia.

IRAN:

Thank you, chair. With respect to how we will communicate that to GAC, I think GAC advice with capital A in the new bylaw has some criteria. In order to meet some criteria or maybe some of these issues which are very important, do not satisfy that criteria.

So our proposal is to not put it into the GAC advice; just put it as a suggestion or whatever you want, communication, exchange of views with the ICANN board in order to study of that. That will be more easily understandable and more easily approved. [Inaudible] GAC advice. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Iran. I think you have a pertinent point. That may actually speak for declaring this as a statement, not advice. A statement we can then still give advice with respect to the

statement in our communique and the ALAC may give advice relating to this statement which in the end amounts to the same but it may be easier also given that we want to get this done fairly quickly that we can agree on the statement by tomorrow maybe and then give advice in our communique, making reference to that statement. It amounts to the same, but it may be the easier track. Okay, Alan, maybe -- ah, Indonesia, yes.

INDONESIA: Thomas, just a short note that during the [indiscernible] you remember we also made a joint statement with ALAC, that time, if I'm not mistaken, lowering barriers or something like that. That time you were the vice chair, I might be wrong. Many years ago, you know? I was --

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: That's interesting; if you find it, share it

INDONESIA: No, but what is important is that that time we made a joint statement and both of you, ALAC and the GAC chair can inform what is the positive side of the joint statement so that we can make sure that this time, this should be better than the previous joint statement, in the implementation at least. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, I'm not aware of a statement on this issue. And nor is Alan. There may have been a statement on something, but since we don't recall it, we don't think that it has got something to do with this. But whatever there has been [inaudible], I'm interested and curious to see it. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: As we're talking about this statement, and I've read it moderately carefully, at least in the earlier version, I think I have to issue a caution that in a statement asking for simplicity and clarity we make sure our statement at least meets those criteria also. I'm not sure it does right now, and we don't want to be subject to criticism saying, "If we can't do it in our statement asking for it how can we expect them to?"

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Well, we use less acronyms, so it's definitely --yeah, there's an improvement, and if we make a reference and put a date on it, and then a [inaudible] and all this stuff, that's already an improvement. I actually think, since the board is already there waiting and we have a nine minute break between, I think we may have to -- let's just have a quick look at the agenda, maybe we can follow up electronically on the other issues.

I think the GDPR was on the agenda, but since that's not really important in this context, of course we can easily skip it. I'll leave it up to you whether that was a joke or not.

And I think we can follow up on the other issues [inaudible] communication between the sessions, between this and the next meeting. Thank you all very much for having you and we look forward to continue its close cooperation.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you for inviting us.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]