

---

LONDON – GAC Open Forum - Open Session for the Community  
Thursday, June 26, 2014 – 08:30 to 10:00  
ICANN – London, England

ANDERS HEKTOR: So just to say welcome to everybody to this first GAC open forum. And here's Bertrand De La Chapelle who is going to moderate this session. And before I wanted to introduce Bertrand as a former GAC member and, obviously, everybody knows him as a former member of the board as well. And, if you're sitting in the wings, please come in to where there are microphones and take a seat closer by so that you will be able to interact.

This is not -- you don't have to be afraid to take a seat of a GACer at this particular meeting, actually. So we're not having any more GAC-related interactions. Okay. So I'm handing over to you then, Bertrand.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Good morning, everyone. We're starting a tiny bit, five minutes, late. Before we start, I'd like to make one question, which is: Could you please raise your hand if you are not from the GAC? Okay.

It's important to know because this session is a direct consequence of the ATRT report. And the idea is to explain how the GAC functions. So please consider that, although you may be in the rows behind, you are the audience, not the GAC members who are here to help and potentially explain also their own experience.

---

*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.*

---

The reason why this session has been established is because, in many cases, you know this organization as this great quality of bringing everybody in the same place and then immediately putting them into different rooms so that they don't interact with one another. So that's the model, fundamentally.

And so, understanding better how the GAC functions and particularly how the rules apply or direct the structure, the functioning and the work of the GAC, is extremely important for the rest of the community.

So we have a tight schedule, actually. Anders has made a wonderful agenda. Very briefly there will be several sessions -- or segments in this meeting. First of all, Anders himself will make a general introduction on the basics.

The second session will be about how the different GAC members work in their own administrations, how do they prepare for the meetings, and also how the working groups work potentially intersessionally. And this will be Nicholas Cabellero from Paraguay, Suzanne Radell, I don't know -- you seem to -- you understood that. Then will be Manal Ismail from Egypt. Then Heather and -- Heather Dryden, sorry, the GAC chair from Canada and Stefano Trumpy from Italy will have the great responsibility of explaining how the GAC communiques are being prepared and also on the basis of some -- I wouldn't say historical, but past GAC communiques development. And, finally, Olof Nordling, who is from ICANN staff, will explain the type of support that the GAC has in the ICANN system.

---

So, without further ado, I will pass immediately the mic to Anders Hektor from Sweden. You have a series of slides. And we're trying to be up to -- you have 10 minutes. Will that fit?

SWEDEN: I think that's plenty, yeah.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Go ahead.

SWEDEN: I have many slides. It's easy to make slides. There's 10 of them, if you want to count them. But, if we could have the first slide, please. If you could change slide next. I don't know if anybody is up -- do we have a clicker up here, or are they clicking there. Julia is clicking. Excellent. Okay.

Well, the GAC has been around since Heather -- I have learned from Heather the other day that it's been around since 1998. I saw a note the other day for when the first chair came in, which was dated 1999. So around that time. We've been around for a while. Next slide, please. Next slide, please. Next again. There.

There is, even in the Affirmation of Commitments, a role assigned to the GAC where the Affirmation of Commitments is recognizing the important role of the GAC to give input on public policy for the ICANN. And it's detailed even further down in the in the commitments where the GAC is -- where there is information about more precisely on which

---

parts the signators are expecting input from the GAC. Next slide, next slide, please.

Obviously, the most important policy papers for the GAC is the ICANN bylaws and the GAC operating principles. And the ICANN bylaws regulates our work. And it shows the GAC's work needs to be taken into account and that there is a core value for the GAC, for the ICANN to take into public authorities and the government and governments giving input on public policy issues. There's also some text in the bylaws about how to react to GAC advice. Next slide, please.

And it stipulates that there should be a Governmental Advisory Committee that should provide advice. So the GAC is not a body that makes any decisions but provides advice in areas of public policy. Next slide, please.

The membership in the GAC is open to all national governments. Recently we became 142 national governments as members in the GAC. So we're now quite a few -- there's quite a few of us. It's also open for distinct economies such as the African Union Commission and the European Union Commission as full members. And multinational governmental organizations and treaty organizations can participate as observers. And there are 31 such members, such observers.

I think I saw at the communique that just -- we just saw, actually, that at this particular meeting there were 61 countries present and, I think, 8 observers, which is fairly good.

---

The number for the governmental high-level meeting was quite a bit higher. I think 100 members actually participated at that meeting, which I think is a record high. Next slide, please.

A member appoints a representative, an individual together with also an alternative, an alternate. And you can bring advisors. So, if you are participating at the open GAC meetings, you can notice that, when you enter the room, the room is already almost full for some meetings. Because you will have quite a bit of representatives and alternatives and a bunch of advisors as well. So there can be quite a few people present. Actually, I haven't heard how many people actually fits in the room or participates in the room. But there is surely quite a few. And, also, the members need to be a -- or the representative needs to have a formal function within the government working with policy issues. Next slide, please.

So we elect a chair. And the chair participates as a non-voting member in the board. And the bylaws also stipulates that we can have -- we should have a non-voting member in the NonCom. And we can have non-voting liaisons, not members, but liaisons in other supporting organizations and advisory committees as well.

We adopt our own charter, which is expressed in the operating principles. And the GAC conducts its own review, which is also explained in the operating principles.

Next slide, please. Next slide. I think it accidentally went back. Great.

So the board is supposed to notify the GAC of any proposals that may raise public policy issues. And the GAC can, on its own accord, raise

---

issues directly to the board in the form of advice, comments, recommendations for actions, new policies, or revision of earlier policies.

Next slide, please.

The board is mandated to -- the board shall take GAC advice into account. In the event that they cannot agree -- if they don't -- if the board doesn't agree with the action that GAC recommends, they need to inform the GAC about that, state its reasons, and interact with the GAC on how to find a mutually acceptable solution.

Now, this is, obviously, a very important issue.

And, at the end of the day, it may be that there is no solution to be found between the board and the GAC that is mutually agreeable. And then it's up to the board to make the decision and to state in its decision the reasons why they did not act in the way that the GAC advised.

Next slide, please.

So the operating principles -- the details, the provisions in the bylaws. There are 15 articles and 54 principles stated in it relating to all the aspects of the bylaws and then some, I would say. You can see a choice of headlines here. It regulates the scope of the meeting agenda -- the scope, the meeting, and the agenda; how membership is -- the more detailed regulation around the membership and representation; how the -- what the chair is expected to do and the vice chairs -- how we elect chairs and vice chairs and how we conduct our business.

---

It also stipulates how that there should be a secretariat support for the GAC. The provisions for giving advice and how we -- publicity -- I don't know really what that stands for -- how we publicize our results. Also, next slide, please.

Which is, actually, the final slide. See? I'm making my way through.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: I'm impressed.

ANDERS HEKTOR: As an example and also a very central issue and something that can come up later as well is something more about how we conduct our business. And, again, the GAC is supposed to provide advice and communicate issues and views to the board. And we're not a decision making body. We operate by agreeing with consensus, which means in this case agreeing -- having a general agreement in the absence of any formal objection. And where consensus is not possible, the chair can convey the full range of views by the members to the ICANN board.

And this is, obviously, a central issue, something that is also discussed from time to time. And the interpretations of it sometimes also discussed.

So those were actually my slides. I think, possibly, I'm under 10 minutes even.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: You're absolutely remarkably perfectly on time.

---

A few points. You've seen in those slides a lot of elements. Each of them could deserve a whole discussion. And some elements of those points are going to be discussed in more detail. But I just would like to pick a certain number -- very quick number of things.

First of all, you cited a number of governments who do participate in the GAC. This number has evolved considerably in the last few years. And I must say that 142 countries is reaching a level of proportion of all governments of the world that is significant, especially if you take into account the populations that are represented. And I don't know if you made any calculation. But it certainly representing a huge majority, if not 90-95% of populations.

And even the attendance of 60 -- 60 countries because I must say from my experience -- I've been the French representative in the past, from my experience in many international organizations, a number of 60 countries participating in sessions and working groups is significant, and deserves to be commended, I think.

There are elements -- you noted that there is a mention of nonvoting liaison to different groups. If you want to elaborate on this.

One thing is the practice, and Heather, correct me if I'm wrong, the practice is that the liaison to the Board is the chair. Is that structural or is that a choice by the GAC that it is the chair that is the liaison to the Board?

HEATHER DRYDEN:

I believe it was a decision taken before my time that the chair would play that dual function. It is different from the other SOs and ACs who



---

do split it, so that one person is chairing the S.O. or A.C, and another person is identified to serve as the liaison. So, yes.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: I just wanted to ask the question because among the different provisions in the bylaws and the operating principles, there are variants of flexibilities that can be chosen Ken. Likewise the fact that the communicate is now used as the main channel for advice is something that has evolved relatively recently. There were separate advices or principles in the past, and we will come into more detail. But I understand, or it's important that people understand that it is now the main channel for conveying advice; right? Okay.

And finally, two words that are -- they are expressions that are extremely important and that sometimes trigger natural tensions because they have interpretations that are difficult. The word "timely" at one moment is one of the important elements that may be we will come into more detail into explaining how the work is being conducted, because there are some constraints on the work the governments do at home that impact on how fast the advice or the response can be produced. And second, the articulation between the work of the GAC testify and the work of the working groups in ICANN is impacting on this question of when and how the GAC advice is coming.

The word "consensus" is, as was mentioned, an important element in many discussions, especially when questions are sensitive.

So I just wanted to pick on this. Is there at that stage any specific question regarding what Anders has produced?

---

Any question in the audience that you would like to raise?

If not, we will move to the -- to the next segment, which is titled "Preparing to Participate, Intersessional Work, and Working Groups."

And so I understand that it's Nicholas Cabellero and Manal who successively -- you want also to talk?

[ Laughter ]

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: So, please, your turn.

I think in terms of the order of the topics, it was more related to first the activities of governments at home, and then how the intersessional work works.

Please.

NICHOLAS CABELLERO: Thank you, Bertrand. My name is Nicholas Cabellero. I represent the government of Paraguay. I will be very brief.

Two important things before beginning. Number one, I don't have anything to do with the picture that's right next to me that I understand represents some Canadian gentleman singer or something like that.

And the second thing is Paraguay doesn't have anything to do with the team that beat England and Italy in the World Cup. That's Uruguay, just in case.

---

Well, I work for the national ICT secretariat, SENATICS, which is basically the institution in charge of electronic government and all Internet matters.

My positional role in the government is coordinator for cooperation and international organizations. I have other responsibilities related to fiberoptics, data centers, and I'm obviously the GAC representative for Paraguay.

Regarding resources or opportunities to participate in GAC meetings, they are very limited, especially for a developing country like Paraguay. So depending on where the GAC meetings take place, you know, we have a big or small budget.

Regarding intersessional work, we basically work through mailing lists following the main topics, and also we do our best to participate in Webinars, Webinars and those kind of video conference style meetings.

When it comes to preparing for meetings, basically we have -- we have meetings directly with the minister in which we talk about the state of the art, so to say, in Internet governance at the moment. We basically review a list of topics to be covered, and we basically check if there are sensitive issues for Paraguay as a country representative, or hot topics, so to say.

Thank God we didn't have anything to do with the Amazon thing or Patagonia or .VIN and .WINE, but I'm sure that in the future, something similar will come up. Hopefully we'll be a little bit faster to find a solution if that comes, if that situation comes.

---

We also tried to be -- We also tried to have a regional -- regional engagement, so to say, so that we can talk about our common interests, especially regarding bloc interactions, like Mercosur, Unasur and Celac. So whenever we discuss about the common issues, we try to reach consensus, we try to reach consensus among those countries that are part of those blocs.

But above all, every time I have -- and ministers change every time, so basically my role is a translator. Not an English translator or Spanish. And I apologize, English is not my first language. Exactly, an acronym translator.

I will just briefly read one paragraph so you understand what I -- this is related to protections for IGO acronyms.

It is like this. In 17th October 2012 Toronto communique, the GAC advised that the names and acronyms of IGOs must be protected and that such protection at the second level must be accomplished prior to the delegation of any new gTLDs, and in future rounds of gTLDs at the second and top level.

The NGPC noted some concerns with implementing the GAC's advice on protections for IGO acronyms, and has been working with the GAC representatives of some IGOs to find an acceptable approach or framework to implement the advice.

So basically my joke would be to explain right from the beginning, number one, what is ICANN. Then what is GAC. What is an IGO, intergovernmental organization. What are new gTLDs? Global top-level domains. And NGPC, which is ,if I understand correctly, New gTLD

---

Program Committee. And so on and so forth. And then there's CPE, Community Priority Evaluations.

So most of the time, I would say 80% translating. I don't really think -- I don't really think everybody understands in the ministry, I mean, the implications of those acronyms, but that's my job.

And basically, I just wanted to give you a general overview of I understand that every country has different methods and methodologies, let's say, for dealing with a issue. And I just wanted to give you a brief overview of developing country point of view.

Thank you.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Thank you, Nicholas.

Anders, do you want to chime in on how it works in Sweden?

ANDERS HEKTOR: Thank you, Bertrand. Yes, I would like to. Just I'll try and be brief.

I think the role as a translator was a very good description, Nico. I think I'm going use that to describe my work. So I'm also a translator in this area for Sweden, which is a country in the European Union that also gives a special flavor to what it means when Sweden speaks. Sometimes we will hear the Commission speak, sometimes we will hear Sweden speak, and sometimes perhaps it can be difficult knowing -- not which is which, that would be clear, but when are the commissions

---

speaking for all the member countries. And we're trying to be clear about that so that nobody needs to be in doubt of it.

But I'm Anders Hektor. I'm a nonpolitical servant, civil servant. I'm at the Ministry of Enterprise, Energy and Communications. In my portfolio, I have the Internet governance issues which means covering ICANN but also the different ITU working groups that are dealing with Internet governance, and coordinating extensively with my Ministry of Foreign Affairs that are covering the WSIS process and the U.N. processes.

Besides this, this is not a full-time job, as you understand: Many of us had different things in our portfolios as well. And some of the other things I have, the main ones, are the Internet economy related issues and growth analysis, and general digital agenda issues that I'm helping my ministers with relating to ICT in schools and eCommerce and all the plethora of European Commission issues that lands on our desks as well.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: And sorry to interrupt you, but to do this kind of range, you have, I suppose, about 40, 50 people to help you; right?

ANDERS HEKTOR: I wish, I wish. No. But I do have support. I mean, we have --

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: A secretary.

[ Laughter ]

---

ANDERS HEKTOR: I wish. Could you be my secretary?

NICHOLAS CABELLERO: We in developing countries do.

ANDERS HEKTOR: You have, of course.

We have about 20 people at my unit, and we have some overlap; you know, to have some redundancy. But I have the lead on these issues. And then I'm supportive on other issues.

So someone else will be leading in ICT and schools. So I don't have to do all that.

But so just so you understand that there is a range of things.

And there are two main strands for us or for me to prepare for going to the ICANN meetings besides our booking the tickets and finding a nice hotel. That is obviously seeking expert input from other parts of my government that is -- has some stake in these different issues that are up.

Sometimes we have an instruction, but it's fairly loose because many issues aren't immediately or acute for us, or they're -- there are, you know, developing work in progress or business as usual. Then we can have quite a loose instruction. But sometimes there are issues where we have a very strong position, like some countries have positions on -- I'm not going to mention strings now. But then we will have very firm

---

instructions about what we -- we may even have speaking notes. It may come to that.

But most of the times, we -- our governments trust us to do the best we can, because this is not a mainly political group but, still -- well, it's a political group in a technical setting. I'm not going to speak very much more.

And then we have also an external reference group in Sweden. Many countries, I understand, have this. We call it reference group on Internet governance. It's even an English acronym. I don't know why. It should be in Swedish but it's not. I'll have to try and change that. Where we meet with stakeholders to these issues and industry representatives, but also other peoples that are going to ICANN meetings.

So we have an opportunity that is really good to coordinate with them the different issues that are going on in different ICANN constituencies.

So that's to give you a flavor of how we prepare.

Thank you.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Thank you, Anders.

We have limited time and I would love to have the opportunity to ask a few other government representatives, but as it is not necessarily the case, I want just to pick a few things in the two presentations that have been made.



---

One is that there is sometimes a difference between large and small countries with benefits and drawbacks. The simple fact that Nicholas can say, "We sit with the Minister and we review the agenda," I can tell you this is not the case for a lot of governments where the opportunity to check with the minister is much rarer. There are chains of commands, and sometimes it's easier to have a short chain of command. Even if you have to translate, you can translate more quickly without all the additional layers.

So there are differences within the countries depending on how many layers you have between the political decision-makers who are the ultimate accountability mechanism and your own responsibility as a representative of your government.

But the second thing is what has been alluded to, a lot of the GAC representatives do have a lot of other responsibilities on their plates. And even if they deal only with all the international ICT or telecom related issues, this already includes now a very broad range of topics.

So if you take those who have only the international issues, they already have a lot of diverse activities beyond ICANN, but -- and maybe I can ask Heather to confirm that in many cases, they also have important responsibilities for the national ICT issues. And I don't want to make a show of hands, but I believe that a large proportion of the people who are in this room representing the governments also have responsibilities at the national level which -- I see a lot of nodding, which are a big constraint.

So it's a very important element to understand that in many of the constituencies of ICANN, the activity that people have is in this sector.

---

They are in the domain name industry. They are about Internet governance.

For most GAC members, it is a small part of the portfolio, and for those of you who were there yet when Janis Karklins was the chair of the GAC, he was saying it was basically his hobby activity because he had all the rest of the things he had to do.

And the final thing is in most countries, the coordination with the other ministries, not to mention sometimes the tensions with other ministries, depending on who has responsibility or not, is an additional layer of coordination.

So it would take a lot of time to explain, but it's the opportunity to pick on some of the things that have been said, to highlight that the activities that you see at ICANN are a tip of the iceberg of all the activities that the GAC representatives usually have to do at home, including now more and more consultations with the stakeholders at home, which is a good thing but is very time consuming.

So that's one element, tip of the iceberg.

Now I would like to ask Manal to address the other tip of the iceberg which is you see GAC members at the ICANN meetings but what do they do in between to prepare for those meetings? Working groups and things like that.

Can you tell us a bit more?

---

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Bertrand. And just very quickly before I go through the slides, let me just share with the community here how things have developed.

I know this will make me sound too old, but we've hosted an ICANN meeting as early as 2000, and I was asked by my superiors to attend the GAC meeting as the host country. We were not members by the time.

And I tried to enter the room where the GAC was meeting but it was locked with a key, and I couldn't get inside. So we really used to have closed meetings.

So I do hope this would give a sense of how things have developed until now.

And of course, like my colleague said, I have other things on my portfolio. We run the IDN ccTLD of Egypt. We also have the Internet exchange point. And the main thing we do, we coordinate with infrastructure providers and ISPs and things that has to do with broadband and so on.

So if we go to the next slide, please. Just the next. Thank you.

So normally issues are discussed among the whole GAC membership, either through the mailing lists or -- the mailing list or conference calls or at the face-to-face meetings. But sometimes a topic lead may be designated to further progress, discussions on certain topics of interest or concern to the GAC.

As it was mentioned, we come from very heterogeneous environments. I mean, people -- We have new members, we have old members, we

---

have members who are interested in certain topics, and we have members who come from underserved or not that mature DNS markets. So some topics are not of equal interest to everyone. And at the end, it becomes the easy task for the chair to drive us through consensus.

We have working groups created to focus effort and facilitate GAC reaching decisions before providing advice on any of the topics.

Change.

So if we go to the next slide, please.

We have three different types of teamwork or working groups. We have the GAC working groups, and those are internal working groups and are not open for members out of the GAC. We have joint working groups which are basically interconstituent, between the different constituencies of the ICANN, and we also -- GAC members do participate on review teams.

If we go to the next slide, please.

Can we go to the next slide, please?

So the groups, as I mentioned, are created to address specific issues, and GAC members volunteer to join the working groups.

Normally it's coordinated by the topic lead, and a few examples of those are working groups on capacity building, GAC early warning advice on new gTLDs, issues for future rounds of gTLDs which is currently a working group, and also working group on GAC working methods. And finally, a working group -- this is the newest working group we have created. It's on government engagement strategy.

---

So if we go to the next slide, please.

We have our joint working groups. It is cross-constituency membership, of course. It's normally either co-chaired by both constituencies or chaired by a member of the constituency responsible for the subject under discussion. Examples of those are the framework of interpretation joint working group, which is joint between the ccNSO and the GAC. We have also the BGRI working group cochaired between the board and the GAC and looks into implementing the recommendations of both ATRT review teams.

And we finally have a GNSO/GAC consultation group which looks into early engagement of GAC and GNSO PDP.

Can we go to the next slide, please.

So how those working groups conduct their work -- normally, they sometimes have separate mailing lists. They, of course, coordinate the work between the GAC and the relevant SOs and ACs. And they have to get to the GAC with briefs to keep the GAC informed of how things are developing, drafts to discuss and seek feedback from the GAC. All concrete proposals again to seek feedback and ultimately seek approval to proceed.

And I have to stress here that neither -- I mean, no member and no working group can move forward without, ultimately, the GAC approval of the final outcome.

So can we please go to the next slide?

---

And I'll try to illustrate by an example of the consultation group I'm involved with, which is the GAC/GNSO consultation group on GAC early engagement. It's cochaired between the GAC and the GNSO. It has approximately equal members from both sides. And it looks -- it tackles one of the ATRT2 recommendations.

This working group -- if we go to the next slide, please. This working group holds weekly conference calls. They alternate between team lead calls and calls of the whole consultation group. The ongoing consultations and consideration of received comments -- okay. Sorry.

We have to consult at each and every milestone to make sure that both our constituencies are well-informed, agreed to what we have achieved and give us the green light to proceed.

We have also arranged two informal gatherings in Singapore and here in London to further engage in a less formal setup which, I believe, was very successful to get the GAC members to engage with GNSO colleagues.

So I think -- yes. I think I'll stop here. Yeah. And hand back to you, Bertrand.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Thank you very much, Manal.

As you saw in the previous slides, each of them is an anchor for potentially additional discussions.

In the interest of time, I would just like to pick on two things that have been mentioned regarding, one, the diversity of methods. And there

---

are formal groups and formal processes in the GAC. One of the challenges is how to prepare and optimize the intersessional work and, in particular, how to compose whatever subgroup of the GAC to prepare a discussion and make it work.

But the most important element is what is related to the interactions between the GAC and the other constituencies in ICANN and the other processes.

From my experience and some of those that have been mentioned, I've participated in two issues that were related to the relationship -- followed -- relationship between the GAC and the ccNSO. In particular, on the IDN ccTLD introduction, which was, I think, a very positive exercise which was not limited to the ccNSO and the GAC, but also bringing other actors from the community in a fully open manner, but it was a joint initiative. And the second one I didn't participate in but I followed closely was the ccNSO/GAC work on framework of interpretation, which extremely important in the context of the NTIA transition that we're talking about. And that was also, I think, a very in-depth and useful work.

The reason why I raised this is because there is an ongoing debate on whether the GAC members can or cannot participate in the PDP processes and so on. The proof is that, when there are working groups and there is structured interaction, there is perfect capacity to interact. But the way the GNSO PDP has been functioning so far has not been a good mechanism for interaction, and it was not very practical for GAC members. And I'm very happy to see that there is this working group between the GNSO and the GAC on how to improve the PDP. As a

---

matter of fact, this is the reason why I mentioned the word "timely" as a key element in the early comment. Because most of the tensions regarding the timely coming of any advice by the GAC is related to whether GAC members have the capacity or do participate in the early framing of issues. Having been both on the GAC as vice chair and on the board, I've been on the emitting and the receiving end of this situation. And it is extremely difficult for the board to actually handle a situation where the whole PDP has been developed and the GAC advice seems to come late but it comes late just because it's the moment where the GAC is producing advice to the board.

So this working group is an extremely important one. And I encourage all of you to try to look at how it evolves. Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Just very quickly, Bertrand. Yes, you're very right. We had a very positive experience on early engagement. And when we engaged early on IDNs, it went smooth.

We also have -- we found out that we work with different -- very different working methods. And my colleagues here can assure this. When we created this joint consultation group, the way the GAC works and the way the GNSO works, how things are approved through the process and how even the working groups are created, they need charters. We don't do charters -- I mean, it's very different. So thank you.



---

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Yeah, that would deserve a whole discussion. But just for information, I mentioned also the fact that the communicate is now the very called-for advice in most cases. The GAC has used in the past -- and it would be too long to detail -- other tools. And, in particular, the early stages of the new gTLD program development, the GAC developed the GAC new gTLD principles. Some in this room may regret that they were not considered and taken into account more strongly in the framing of the program. But that's a gone discussion.

I'd like to move now to Heather and Stefano Trumpy to talk about specifically the GAC communicate and how this is used and also drawing on past experiences of how some past communicates have been developed. Heather. Can I give you the floor?

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you. So I think if we're going to talk about the communicate, it's useful to think about GAC advice, first of all. For quite some time there was lack of clarity about what GAC advice was. And sometimes we would have exchanges with the board or -- in that kind of a setting. And the board would wonder whether they were getting GAC advice by having various GAC members intervene. And, unless we go through the process of negotiating text and putting it in writing, it can't be GAC advice.

You mentioned earlier that the main channel for the GAC to communicate its advice is via the communicate. And that's certainly true. And overtime I think that the effort has evolved in terms of how we generate those communicates. And there's always been a bit of a tension between moving towards a high-level set of principles. You

---

mentioned some of the principles documents that we have developed on things like country code matters, the gTLDs, and so on.

But this is -- we were -- most in the GAC are perhaps comfortable. They're used to looking at issues from a high level because they're determining policies at home for regulatory frameworks and so on that are in the big picture. And so that's really where colleagues in the GAC will naturally want to move to.

The challenge for us is in our interactions with the board and communicating advice and so on, well, they need to be able to interpret it. They need to be able to identify actions to take. And over time, we've seen that this has sometimes been a real challenge in order to get the result that the GAC has been seeking.

One very interesting example, going back couple of years, maybe a bit more, was when we were having the Board/GAC consultations regarding the new gTLD program. And it was clear to the GAC at that time that the concerns that the governments had and were communicating via the GAC weren't being taken into account. And so we entered into this process of consulting with the board. And, as part of that, the GAC developed its first scorecard, as we call it. And this was a scorecard where we had GAC agreement on its contents. And it was extremely useful for us to be able to say we have consensus so that it could be very clear for the board that they were dealing with a GAC view. And it also went in to further detail than previous communiques had gone into. And it was very interesting to see the reaction from the community as well as the board who said, "Well, perhaps we don't

---

agree with everything that's in that scorecard, but we like it because we understand what you're asking for."

So you still see this tension in the GAC between moving from doing something at a high level, issuing high-level advice, principles based and so on, and to getting closer to specific details or implementation details, which can be very relevant for us.

And, you know, at various times views in the GAC can diverge depending on the particular issue or the timing of a particular discussion. There's quite a bit of back and forth about that. So at this stage it's also a challenge, I think. Bertrand, you also mentioned that, because we have a larger committee and we're negotiating this text and dealing with a variety of issues, we have all kinds of streams of work under way at ICANN that are of interest to the GAC, which has a broad remit, that this can be time consuming to come to consensus and to come to agreement on text.

And this is more easily done as well when it is high level. Coming to agreement on something that goes into further detail is certainly difficult to us.

So we negotiate our communiqués throughout the week and finalize it at the end of the week.

And it is meant to reflect our discussions and agreed outcomes to communicate to the board and, as I say, as well to the community. I think it's important to emphasize that.

So I will stop there. If there are any questions or anything like that, happy to address those.

---

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: No. That's a nice segue to Stefano, so that he can give a few examples of practical elements or particular experiences. At that stage I would just like to highlight one thing that you mentioned regarding the scorecard. Having been on the receiving end at that time when I was on the board, before the meeting that took place in Brussels -- maybe Stefano will be able to comment on that -- it was, indeed, extremely useful to have the structuring of the interaction and to have some ways to track where things were, and in particular to understand better what exactly was meant by the different messages. And it allowed to keep track of progress in the discussions.

I want to highlight at this stage that, although ICANN is celebrating its 50th meeting, it is still developing the tools for multistakeholder interaction. We are familiar with all the traditional tools of interaction in intergovernmental negotiations, in business negotiations, and in civil society statements.

But the development of positions and the development of rules in a multistakeholder format requires new types of interactions between completely different modes of negotiation. And what you describe in the scorecard and the -- and the different element and all of -- contribute afterwards on the kind of support that is being provided, we must all understand -- and it's probably useful to have this comment at this session -- that nobody has established the definitive methodology for developing multistakeholder policies and agreements.

If you look at what parliamentary systems have been, the evolution of the rules of procedures and the mechanisms in parliamentary systems

---

have taken years, if not a couple of centuries. The multistakeholder approach is putting different ways of developing components of a policy. And the GAC has contributed with the scorecard and the development of its structured communique to one way to interact. The other question is, as we said before, how this interaction takes place early on, and, in particular, how it takes place at different levels.

Because the advice is not necessarily the same if it talks about high-level principles framing the debate early on or if it talks about a very specific issue in the full implementation of a process as we have now to deal with on the new gTLD program, for instance.

Stefano, can you please go through a bit of historical references?

STEFANO TRUMPY:

Thank you. I'll do it with pleasure.

First of all, I'm an associate researcher in the Italian Council of Research and senior advisor of my government. And I joined the GAC in Berlin in May '99, so in the previous millennium. And I have here some examples or some consideration that are coming from my experience.

Let me say that the communique are the resume of the discussions that the GAC has in almost a week before arriving at the conclusions.

But what is interesting is to have some examples of the process to reach in the end this communique and then the conclusion of the meetings. So the work of the GAC is not so easy because the reps have to be flexible, have to listen all the opinion from also the other constituency

---

confront with the opinions of the other members of the states and so on.

So I'm making a few examples that -- relation with the country codes, relations of the GAC with the country code national registries.

The GAC adopted the two different versions of the principles for the delegation and administration of country code top-level domain. The first one was conceived in the year 2000. So a long time ago.

And the real point is that, in the reality of the country codes, especially at that time, a number of them was strictly connected or managed by governmental agencies while others were completely independent.

And then there was a set of principles that were established that didn't play -- didn't -- was not welcomed by those registries that were independent.

And this was considered something like wanting to establish a dependence of all the country codes from the government.

And these principles were not discussed with all the constituencies and only marginally with the constituency of the domain name supporting organization.

Then there was a need to rewrite. And in 2005 these principles were confronted actively with the registries. And it was clear that also they were not binding. There was not a binding condition connecting the registry with the respective government.

And so this was just a mood of having the GAC interacting much, much more with the other constituencies, while initially it was not like that.

---

Then, just to make a couple of examples that are not in the communique but just to make an example of the case of Nigeria. Nigeria asked for redelegation. And it took years before ending up this process. And ICANN was criticized because it was not able to decide something.

The problem was that two different ministries applied to have the redelegation.

And then simply ICANN said they are our Nigerian colleagues. Please. First of all, select who is the one that I have to follow and drop the other one. This is just to -- an example to verify how then things are difficult to also playing the role of ICANN. Because ICANN has to assure that in the redelegation, the future registries that get a redelegation is able to provide the service and it is in the interest of the local community that is interested. And this is only one case. There are others. But I stop here with the country codes.

Then there was another case that in my opinion is very important is the case of XXX. I do not want to enter too much into the why I think it is being conducted in a way. But, substantially, in 2007, after long discussions, the amount of time that we lost in discussing XXX is comparable to the .WINE or .VIN. I mean, the time dedicated to.

But, in the end, the GAC said to the board, look, for this new registry that is a sponsored type of registry that was called in the 2004, there is not support. But we are -- in the end there is a number of countries that will emphatically oppose if you adopt XXX.

---

So then the board denied the activation of XXX, but the applicant asked reconsideration. And then the problem came back again to the board. And what is interesting is that the board asked again the opinion of the GAC. And the GAC repeated the previous opinion, because we didn't change the opinion.

But the board tried to ask the GAC to provide a list of those that will emphatically oppose. Because, you know, the board, if he knows the list of those opposing a position, then they have an idea of how the decision to follow or not to follow which impact they have.

But here, there is another point that is also very actual that -- the fact that the GAC reps often are -- their ministries send formal letters to the chair of the board, to the president of ICANN, that is going up. So in single governments write to the board without informing some cases even the GAC reps.

So the GAC rep has to be very careful to have good contacts with different ministries in the government because then there is also an external channel. Not everything is going through the GAC is what I'm saying. And then we experienced this in recent times very sensitive. And the meeting of the high-level representatives has been very, very interesting. And also it was interesting to ask if this meeting is part of the GAC or not. So this is, I think, a very relevant problem. Because the situation is really complex.

Let me say then only one thing: Referring to new gTLDs, a sentence of a communique dated March 2000.



---

With regard to the additional new generic top-level domains considering the possibility of expanding the domain name space, the addition of new gTLDs should be done thoughtfully and through a consensus basis process. New gTLDs for specific uses as well as for more generic or open registration should be fully considered.

This is just to demonstrate that the new gTLDs project didn't come from the blue. It was something in the status of the bylaws of ICANN when it was constituted.

And so the final consideration I want to make is what -- about the idea of the scorecard that was mentioned by Bertrand.

The scorecard is a nice invention, let's say. But that constituted a sort of a dialogue between the GAC and the board.

And that -- and then there is only one risk that, in this dialogue, we say each one we agree on your considerations. And we will follow on. But with no specific decision making in between. Because it is a continuous dialogue to verify if we understood what you said and things like that.

This is also an important consideration to be made. I stop here. Thank you.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Thank you very much, Stefano.

There are many, many elements that have been raised. But I would like just to pick on the last thing you mentioned. When the scorecard was used, it was considered, indeed, as a progress and as a tool to interact. At the same time there was concern in some parts of the community

---

that the dialogue became exclusively Board/GAC dialogue and that it was changing the balance of responsibilities or roles inside the ICANN space.

So it's just something I mentioned, because, as I explained before, we are inventing the mechanisms for this. And ICANN is at the core of the most sensitive expression in the whole documents of the Tunis agenda of the WSIS, which is the respective roles of the different stakeholders.

And why is ICANN in this particular position? Because it is the only entity at the global level that actually makes decisions and makes policies on the management of the resources. And, as you know, making decisions and having to implement them and live with the challenges of implementation is slightly different from producing just a document. Making a resolution, making a recommendation in a declaration by civil society or a statement by governments in an international organization is not the same thing as having to come to a concrete agreement on how to implement a particular policy.

And so the whole debate that is taking place regarding ICANN accountability and the mechanisms and the functioning of ICANN also is connected to the role of the GAC inside of the organization, how it participates.

I hope this has given some glimpses of how the GAC functions. It's an ongoing discussion. And, as for the functioning of the GAC, I would like to encourage all of you to connect with your national GAC representative to understand it better and to interact with them.

---

But I would like now to give the floor to Olof Nordling from the ICANN staff on the support that the GAC has, the tools that it uses. And then we'll open the floor for any questions or comments.

Olof, the mic is yours.

OLOF NORDLING:

Thank you very much, Bertrand. And good morning to you all.

My name is Olof Nordling, and I'm a senior director of GAC relations and responsible for as a branch manager for the Brussels office we have as well.

A few words of support resources available. And in two aspects, really, people and tools. And next slide, please.

Support to the GAC --- in all respects imaginable, we have actually two groups. And one is an independent GAC secretariat. And I underline independent in the sense that it is independent from ICANN selected by the GAC and financed by a group of GAC members. And ACIG is not an ICANN acronym for once. So it translates into Australian Continuous Improvement Group. And there are two full-time support from the ACIG. And those are Tom Dale and Michelle Scott-Tucker. Absolutely stellar. And please stand up, Tom and Michelle, so they will recognize you for the future.

(Applause)

And from the ICANN side we provide staff support as well from the policy support team. And that is Julia Charvolen. And she's way back

---

there. So a little exercise, turn around your head. And Julia, who is tall, can stand up.

(Applause)

And then yours truly.

(Applause)

And we have got a generic contact address for any questions you might have. And it's fairly easy to remember. Gacsec@gac.icann.org. And, if you miss out on the gac.icann.org, just write icann.org. It will work as well.

So so much about who. And the next slide. Please. Then what?

What kind of tools?

Well, a little array of them that -- the traditional one, of course, we have mailing lists for GAC and its working groups. And we maintain those. We have conference calls where we use Adobe Connect, which is also used for various webinars. Because, of course, being ICANN policy staff, we can also draw on numerous subject matter experts from within the ICANN staff.

Web site, not that difficult to remember either. It is divided up into two parts. One is perfectly public. The public section which has GAC output, meaning you have the -- all the past communiques, for example, ever since the very beginning. And you've got the GAC advice register where the advice part of the communiques are parsed into its constituent parts. And it sort of connects into the dialogue Stefano mentioned where you also link in the board responses because it's a back and forth.

---

So I think you will find that interesting. It says any particular subtopic that you're interested in.

And then we've got a members section for members only. For example, we have Wiki working areas for the working groups of GAC. We do provide not only the rooms like this, but also translation for selected documents currently. It's not for everything. But we're working on that to make a better selection for what should be translated into what. And, currently, it's the six U.N. languages plus Portuguese. And the same goes for the interpretation services which we have at all ICANN -- all GAC meetings. Also, like you can see here to my left, your right, the six U.N. languages plus Portuguese. So you can really enjoy it in a wide variety of languages of your choice.

And there's some language practicing if that is your interest as well.

We also provide travel support to the GAC meetings for qualified countries in that regard. Like an example least developed countries and small island states would typically qualify. And we can finance in that regard up to 30 travelers per GAC meeting currently.

And with that, I think, I will conclude on resources side. And you'll see the tools at the bottom how to be with the garden. That's what we do. And I hand it back to you, Bertrand.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Thank you very much, Olof. I'm amazed that we have stuck to the exact timing of the agenda. That's remarkable. And it's not my feat, but the speaker and panelists. Thank you very much.

---

Are there questions from the room? Additional comments? Because otherwise I can perfectly fill the next 10 minutes. There's no problem.

Any questions from the room or any additional comments by GAC members who want to intervene and add comments? We have about 10 minutes. So the floor is yours. I don't know if there is a roving mic. Are there questions from the room? Or is everything about the functioning of the GAC, its role and its responsibilities in the ICANN system so perfectly clear that there is no doubt about it? Which actually would save a lot of time on the accountability discussion, because -- yes, please.

>>

Good morning. I'm going to speak in French.

I'm (saying name) member of the regulatory board of Senegal in telecommunication issues.

I know that Senegal is a member of the GAC. This is my first time at ICANN. Right now I think it's very interesting. And I have a question.

Do we know why there are countries that are not members so far? Have you made this question yourself? How can we evaluate the members of the GAC? Because some countries participate all the time. Some others do not. Do we know why we don't have representatives from some countries? Have you asked this question yourselves so as to know why some countries do not participate? With respect to developing countries, as was mentioned by you, we have to put some emphasis in these countries.

---

I think that today we are discussing the transition of IANA stewardship function. And so I think these countries should also be heard so as to participate in this issue that it's certainly important to everybody. Because the Internet, as it has been said before, is an essential element for all countries.

We know that today there is a lot of penetration and broadband is being implemented in many countries so that the Internet would vastly reach all cities. This is also related to the security of the Internet. I'm certainly concerned with all these issues. Because we should have the possibility of reaching these peoples, these populations that do not have the tool or the education or the preparation to participate, to be engaged in all these issues. They are related to Internet security and the security of the DNS. I'm very happy to be here having had the possibility of participated. And I have the idea that we don't have official delegation. I'm member of the authorities, but I'm not part of the ministry. The representative of the ministry did not receive the visa for coming here to London. So it's a pity that at so high level some countries cannot be heard in these meetings. I have something to say, but certainly I'm not formally representing Senegal. So thank you very much for moving forward.

And I would ask you to evaluate at these kind of meetings what is happening and why some countries are not present and not represented?

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: And even --- the question that was raised regarding visas, which is sometimes an important question. Anders.

---

ANDERS HEKTOR:

Just thank you for the question.

I had an opportunity when I had an intern at one point, actually -- I had a secretary for a few days.

I asked him to make a list of all the countries that are not members in the GAC. And it became an interesting list.

If there was a pattern -- there was about 50 or 60 countries on that list. And, if there was a pattern, it would see that there was developing countries and least developed countries. But also some other countries that for some reason or other weren't members.

We have been -- from the Swedish side, we have been making an effort whenever we're meeting representatives from countries that we know aren't members, both at my ministry and at ministry of foreign affairs, to ask them about this, why they aren't members. They find it extremely difficult to answer, because they don't know what it is. They're not familiar with ICANN. When we meet government representatives that aren't members, I would say for most of the times it's because they're not aware of what this is all about. They are used to the U.N. processes and the U.N. meetings, and they have representatives there. But they are not familiar with these settings and circumstances.

And, as you can see, it's -- it takes some getting used to to get to know how to engage in these areas. That may not necessarily mean that there are not people from these non-GAC member countries that aren't active in the ICANN community. I mean, there can be people in the



---

industry and the technical community that are active, but they don't have the relationship with the governments. We see this many times, and we are trying as well, you know, to bridge this difference.

But for sure, there is a lot of outreach to be done.

This is a small way of trying to do this here in this community. We're also going to have a GAC open forum at the IGF in Istanbul. Hope to see you there again.

Hope to see you there again. Repetition is the mother of knowledge, as you all know. People will say the same things again or you can help us improve it. So we're seeking ways of having more countries to be a member.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Thank you.

Heather, do you want to make a comment?

HEATHER DRYDEN:

Thank you. I agree certainly with what Anders is saying about awareness in the GAC. It can be challenging to communicate about those and why it's relevant and so on. But it certainly -- certainly is useful for colleagues that are in the GAC to be doing that kind of outreach and working with -- with other governments about -- about, you know, spreading the word.

So there are increasing efforts all the time to -- to support efforts to provide information and do that kind of outreach.

---

It's certainly the case that because of the particular role that the GAC was given as part of the gTLD program to comment on controversial and sensitive names, this brought a number of new members or representatives into the GAC. Sometimes we have a government that has joined the GAC that perhaps their membership is not consistent or there are gaps in their participation. But this has been reinvigorated. And presumably, this is because some governments saw that there was an issue of particular concern, and then the GAC became an avenue for them to come and discuss it and perhaps even put forward views. And it was just a broad expansion with the gTLDs that, you know, there were concerns generally about safeguarding such a large process in terms of controversial and sensitive top-level domains.

It's also a matter of having the right support available to newcomers. And we've made some strides in this area with having interpretation of available and having travel support funding available from ICANN in order to allow developing countries to come and see what the GAC is about. So that has helped, but clearly there is always more to be done.

And as I say, we're looking very closely at ways to work with ICANN and others to provide that kind of support and resources for newcomers.

So thank you.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Thank you, Heather.

Olof, you want maybe to touch on briefly the efforts that ICANN is doing in terms of outreach as well?

OLOF NORDLING:

Thank you, Bertrand. That was exactly my intention.

There is quite an extensive team of what is called Global Stakeholder Engagement Team in ICANN which has that particular mission -- not exclusively for the government, but including governments -- to raise awareness and improve participation in the ICANN process.

So that's GSE. And that is an ICANN acronym, global stakeholder engagement.

Then we have GES, which is government and IGO engagement strategy working group, I think that was mentioned earlier, and which is -- has that as a focus area as well from the GAC side. So that's a GAC acronym.

So distinguish between GSE and GES. Same letters, different order. And they're coordinating in order to make this a very, very fruitful exercise. That's the only thing I would like to add.

We mentioned travel support and interpretation, and we're working on it to develop it further.

Thank you.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE:

Thank you, Olof.

And, actually, thank you for the question that was raised because it is triggering an opportunity to pinpoint to various angles of solution.

---

Nigel Hickson from the ICANN staff also wants to make a comment, mark from Carvell the U.K., and Manal.

And I have just the opportunity for a last question, and we will wrap up. So briefly.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes, very briefly, Mr. Chairman. Good morning. Nigel Hickson, ICANN staff, government engagement. No acronyms. Just engagement.

As Olof said, the global stakeholder engagement team has obviously as part of its mission to involve governments in the ICANN process. And clearly we're delighted at the level of participation at the high-level government meeting here on Monday, and of course within the governmental Advisory Committee.

As a former government employee, I think I recognize the difficulties of engaging governments in raising these issues up the governmental agenda. ICANN was not thought of as the most sexy dossier several years ago to get involved in nor Internet governance. But because of the prominence, because of the importance of it now, I think there is a real opportunity in furthering engaging governments not just in the subject matter but getting them to come to the Governmental Advisory Committee. And that's something we're committed to.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

---

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Thank you, Nigel. And part of the activities that ICANN is undertaking is reaching out also through international organizations, as you mentioned.

I know that in the audience there are also people participating or following the GAC that are from international organizations, and they are also a vehicle for smaller countries sometimes to interact.

Mark and Manal, and then a last question and then we'll wrap.

MARK CARVELL: Yes, thank you, Bertrand. Nigel mentioned briefly the high-level governmental meeting. We, the U.K. government, hosted that here on Monday. And this -- The high-level governmental meeting is the second one we've had.

They'll be held, it's expected, every two years or so.

And one of the aims is outreach to governments that are not participating in ICANN, that are not members of the GAC. Ed Vaizey, the U.K. minister who chaired the meeting, wrote to all ministers in all governments as part of that important outreach effort, and we also had briefings for embassies and high commissions in London with -- representing administrations that are not engaged in the GAC and generally were very unaware or indifferent to the importance of ICANN.

And the result of that was ten -- ten administrations did participate in the Monday meeting, so we're hoping very much that that will lead to greater commitment to participate in joining the GAC for those administrations.

---

A second objective was to -- just picking up on your second point that you raised about increasing the level of commitment of those governments that are members of the GAC through governments being able to resource participation and prepare for GAC meetings and then be more active in the Governmental Advisory Committee meetings and discussions and so on.

So that's another objective of the high-level governmental meeting, so that ministers and senior officials have a better understanding of what ICANN is, the role of the GAC, and the importance of active participation in the GAC.

Thank you.

**BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE:** Thank you. We're running a little bit short. If the next slide could be put on the screen, which is a call basically for giving feedback.

Manal, a point, and a last intervention from the room.

**MANAL ISMAIL:** So thank you, Bertrand.

Very, very quickly, just to highlight that apart from the awareness thing, there is also the interest in the topics that are being discussed. If we're talking about developing countries, some developing countries are still talking about connectivity, whereas here we're talking about WHOIS and things.

---

Also the continuity in participating. I do understand that, of course, there are 30 opportunities for funding, but then you cannot keep funding the same member all the time. Then comes the continuity thing, which really affects the participation.

And after all comes the active participation during the meetings. So it's not just a matter of numbers of members, but also how they are engaged and actively participate. So it -- Thank you.

**BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE:** Yeah, there are definitely barriers. And just one point. The engagement strategy, as far as we understand, is not just to bring people to the physical meeting -- oh, Suzanne? You want to make a quick point? Go ahead. Yeah.

It's not only to encourage people to come and participate in physical meetings. It is participation in the ongoing discussion. But it is also reaching out to those organizations, and there are vehicles -- I mean, there's Commonwealth organization, Francophonie is also a tool for reaching out to a certain number of countries. Also Bernadette Lewis from the CTU in the Caribbean who was there as well. There are regional organizations, and I suppose the Arab League is doing work as well, to allow the actors in the countries who are not participating, who are members sometimes of the GAC but not participating, to follow the activities.

Suzanne, you wanted to make a comment. Suzanne Radell from the U.S.

---

SUZANNE RADELL:

Thank you, Bertrand. Good morning, everybody.

I guess what I wanted to do is really sort of -- even though my back is to many of you, my apologies, is to really urge everybody in the room, our visitors, to use the feedback mechanism and to put in a strong suggestion, at least from my part, from the United States, I would like our -- as we continue these exchanges, I personally would like to put in a bid for a lot more interaction and a lot more exchange with non-GAC people so we can have a better sense of your questions to us, your suggestions as to how we might be able to interact slightly differently.

So I thank you all for coming and the high level of interest, but I think it would be great for us to listen a little bit more to your views. So I do want to encourage the feedback.

Thank you.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE:

And, please, last question.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Okay. I'm Susan Payne. I'm from Valideus, which is a consultancy based here in London, and I'm a member of the IPC.

So I wanted to ask you, if you can tell us, what is the accountability mechanism that you have in place to ensure that the GAC representatives are not advancing their own country's particularly agenda as opposed to what would be beneficial to the organization as a whole?



---

Thank you.

**BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE:** The first thing is you're asking a very important question which is what is the difference between the national public interest and the global public interest. And following up on what Suzanne is saying, as you obviously understand that this tiny little question is not going to be addressed in 20 seconds, I would suggest, if this is agreeable to the organizers for the next sessions, that that might be one of the questions to be addressed in a session in Los Angeles, for instance, because we're closing now.

But I think both questions that were asked in the end are perfect roadmap, to use the expression that now is coming from NETmundial, to structuring the next session as a suggestion.

And Anders, last words for you.

**ANDERS HEKTOR:** Thank you.

Just a very brief short answer. I mean, there could be a really long discussion about that, but the very brief answer is consensus with no substantive objection.

So it's not possible for Sweden to promote a particular Swedish issue if we don't have, you know, support from the GAC. We can make our point. We can be heard, and we can argue as much as we are able, but it will not prevail unless there is a consensus on the issue.

---

So that's my answer to it. And Manal is nodding.

Yeah, okay.

So just to -- not to prolong the discussion about that, so then I'm wrapping up. And thank you, everybody.

Could -- We started by having hands raised about how many was not coming from the GAC. So can you again show hands if you're not from the GAC? How many are left here? There is actually more now than when we started, which is a really good sign.

So we're probably going to -- or we are going to do this again. We're planning it for the Los Angeles meeting as well.

We need your input. This was a first small attempt of doing this open session. So if you have a -- if you have ideas of how we can improve, what we should continue to do, what we should not do, what we can do better, please send an email to the GAC secretariat. We would appreciate that very much.

And I'm looking forward to seeing you all again. Thank you.

And thank you, Bertrand.

[ Applause ]

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**