

Review)

MARRAKECH – GAC: Operational Matters (GOPE WG Plenary Meeting and Travel Support Rules Review)
Thursday, June 27, 2019 – 10:30 to 12:00 WET
ICANN65 | Marrakech, Morocco

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Can someone please alert our colleagues outside that we are starting?

So welcome back, everyone. This is our session on the GAC operating principles evolution, and just before we start the session, and I hand over to funky would just like to bring to your attention that I got to know that this is the last meeting for our colleague, Thiago, from Brazil. We normally acknowledge the outgoing vice-chairs at the end of their terms, which comes in March, but since this is his last meeting I ask for your understanding that we can put a sentence in the communique to acknowledge his efforts and his contribution to the GAC so just -- yes, thank you. So the sentence reads, the GAC thanks Mr. Thiago Jardim Brazil for his service and wishes him well for the future. And I hope its okay. It's again taken from previous communiques and I truly thank Thiago for his active contribution, as a GAC representative, and as member of the GAC leadership throughout his work with the GAC. So thank you very much, and I would appreciate

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.

Review)

(Applause)

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: With this I will be handing over it Feng to start the discussion on the GAC operating principles and, yes, if we can go back to the presentation please thank.

GUO FENG: I want to send my good wish to Thiago. I want to wish you good luck for your future career and so this is our GAC operating principles evolution working group the plan session so I would like to welcome everyone working group member as well as the GAC members who are presenting here.

I'm Guo Feng with Chinese government, and the chair of this GAC operating principles evolution working group. So can slide go to the next? Yes, this is our agenda today.

The agenda number 1 is opening remarks. Number 2 is I will update you at the working group progress. In the past several months since Kobe meeting agenda item 3 is the working group guideline draft review. I would ask Benedetta to walk through the current draft because we have plenty of time this session compared to the session in the morning -- afternoon so we can we can go to each paragraph of this draft slowly, and carefully to

Review)

traps to see everything. To read everything, and GAC colleagues here can present comment or you can make suggestions. Number 3 -- this is number 3. Number 4. Perhaps before, before that I will highlight again to you the key issues relating to GAC operating principles -- to the GAC working group guideline before comments on the draft. I will highlight to you again the key issues to trigger the discussion and then agenda number 4 I will kindly stick your comments on the draft and secure guidance on the future work, in the following face of this working group. The last is any business.

So anyone -- does any one has comments on today's agenda? If no we will proceed. Before I go to the next agenda item which is number 2, I would, I would remind you again that we have now an open position for this working group. We -- for the co-chair. Another co-chair of this working group. Perhaps for me to share -- to share the work load, and shoulder this -- shoulder the burden because this is a very important task within the GAC. So I think this is what I have to say with regard to agenda number 1. Agenda item number 1

So next we will proceed with agenda item number 2 which is the working group progress since Kobe meeting. So with this, as you may know that that working group was established during the

Review)

ICANN63. The GAC meeting in ICANN63 in Barcelona, and we, we generate or this working group term of reference and the Work Plan in -- before Kobe meeting, and these two document that and Work Plan were adopted in GAC Kobe meeting. So since Kobe meeting the GAC members have work hard. The working group members have worked hard to be in an alignment with the Work Plan and past few months we had 2 working group leadership call and the 2 working group, two working group call. So we have been focussing our efforts on the GAC working group guideline draft. The drafting work. On April 5 we have -- we had the first working group leadership call. It was on that call it was suggested that to circulate the previous available document, the GAC effort working group -- to the whole working group members, and it was also planned to schedule a working group call targeting at early of may to discuss the next steps. So this is the first leadership call.

And second leadership call was on April 30. We have covered several issues like how to update the framework and discuss proposal to distribute the drafting work load among members, and we also discussed the agenda for the next -- for the, perhaps the first working group conference call, and we also circulate the previous GAC procedure document. We remind we were discussing to remind the working group again to bear in mind the valuable document on GAC procedure. Working group procedure.

Review)

For the members to better prepare the working group conference call. So, on may 7 we had our first working group conference call. The update the framework guidelines was agreed on that call, and we discussed the work load distribution and the deadline for drafting the first investigation of working group guideline, so some member voluntarily took some took some tasks shared among working group members which is very -- which is great, so we also -- we did use the Google doc as a tool to carry out the drafting, though the working group volunteers the pain holders can contribute on-line. So at the beginning of the June we had the first version of the working group guidelines.

This is the first working group -- the whole working group conference call. The second working group conference call was held on June 12th. We were working through the first version of the working group guidelines, sharing ... among working group members and also we addressed the areas where we did not have texts which was a small part, and this is the second working group conference call. And as you may recall, that in early of this week, on June 24 our ... had a working group face-to-face meeting preparing for this plenary session today here now, and we also take comments from GAC members on how, on how to prepare for this plenary session.

Review)

So this is the, the time that we have covered. We have finished in the past few months, and I will take this opportunity, I would like to thank members of this working group, and also support staff for your contribution, for your great contribution to the work processes, and also for your contribution to the current draft of working group guidelines. So I think this is this is what I would like to share with you on this agenda item. Shall we move to the next next one? Agenda number 3, in, with this I would like to ask Benedetta to lead us to work through the drafted guideline of the working group.

BENEDETTA ROSSI:

Thank you ever so much, Feng. My name is Benedetta Rossi, for the transcript. So as Feng very clearly reviewed the GOPE working group conducted a lot of inter-sessional work since ICANN64. And as Feng noted the focus thus far and the working group has been on updating the GAC working group guidelines document, will we will be showing on the screen shortly so you can actually have a sense of what it looks like. The this guidelines document is actually based on a previous approved GAC working group guidelines document which Jorge Cancio shared in I believe ICANN64 or right after, and so the working group since ICANN64 has been focussing on updating this document either by

Review)

reformatting the actual document to make it more current and more useable, adding original language therefore from the 2016 version, new language proposed by working group members, and on instruction from the working group support staff also researched similar language from other -- well from the GNSO so and the ccNSO relative to working group guidelines so all of this is tracked in the Google doc and color-coded so you will see what language documents from the original approved GAC language from the original version. Which language is new language from working group members, and which language comes from either the ccNSO or the GNSO work group guidelines however they referred to them.

So far the working group has managed to populate most of the sections within the document. There's one pending section which is under norms, 6.1 where language is currently missing but otherwise the working group has done an excellent job at collaborating and populating and updating the entire working group guidelines for your review. So that's the update that I had Feng, and I will turn it back to you and then let me know what you'd like to post the actual guidelines on the screen.

Review)

GUO FENG:

So I would ask again whether you have any comments or questions as this point? If no, I think we can go to the document, to look at perhaps each paragraph, each part of the document, and to take a closer look at the language. Yes so this is our working group guidelines, so Benedetta, can you please –

BENEDETTA ROSSI:

Thank you Feng. So this is the updated -- well, this is the actual Google document so the framework of GAC working group guidelines. Okay. So section 1 is the background as you can see this text is blue which means it's original language from the 2016 guidelines. Sorry let me just -- sorry. Okay then we have purpose of work. Section 2. This text is new text provided by working group members as well as section 3 formation after working group and 3.1 initiation again this is text provided by the working group. You can also see we have some comments and questions that the working group is still addressing so and we have them tracked in the comments. Then 3.2 membership applications. Again, this is new language and you can see most of the new language can actually be seen from whoever provided the comments. Some of them are anonymous users which is why in some sections you just see black text but anything that is black is new text from the working group. So yeah. Here. 3.3 election of the working group

Review)

leaders. This text is purple so -- I'm sorry, let me recall. So that's language came from the GNSO.

3.4 adoption of the terms of reference. This is from the original 2016 working group guidelines. Rules and responsibilities we've got the chair and co-chair's role this is taken from the GNSO working group procedures as well. And there's mixture of original language as well. So the language in blue is the original GAC approved language and the purple one is from the GNSO.

We were also instructed from working group members to remove mention of the independent secretariat so that's been done across the document as well on any of the original GAC language. And here you see there's a lot of on going activities with an entire text which didn't fit in with the updated structure of the working group guidelines as the working group changed the format. But all of this text that you see that is been erased hasn't been lost. All of it has been moved so, for example, here you can see there's comments at that says it's been moved to logistics so nothing has been just erased and moved. Then we have new text from working group members on roles of its vice-chairs in 4.2. 4.3 members again it's additional language created by working group members or proposed by working group members. And 4.4 is liaison section. Again, this is a new text proposed by working group

Review)

members. 4.5 is support staff, and that's been proposed by support staff. Or updated by support staff, and most of it is actually based on original GAC language with a few updates submitted from support staff. Section 5 operation of a working group, there's a mixture of new text, and original language as well as reference to the annex because we have the Work Plan, and terms of references within this document as annexes. So 5.2 meetings.

Again, this is new language provided from working group members as well as some of -- there was a section that was section 6 in the original guidelines which didn't match with the new structure of this working group guidelines document. So the entire section 6 was erased and then repurposed within the document in the subsections as re-created by the working group. And this reflects this for example. 5.3 is decision making new language from working group members. Yeah. And some this is 5.3.2 is actually original language. And reporting to the GAC is section 5.4 this is original language from the previous document. 5.5 use of subsistence teams this is new language proposed from working group members. 5.6 final report. This is language taken directly from the terms of reference document since it wasn't present in the previous working group guidelines. But it's the obviously the GAC's terms of reference document. And 5.7 closure

Review)

of a working group. There's combination of original language from the 2016 guidelines, and the language taken from the ccNSO working group guidelines for the GAC's consideration. And here we have an alternative proposal from one of the -- yeah from the U.S., one of the working group members, so that the working group is actually still reviewing the closure after working group. The entire document. This is all up for review and discussion of the working group has been focussing on populating each section. None of it has been reviewed step by step for the working group net. Just for clarification. 5.1 we have logistics and this is session planning general meeting logistics. It's taken directly from the original approved GAC language.

5.8.2 is communication and collaboration tools this is a combination of original language in blue and the purple language is taken from the GNSO working group guidelines. 5.8.3 is regarding translation, and this is taken from the GNSO working group procedures which is provides standard ICANN Org text regarding the use of translations. Section 6 is norms and here we have the one pending section which is 6.1 participation. What we don't have any language either in the original language or submitted by working group members. And then standard of behavior, we have some new text submitted by -- proposed by one of the working group members, and here just at the end you will

Review)

see the original language of the code of conduct of GAC -- sorry, conduct of GAC working groups which is a section that has been completely erased because we've moved it into the new structure of the document. Again, none of this language has been lost. It's just been moved but we kept it so you could see and track it. And then just at the end we have the annex which is these annexes have not been touched much it's the GAC working group terms of reference template, and the Work Plan I believe. Here you have the general GAC working group Work Plan template which the working group hasn't reviewed either template yet.

So I will just -- I will pause here, see if there's any questions and turn it back to Feng.

GUO FENG:

Thank you very much, Benedetta, for this. So we just had been going through each part of this guideline. This draft working group guideline, so this document has been circulated immediately after the morning after new session, so perhaps everybody can see that in your mailbox. So before, I open the floor for discussion I would like to highlight you again, perhaps to the key issues or some of them are principles to conduct our work, or trigger discussion with that, we can trigger discussion, so with this, so can we first go back to the slide and go to the key issue

Review)

slide? We can quickly highlight some of the points. And in that slide we have accommodate some of the comments made by GAC members in the session of Monday afternoon session. So as it is shown on the screen, so perhaps the first, the first 3 are high level. Some of the high levels we should bear in mind when we conduct our work on the working group guideline. The first is we want this working group guideline as flexible as possible. Perhaps this is one of our principle to the drafting work of this working group guideline. So number 2 is the GAC procedure document V4, still valid.

So this is -- this means that we will adopt we can adopt most part of the previous GAC procedure document before, and to, to perhaps adopt the accountant of these procedure document before, and put the accountant into our current with guidelines, or we don't perhaps open again the discussion on the issues is already covered by the procedure document. So this is another perhaps another principle, and number 3, as I recall it is raised by Kavouss that principle is to avoid overlapping. One, one side is too avoid overlapping of work between working groups and also to avoid overlapping between working group and the plenary. So those are some of the high level view, high level principle we can -- we should have in mind, so number 4 is, is the co-chairs and vice-chairs currently as I said to you on Monday afternoon that

Review)

perhaps in current practice we do have a co-chairs for each working group, but should we, should we establish the position of vice-chairs? This is a perhaps an issue. And the number 5 is how to encourage working group members to make contributions? Number 6 is how, how do we endorse the working group documents who had had the authority to endorse the particular document produced by working group, or whether its working group at the working group level or GAC chair or GAC leadership or the whole GAC so this is an issue I think we need to think about.

And number 7 is the working group output generation principle. Currently we have the ... consensus driven to, to generate our output at the working group level, so I think we can still stick to this practice, and reflect this in the working group guideline document. I think if I remember correct, perhaps this, this issue is touched upon by the previous GAC procedure document, so we can still use the same, same paragraph or the same language. Number 8 is about establishment and closure of the working group which is also related to assess. The working group progress and outcome. So perhaps we need to also cover this issue in the working group guidelines, so those are some of the key issues, or in mind of the vision the first 3 are the high level principle we should, we should bear in mind in our work, in this working group, so I highlighted those again to trigger and perhaps trigger the

Review)

discussion before I open the floor for you to think about this issue.

So now can we go back to the document again? So thank you very much. Now we are put again the document on the screen, so perhaps it is time to open the floor, over to you to -- I would like to take this opportunity to seek comments and get an answer from working group members and as well as GAC members. I want this work on the draft, or your suggestions on this. So the floor is open. Please, Mr. --

TAIWAN:

Thank you, chair. I am from Taiwan. Taiwan one and thank you chair for your leadership and for the input and the input from the working group member and the ICANN support staff so now we have an almost complete document for discussion. And as we can see, this document comes from various input. Some from the 2019 assisting language and the some from the working group, working group members, and some from the ICANN staff. They -- first reference in the language of the see CCNS or the GNSO there are still some inconsistency in the document so the first one the structural problem because for some item they only have a description but for some item they only have a point but [inaudible] the second problem is the overlap. For some, some

Review)

item have a similar content in the item, other item and the third problem is the trend. [Inaudible] approve in some item we approve and in some we call a subsistence team. My first suggestion is maybe we need someone to put the English as the whole to reduce the inconsistency. That's -- maybe the ICANN support staff can do that under the leadership of the chair or Board. That is my first suggestion.

And the second suggestion is but before that, because the chair already mentioned the other key issue right, I think maybe add a key issues. The first three is the principle. Maybe we should also reference the 3 principle to revise the ... and for the key issue of number 3 on -- key issue follow through. I think we need to make some decision for this first thing we know how to revise the document accordingly. I mean, if we want to have a finalized document before the end of this year, we, we -- I think we need to work on the document, and based on our agreement about the key issue earlier then we can revise the document during the inter-sessional before the -- inter-sessional period before the ICANN66 -- the ICANN66, we can have a finalized document for a document. That's my suggestion. Thank you.

Review)

GUO FENG:

So thank you very much for your comments and suggestions. With regard to your point one I think yeah, perhaps that the first step for us is to have a version at the beginning and we can discuss and modify the each part, and each point and within this document, and we -- with regard to your second point that we perhaps within the working group we should first identify carefully the, the key issues within this, this document, and spent time to discuss them, to address them, and also we keep in mind that the principle, we already had with regard to this work, and to proceed the following phases but yes from my observations it's a little -- perhaps we had challenges to finish our work before the end of this year, so from my side I would try to, try to lead this process, and to work together with the working group members to, to keep up with the Work Plan. In order to have a, a pretty ready document before the next GAC meeting in Montreal. And, hopefully we can have a -- the final version by the end of this year. Thank you. So, any other suggestions? Please, Kavouss.

IRAN:

Thank you very much. I think the work that you have undertaken is very important because its serve as I would say, cozy GAC convention. How it works. It's very very important and we should not rush. I don't think that you could finish everything by GAC 66 unless there is one or two point very urgent and you could fill it on

Review)

the ad hoc basis but I don't think that we should rush into the situations because in ICANN66 or GAC 66 there are some other I would say very emerging important issues which comes for discussions and among them is EPDP. However, I would like to raise one point. We need look into the working groups, how they are established. I think we could have as much as working group as we have, but important is participations, and effectiveness.

So outside the ICANN in other international organizations that we are got also, we had one important fast -- look into the working group to minimize the number to the absolute minimum questions with a view to avoid any overlapping among them. That is very important. And look into the working group to take necessary actions for to... or create a new group if necessary. We shouldn't continue a working group to contain forever because it may not be very useful. Sometimes it may be one ... no one participate and the chairman or lady they were effectively alone. So we need for this. This allow looking int the working group to minimize the number to the absolute minimum necessary and to avoid overlap is very important. And then we have to look to that one and what the total activities that you do. We really appreciate your effort. Your devotion and we have a strong belief that we do not reach any conclusion by ICANN GAC 66.

Review)

You have to wait for that because that's important. I don't want to go to something in French as (foreign) quickly done badly done. We should wait. Look into the whole things, and fortunately we have a dynamism and devotions, young man's IQ you could put all efforts and so on and so forth and serve -- this is my contribution. Hope that you have kindly taken note of that. And sorry to see whether you have an agreement that this is something we have done elsewhere. Government has done elsewhere and minimize the number of group and avoid overlapping of that one and so on and so forth. Sometimes we should also put one element in every working group that say liaise with other working group if there was some sort of communication with liaising beyond ... X or Y if necessary if there are something to be communicated in order not to have so many groups and not to have anything which is overlapped and forgotten. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So I can see Jamacia in the queue so -- and also Kavouss, may I ask you, I fully agree that we shouldn't rush but I don't think Feng was referring to the whole operating principles exercises, but rather the part on working group's right Feng or -- I mean the deadline by Montreal is only for thing to work right.

Review)

GUO FENG:

Thank you for your suggestion Kavouss and your question from Manal. Yes, currently we are looking on many with the working group guideline. Yes, I think I agree with you that we don't rush to push forward anything, and we we should have an assist discussion on the key issues with regard to the work of the... the working group guideline but I think we have already our work plan, we keep that in mind but we don't rush to make any suggestion or output, but we we try our best to move, to move forward this process, and you Kavouss you point out we should avoid overlapping, yes, and I totally agree, I will keep this in mind, and to -- in our following work in the drafting, and move forward. So next I have Jamaica.

JAMAICA:

Good morning everyone. Thank you, chair. Having reviewed the document I want to take the opportunity to congratulate yourself and the team. Clearly some substantial work has been done with respect to these guidelines, I agree with the representative this Taiwan that there are some internal inconsistencies and or repetition of some things that needs to be sorted through, I'm not sure how you propose that we assist you with that because you could get extremely granular, so I would wish to be guided as to whether or not the group document would be made available, and then we can make our edits there because some of the edits I

Review)

want to propose have very granular and I wouldn't want to take the time in this session to make those recommendations, but one section that requires attention is 5.8.3 which deals with the translation. It appears this was a cut and paste and I think we need to reword the section to indicate how ICANN will support the working group with respect to translation rather than just simply restating what ICANN's translation principles are.

This is a working group document. It would, I think be appropriate for the language to be rewarded to indicate how as I said before, ICANN will support the working group with translation as opposed to just restating what the principles are.

GUO FENG:

Thank you, Jamaica, for your suggestion on the rewording of 5.8.3 and your point is noted. And with regard to your first point, we do have the on-line tool, and I think the work -- that the link can be circulated and you can go to the Google doc line and make your suggestion and make your edits. Thank you. And any other reactions? Indonesia, please.

INDONESIA:

Thank you, Guo Feng. Indonesia, for the record. Just want to remind that one of your -- the problem you mentioned that is how

Review)

to GAC will make agreement or disagreement or -- hello?
Comment -- sometimes the sound disappear you know. I was
wondering --

How do the GAC will make a decision on the... working group is
somehow difficult, consensus and so on I just want to remind this
these kind of things has been discussed since many years ago.
And one of the problem is that here we are not an IGO where we
sign a government agreement on how the decision process should
be made. We didn't have that one. There's no government
agreement as how the decision should be made within the GAC.
So I think this principle or this philosophy can be stated... in the
beginning of the working group studies so that we know that it is
based on that philosophy that we will then -- the working group
and the GAC will then discuss this point, whether it is by consensus
because it is no agreement, or as we mentioned what we normally
do as a problem like this. Some countries agree. Some countries
give they are disagreement and so and so on. So it is not just what
happened in the meeting. I think that point would be put in the
beginning of the working group report. Thank you.

GUO FENG:

Thank you, Indonesia. You mentioned about the philosophy
about consensus in the -- when we are discussing things in this

Review)

working group. May I ask you clarification? Are you suggest that we should put a language stating, consensus driven, as a principle at the beginning of this document, or to let everyone in this -- bear in mind this principle?

INDONESIA:

Not on such a level as a principle but we have to be in a working group we have to be aware that there is no governmental government agreement as how a decision should be made because it is not an IGO, if you -- it's not like, like a decision making in if the ITR, for example. In the ITITR, no, I agree or I abstain or whatever and because the government our agreement has agreed as how the decision should be made. The decision-making process is there and we have to follow that because my government has agreed to that decision-making process where here there is no... we sit together and I say, okay, I'm not -- I am not having a problem with that word or you know that language and so on. So it is more consensus, and, and what's call it, agreement or disagreement written in the sentences that some countries disagree, some countries agree as we normally do until now.

GUO FENG:

Egypt, please.

Review)

EGYPT: Yes, thank you. Christine... Egypt suggested it may be here for the consideration of others. I think for the sake of consistency of the document we do not really have much text or why the text need to go more in depth. It might be worth that we have like overarching questions to be answered in that part. So that would guide the working group members who are going to draft to remain within a certain framework. My suggestion is that if you chair of the working group together with the secretariat can frame like one or two or 3 questions for the areas we need to work more and then a sign that to the different working group members it will make it easier to have consistent text. Thank you very much.

GUO FENG: Thank you, Egypt. You mean the guiding question for each part, right?

EGYPT: Yes, I mean guiding questions to -- for the working group members to draft according to those questions so that we have at the end consistent text that is what we want to see in that part.

GUO FENG: Thank you very much. Next I will -- Kavouss.

Review)

IRAN:

I think we should be practical. I don't think that we should strictly say everything in the working group should be consensus based. You could put consensus with a qualified to the extent possible otherwise one single could block everything and we have know focus. We are not ... GAC advice that we need consensus. ... it's a different treatment but here working group we need to look into the, I would say majority and asking other people to join the majority but not saying only based on the consensus otherwise one or two maybe block everything and we don't have any progress. You put the activities of the working group on so on and so forth with the consensus based to the extent practicable and necessary. So qualifier that needs allow us a little bit of room to move otherwise as I mentioned, till be some blockage so we should not put this -- it's good to have unanimity if not it's good to have consensus but always we should not, as I said yesterday, make good an enemy of perfection. So thank you.

BENEDETTA ROSSI:

Thank you, Iran. Just to respond to your comment I'm referring to the section on the screen. The current language suggested by the working group is not based on 10 -- consensus but it's they've stated reach out puts that reflect the consensus views of the group to the most extent possible taking into account agreed

Review)

work plan and relevant timelines and then it's up to the chair to strive fairly and accurately to reflect all views and where appropriate identify areas where agreement could be reached, so just, thank you.

GUO FENG: Please, Kavouss.

IRAN: Yes, please remove superlative, most. Not that most. You put -- to the extent possible. Not most extent possible. Has no meaning. Most extent. To the extent but not to extent possible because many thing would be possible but not practicable. So to the extent practicable or to the extent visible but not to the most extent feasible. We don't need to put the word most. Thank you.

GUO FENG: Thank you, Kavouss, for your point out this very important issue I think you have -- yeah, your view is clear but I think with this issue we need perhaps further discussion among working group members to perhaps to reach agreement on this, and perhaps quick response to the previous speaker Indonesia with regard to your point that perhaps yes, we are not... so perhaps we -- as I recall some member during the Monday afternoon session also mentioned about we should carefully, on the -- on saying the

Review)

decision at the working group level. So perhaps we, we call the working group output, may call it output, not a decision because it is not treaty based organization. Yeah this is my reaction at this moment. So any other issue? Jamaica, please.

JAMAICA:

On this paragraph 5.3.2 could we have some clarity on what is meant by the GAC working group chair recording the formal endorsement? And why that would be necessary? So as it is now, the proposals or the working group outputs will come to the GAC, and the GAC will endorse the whole GAC will endorse. I'm not sure therefore why -- when this fact has been recorded by the GAC, there is a further action that is required by the working group chair.

GUO FENG:

Jamaica, you mention about the 5.3.1 your propose language changing or –

JAMAICA:

No, I'm just seeking some clarity. This is 5.3.2 as it is now it says that when the GAC working group completed its work essentially the ... represented to the whole GAC for endorsement, and the fact of the GAC's endorsement must be record and by that I think it means it must be minuted and for reference. So it says this fact

Review)

has been recorded by the GAC. And by the GAC working group chair. I'm wondering what role there is after the whole GAC has endorsed and recorded, that what role the GAC working group chair is going to be playing after that?

GUO FENG:

Thank you for your -- for the further explanation. For this part it is actually the language from the previous GAC procedure document. Before I think so it is perhaps when we are producing this language in the previous document we already have some discussions on this, perhaps -- I don't know if members at this room can help with me about -- on the previous discussion of this issue. But this is many -- this is the whole part is from the previous GAC procedure document, so perhaps we, we -- we can discuss this, but I sense that in principle, that for the parts from the previous already adopted document we don't do too much to language, but this is -- I'm thinking aloud now, but you can perhaps -- I will suggest, and you can make your suggestion on-line by using the on-line tool to propose your view further and we can discuss this, this issue. So next, Kavouss.

IRAN:

Thank you, chair. I think you may simplify 3 to 2. The output of working group will be submitted to GAC for consideration and

Review)

necessary action. Full stop. And then the approval process is within the main GAC operating principles. We don't need to state how they should agree with that and after they agreed with it they come back to the working group. They take the action. If we submit the document and document is considered by GAC and is quite clear then they will approve it according to the principles they have. If they need some further action back to you with a question. I don't think you need to go to too much detail here to say the output of working group will be submitted to gag or for its consideration and necessary action as appropriate and leave it as such and then this with any other issue in the GAC will be treated in accordance with GAC operating principle. We don't need to spell out how the principle will be applied with respect to to the output of working group. So it is better not to interact within the operating principle and one hand and the output of working group. Thank you.

GUO FENG: Thank you for your suggestion, Kavouss.

BENEDETTA ROSSI: This is Benedetta, staff support for the working group. I juts wanted to -- I'm recording all of your useful input on and comments on the current draft, but I just wanted to flag again just

Review)

for clarity that so far the focus of the working group has been to only to populate the document based on the original language and any new language on sections that were just must missing and language to the GNSO on ccNSO working group procedures there has been know current review of the guidelines by the working group yet. So that's why you see inconsistencies. There's been no wordsmith -- sorry, wordsmithing as of yet much that is a the next step of the working group. So I just wanted to clarify that since obviously when you see text on the screen it's it becomes instinctive to want to edit it or make suggestions but just wanted to clarify the working group has not done that and that will be done.

That's what Feng was suggesting that the working group will focus on now since the text is the GNSO document is pretty much fully populated the next step is review it to be -- the aim to present closer to finalize the so to speak version for GAC review with updated language by ICANN66. Thank you.

GUO FENG:

Thank you, Benedetta. Yes, we -- because of the work load and our time-line we -- at the working group level we before this GAC Marrakech meeting we didn't have the chance to carefully discuss each part of the document at the working group level. So at this

Review)

moment, and in the following phase we will look into this, all of the problem point out by previous speakers in this room, we will look into the issue of inconsistency and also other issues in this document, and we will have perhaps in-depth discussion for the working group. We should have. Any other suggestions or comments? Kavouss, please.

IRAN:

Yes, it's good to consider the working method of the GNSO and ccNSO and so on and so forth but the working methods of these would be different from GAC. The GNSO does not have a GNSO meeting E they have a council and this council represent the GAC and they meet more frequently than GAC and have a different output so therefore we should be careful not one to one within the working group to the extent that could be. But we are quite different from the situations and so on and so forth. We do not have council. We don't meet physically between the meetings and don't have so much time between the two meetings so perhaps take it back as much as possible, but it's not one to one.

GUO FENG:

Thank you, Kavouss, for pointing that out. I agree with you that we are different from and so are... within the ICANN framework. We perhaps we use some of the -- their experience or their procedure but we should keep in mind that we are GAC. We

Review)

should perhaps we will modify their language and procedure to make it fitting for GAC. This is our approach perhaps. Any other -- perhaps, Luisa Paez.

LUISA PAEZ:

It's Luisa Paez with the Canadian government I wanted to thank you, Feng, and the GAC support staff for ought the hard work in terms of producing and compiling putting together the first draft so thank you for that obviously this is a very challenging and important task and it's just a quick comment in terms of process and echoing if you have a few of the comments in the room. It's important to really take our time to consider the text that is our foundational guidelines for the GAC, so just really wanted to make sure that we -- I think we can have ICANN Montreal as a day to look forward, and it's important to have the intersectional work but I think we shouldn't be tied with that deadline of ICANN Montreal. I think we really have to consider the text that Canada is part of the working group, but I mean there is a lot to read to consider, so let's continue the inter-sessional work but let's not rush. Thank you.

GUO FENG:

Thank you, Luisa, for your point. Your point is well taken. Any other comments? Perhaps we do have -- we are already work overtime, so please, thank you.

Review)

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much. Congratulations for the hard work. It's very very good. Very important for the GAC. One thing I mentioned during the working group session is that there is experience in the leaders of different working group so maybe you can reach out this them with an e-mail and questions and perhaps review in detail some parts of the text because one thing said the rules but when the times comes running the working group different things happen. So you can profit from that experience. Thank you very much. And congratulations for the work.

GUO FENG:

Thank you very much, Olga, for your valuable suggestion. I think in my work we do the check and thank you again for your suggestion. So we already past the hour of this working group session, so I would like to proceed with the last one. List of any other business so with this I would remind you that in if the following phase we will focus on our work, on the -- on this language of this working group guideline to have perhaps an in-depth discussion amongst the working groups with the approach suggested by working group members. Identifying some of the key issues, and also we perhaps we have another task, we should conduct in parallel with this work according to our work plan which is -- that drafting of the code of conduct of GAC

Review)

liaison which I hope, I hope is -- it can be a more easier than this one. So this is I think at this agenda item what I have to say, so -- okay, please, Kavouss.

IRAN:

I think the suggestion of Olga is very important. I request you to consider sending a liaison a statement or a liaison note to the chairman of all working parties and ask them that could you please kindly share your experience with us in order to implement that or to consider that. That is one point. And the other point with respect to the Montreal meeting or not after some discussions perhaps what we do we say that this state is objectives but not totally definitives. It is good to have some object objective dates and that's that Montreal but it is not definitive. Last but not least we would like to express on behalf of all participants, your kind efforts, your devotions, your competency and your patience, and encourage you to continue with the same speed that you have, and try to get something which is because in my view personal this is one of the important issue in the GAC operating on working group and that is the, in fact, the vector of our works and the mechanism that we have if you have a good mechanism this is the most or of works and if the most or works the thing is going on. If the most or has a problem

Review)

you have a difficulty. So it's good I encourage you and we thank you and perhaps [inaudible] we give a round of applause to you.

GUO FENG:

Thank you, Kavouss. I think perhaps I will anticipate we can have some progress, perhaps I would anticipate significant progress in Montreal, but I agree with you that some of you have made that clear that we don't rush to made a decision. We don't set restrictive deadline for us to carry out our work. So with this, I would announce that this working group plenary meeting is closed. Is adjourned. Thank you very much. Thanks to everyone.

[NEXT SESSION]

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Feng, for the progress yourself and the working group members and colleagues who engaged from the floor. Please keep the contributions to this important exercises. A couple of operational matters in the next 15 minutes. Over to Rob.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you very much, Manal. Good morning. Typically we use the last day of the GAC meeting to fill in some opportunities in the

Review)

schedule, provide various aspects about our work. Since we have limited time, a fairly broad number issues, I will leave the slides available for you to look at. The one thing I would like to focus, Manal mentioned earlier in the week during opening remarks about 2019 GAC vice chair elections. So I will just go through those slides. Please at your leisure, since you have been looking at the schedule, if you have questions about any of the other operational matters, happy to answer them here in plenary or privately in the back of the room, and I will follow up with an email to summarize those things for you.

Every year the GAC conducts an election. There are two elected positions, if you will, in GAC leadership, the first is the chair, the second are the vice chairs. The chair has a two-year term but vice chair terms are every year. So although, Manal is in the middle of her term at the moment, we are now looking to begin the process for selecting vice chairs for the next term. The term of the current vice chairs goes through ICANN 67, so this process is to begin the election nominations for people who would undertake those roles.

So five vice chair seats are open. Because they are one year term every year the individuals go up for reelection. The challenge is that vice chairs have term limits and so you can only serve two consecutive terms, in addition to Thiago departing, two of the

Review)

current vice chairs are reaching end of term limits. So as we are begin to go depart and head back to your home capitals, we are opening up the nomination period for the next term of vice chair offices. That nomination period will begin with an email from me that you will see either later this afternoon or this evening.

As you recognize there's about 40 percent of the GAC here in attendance. The other 60 percent not here so the value of the email is that everybody appreciates the opportunity to make a nomination or nominate themselves for one of the vice chair positions. So that period is going to open today and will extend into the 18th of September.

As we have done the past several years not only third party nominations but self nominations are welcomed and we have a procedure for doing that. Not every year do we have more candidates than we do for positions. But we always like to familiarize you with the ballots or election process in case there are more nominees than seats and for that I will turn it over to you, Julia if you can give folks an update of the time frame and process.

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Thank you very much, Rob. As far as balloting concerned, we have used a tool, online tool called tally. We have used it for a

Review)

previous election in 2017 and actually it works very well, had no issues with this tool, how to use it very simple, based on the electorate identified by email address and we just need an email address of the first appointed representative who will be the person who will elect one of the nominated representatives. It's important to note as you can see on the slide, GAC members will be asked to send us their email address to the GAC staff contact. And we will confirm receipt of your email address in the nomination by email.

Do you want to take over for the timeline? Okay. If we can go to the next slide, please. In terms of timeline, so three important dates, nomination period as Rob was saying will be starting today and ending on the 18th of September, 45 days before the start of the next meeting. Balloting period, if necessary, will start on 19th of September and finish on the 5th of November during ICANN 66 and the new terms begin on the 12th of March, right after the meeting in Cancun.

ROBERT HOGGARTH:

What is important is the process for making nominations, so if you want to nominate yourself or someone else, please send email to GAC at ICANN.org, would go to the entire GAC membership list and indicate in the header this is a nomination for GAC vice chair

Review)

then we conduct the due diligence to confirm if it's a third party nomination, that the person nominate would be willing and able to serve. As we have done in the past have a website as we get the nominations, that will be populated so at any time you can refer to that and see how many candidates have presented their names or been presented forward. We will alert everybody obviously at the end of the nomination period as to what the numbers look like and how many people are in the running for the next vice chair and of course whether there is an election needed or not.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Thank you. A personal note. Two suggestions: One, some days minimum, 15 days before the expiry you send a reminder, because of holidays or whatever, number two, in the invitation and reminder please indicate that the principle of geographical rotations is something that needs to be carefully looked at, in particular those countries who have been already served as a vice chair may consider to leave the place to others who have not yet had the chance, just sort of invitations, and something you could add also as usually done now in every organization in the world, the participation and nomination of young generation is most welcome. We need to have successions and so on, so forth to

Review)

train the people because usually GAC vice chair may be a candidate for the GAC chair in the future.

And the last thing I want to raise and I don't know, it's good that we have one year plus one year naming but I think at some time we need to consider maybe in the operating principle, maybe Feng you should look at that too, some sort of continuity. If only one year the person comes in without competence, when he gains experience the term finished and may not be reelected at all, so why not [indiscernible] the principle of continuity, to consider whether we should stick to this one year in future in the operating principle or say have two years, this is something for future consideration. I don't know the background of that, maybe advantage, disadvantage it work may be good to spell them out but I think the principle of continuity is something that everybody agrees because you want to use this because now the vice chair of the GAC having more responsibility in the GAC leadership and help the chair of the GAC not to personally have all the charges on herself or himself. So a good thing that we have experienced people and we have geographical distribution, young generation so on, so forth, I leave to you how to draft but don't want to emphasize the situation, gender equality as well. Another issue most welcome and so on. Don't want to make

Review)

publicity for either side but you may to put this one in that. Thank you.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you very much, and your comments reinforce the value of us having these small opportunities in time to talk about operational matters. Thank you very much for that.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Rob and Julia, for the update. And it's a clarification question in relation with the departure of Thiago, and I would thank his fantastic work not only for the whole GAC but for his great focus on the issues in our region for being a neighbor country of Argentina. I thank you very much. My government thanks you very much for your great contribution and wishes you the best. And the explanation that we are not filling his position and we go directly to the election and I would like to support comments from Kavouss about having more continuity with the vice chairs, perhaps two years and then rotation. Because especially if those younger members, it takes some time to get acquainted to the work and that two year term perhaps for the future considering that. Thank you.

Review)

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you very much Olga and for the reference to principle 31 of the GAC operating principles. Something for the leadership to talk about when you all get together in a couple of weeks is what you might want to do with Thiago's position, the operating principles have a key phrase, which is if necessary. The last time we did this, when Milagros was leaving, she happened to be leaving at the beginning of a term, so the challenge was we went through a similar process for her nominations and so that would likely take time to fill so you all will talk about that as a leadership team in terms of how to approach that. Thank you to please, nominations, you will see my email and thank you, Kavouss, our process is halfway and then ten days before the period ends. Thank you.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I have another suggestion for consideration. Why I don't want to get into the business of the geographical division of the ICANN which was discussed and I don't want to go there but would like to express some tactical experience that we have. Middle East, Asia and Pacific are large areas, 75 countries or more than that of territories. I don't think that this area allows Africa with 54 countries could be considered equally with other regions with three or four countries as far as the number of vice chairs concerned so I suggested we consider the possibility to have

Review)

additional vice chair for those areas, continents that are vast and so on, so forth. It would have a better representation, it would be good that we have representation from the Pacific, from this side of the Asia Pacific and so on, so forth rather than having either this side or that side -- we need also to have that one. This is for consideration.

Without going into the proposal to change the ICANN geographical division -- we don't want to you but to say there's number a restrictions, you remember it was three before, increased it to five. There's no constitutional or legal prohibition, [indiscernible] while we respect all other countries to be well represented but perhaps understand maybe better representation if we consider that. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kavouss. I think if there are no more requests for the floor, then we can conclude or -- briefly because we're starting the following session, please. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I would like to speak about the representation of countries. If we take these direction, are we going to end up saying that the importance of a population has to be taken into account. That I

Review)

believe regional representation should have other considerations.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, and I believe this is a bigger discussion that goes into the operating principles, as Kavouss flagged. But at least for the sake of the upcoming nominations we are sticking with the rules we currently have to stay tuned for an email from Rob and we will proceed by the shared timeline.

Having said that -- and I already see our guests from the global commission for stability of cyber security, if we can invite them to the panel and start our discussions.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]