
LOS ANGELES – GAC Work Plan
Thursday, October 16, 2014 – 09:30 to 10:00 PDT
ICANN – Los Angeles, USA

[Transcript continues from transcript entitled Working Group on GAC Working Methods]

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: And then, before the next meeting or to work out a more detailed work plan with priorities and with deadlines, have a discussion on how to prioritize the issues and how to allocate the resources we have to the different issues so we get a clear understanding, especially before a meeting, how to best use the days that we have, who to meet, how to spend time on issues. What can we do in 10 minutes? What will we probably need? One hour or two hours, of course, with the flexibility to react. But I think we should try and be more open and frank about these things so that we get a clear consensus what is priority, what needs to be discussed when so that we actually are able to give the right answers and also have the time for us internally to be able to give the right answers.

So I would just like to ask the secretariat to note this down that we will try whenever we can. It's probably not the most pressing issue, but whenever we can to have a discussion on the open forum how to continue to evolve it.

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.

Do you want to quickly react to this? Yeah. Okay. Thanks.

>> Just very briefly, to do it here instead of on the agenda-setting issue. 60 minutes. I'm asking for 60 minutes. This will never be the most pressing issue, but we have never spoken about it. So please.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: You mean 60 minutes as a forum for -- not for the discussion on it but for the forum itself?

>> I know. For the discussion in the GAC in Marrakech.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: 60 minutes?

>> Yes.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Okay. We'll take note and see how much we think we can allocate to that. Thank you.

And then, with regard to the minutes, I think this is a good point. We need to be clear what these mean, how important they are, whether it's just an archive to look something up, or whether we actually use it actively as something that helps us guiding -- as a guidance go through the issues as a reference to what has been agreed where we can look up where are we standing? Maybe we also can use this further for -- to make sure that the briefs that the secretariat is providing is in line with the minutes or try to keep them as short as we can but to have the necessary information in there and to get them properly validated, if possible, as quickly after the meeting as it is possible and use that as one of our working tools. Let's try. And then we see to what extent that that is feasible and necessary.

And the last point, yes, workload is increasing for all of us. We also have slightly changed our resources that been allocated to ICANN at the GAC and -- in my government. And "slightly," I mean, it's like a diplomatic word for quite changed. And we're quite happy to have ACIG and also the ICANN contribution to staff and secretariat. And this is what we have so far, of course.

And now I will say something on behalf of the donors, which I'm not, but we're trying to facilitate.

They -- I know that they are very happy to share the burden of funding the independent secretariat. And, if other countries are willing to contribute to that also in the longer term for securing

this for the future, nobody will say no, I guess. So keep that in mind also when we think about it's secured for the next few years, but they might not be able to secure it forever. So also there we need more shoulders to carry the weight, because we will not have less work but more. So this is what I say. Does anybody of those here at the panel want to add something? Yes, Wanawit.

WANAWIT AHKUPUTRA: Thank you, Chair. As most of us here working on the working method, in general, I'd like us to consider the work in CWGs, name functions, which we don't have time until Morocco, Marrakech. We have to adopt the final proposal or the draft proposal within 15 of January, even before. So this is something new. So I like to brief about the work of CWGs. We had the first meeting on the 6th of October online. And talk about the structures.

Then we have the first face-to-face meeting in the CWGs working groups. I like to summarize how that affects our working methods.

IANA have 11 scope of actions, which is a lot. It's include the root zone management, several issues that is very technical terms. They have been specifying that 9 -- 11 functions of IANA will fall into this group of CWGs or name.

When you read the charter -- I urge all the GAC members to read the charter. We're not involved in charter drafting. First of all, there's some difference in the rule of engagement like, for example, the full consensus and consensus definitions might be different than what the GAC normally works. Of that nine -- we have six weeks to go starting from this Monday, six weeks for nine IANA functions. The meeting will be on Monday. Together with the Norwegian team we tried to make a summary of implication on the public policy sending you on Tuesday. Next round the meeting on Monday we have to give a feedback. And this will continue during this six weeks.

The biggest milestone that will be affect us 1st of December to 21st of December is the comment that we need to have that the only time that we can review that draft transition proposal that we're giving out on the 1st of December, we have to get back within 21st of December, which we all know that December times is not really a working month. And, when you're dealing with the government, it might be an excuse to them that we are elephant that tried to dance. And it is a simple one. It's easy, but I look that is challenge for all governments to be aware.

What is even more critical is we have 10 days to adopt the final transition that will happen in 20 of January to 30th of January, which for sure we cannot have a consensus. This, together with

Norway, we tried every possible way. We may need to dance a bit, change a bit how we work.

But I like to raise the issue that we need to convey the message to either community that we tried to do -- that the most important thing we tried to work -- we tried, but I do believe that is mission impossible for all of us. But we try every possible way to convey the right message to the other community that GAC will try to reach the time frames of 15 of January that have been specifying by CWGs and is a charter that agree. And we engage. We have no other way than just try to achieve the time frames. I have been making a mapping, which will be -- which already distribute to the e-mails. So the mapping that we made right after the first meeting, we mapped between the current IANA NTIA contracts that we have been looking at. Only the one that relates to the public policy. And we have the IANA function in the CWG charter. We mapped through the contract, and we worked through all GAC communique in the past that are there any existing GAC register of advice or additional document that lead to this to make all of the GAC member to have easy understanding on the subjects?

And I can tell you that it's not easy to follow all this. But we have to do it. And at least both Norway and Thailand, we try our best as we've been getting the appointment from the GAC to be a

liaison. So member in the CWGs. And we want to be sure that we are elephants that tried to dance. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Thailand, for bringing this to attention. I think we all agree that this is probably one of the most priority issues that we have to deal with before Marrakech, which we cannot wait to keep and get ourselves organized until Marrakech. But we actually have to get ourselves organized fairly quickly. We need Thailand and Norway. But we need a structure within the GAC on how to deal with this. To be honest, many of this is quite new to myself. So I'm trying to learn and find out what the details are here. And I will need your help.

So do we want to have a quick discussion on how we should organize ourselves, not as those who represent the GAC or participate on behalf of the GAC in a group, but on how we deal with this until Marrakech? Are there some views on this? I saw Australia and Sweden. Australia, please.

AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. And thanks for that extremely useful update. I think, clearly, this raises a number of issues for us in terms of working method, which is the discussion we're talking about. It's clearly going to be a challenge having a 15th January deadline which doesn't line up with our face-to-face meeting schedule

because we don't meet again until February. So I think we -- you rightly point out that we have a very serious working method challenge, because this issue is critically important to all governments. So I don't have a solution.

But I do want to quite clearly and firmly state that I actually think the 15th of January deadline and the 10 days that we have to comment is unviable. I think we need to look at this very carefully and not just de facto by being silent buy into that. Because I think the timing, when it occurs straight after the Christmas break, for other parts of the world other than the northern hemisphere, this is, effectively, the summer holidays. And some of our governments shut down.

So I think -- and, even if we weren't, 10 days to digest this document, which is one of the most serious that we'll be looking at, ever potentially, I think we need to just say it can't happen.

Even at an individual government level but at a GAC level without a face-to-face meeting, I think we need to signal very early and very firmly that this is a challenge and invite something.

I just wanted to flag here -- and I think we'll probably follow it up in the following sessions about planning and so on -- one of the things that I think -- and, clearly, I've been trying to drive -- is that, as a GAC, I would think it's very useful if we can provide some guidance to our colleagues who are working in this. So, in terms of working intersessionally, noting that I think the timeline is

going to be challenging, I think we should make every effort to get as coordinated intersessionally as we possibly can. So I think, to the extent that other colleagues agree that going down a path of some high-level principles is useful and then potentially we can go into more detail as we go. But I'm hoping that I'll get agreement from colleagues here to continue driving that piece of work in the short-term. So that, to the extent we can give our colleagues some guidance for their participation in this with those challenging deadlines, we can give that to them intersessionally. So that's to start the conversation.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Australia. Sweden. And then I have Denmark and the U.K.

SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair. And thank you, Thailand, for this very, very useful mapping. It's extraordinary that you've been able to have some people helping you with doing this. I think it may be very helpful.

I would also like only to ask you and Norway that, when this starts, when the email starts flying, that they are very clearly marked that this is the topic. If we can have a sort of a place holder for this particular topic, it -- it's silly perhaps, but it makes things easier.

I'm also wondering if we can use the workspace to map out in a more permanent way the positions and input from different countries that have been given.

I also appreciate what Australia has said. But I really don't know what to do with the conclusion that this is not feasible. Because, I mean, what -- can we do anything about it? Or shall we try and stop it or shall we just try and adapt to it and try to be -- prove that we can really be agile and quick and -- I mean, we're working on different time zones, really. We should be able to be very productive in this sense. So okay. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: I will make a proposal as what Australia said afterwards. But I'd like to first give the floor to Denmark and the U.K.

DENMARK: Thank you very much. And thank you to Thailand for this mapping overview and for Norway and you to take up this daunting task.

I would just like to flag one thing. And that is that we somehow find out how to coordinate this group with -- for the IANA transition. And then the accountability track which, apparently, is -- yeah. Also starting now, I think there will be some kind of drafting of the charter later today or -- but at least I think it will be very important that we very quickly find out how to interconnect our work within the two streams in the long run.

And then I would like to add that I think -- yeah, we support, of course, to focus on the high-level principles as well for this work. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Denmark. U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thanks. And thank you, Wanawit for recounting the challenge. And gosh. And Denmark, because that's the point I was going to make as well on the CCWG on accountability. As Denmark has said, there's the drafting. And then there's the approval by the GAC of the charter as we will be a chartering organization.

And then we have to devise some kind of modality for participation in the CCWG. And then there will be a meeting provisionally planned for mid-November, as I understand, of the CCWG.

So -- and the GAC chair will have to take this on or seek your help from colleagues in terms of engaging in the CCWG and participating in the meeting. And GAC members will have to be very focused in helping to coordinate the GAC position input into the CCWG.

So all of that has to be sorted out now. So you have no regrets about taking this -- anyway, that's an additional challenge for all of us, the working methods and so on. Thank you. Intersessional work. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, U.K. Spain.

SPAIN: Thank you. In order to get us started on this issue, why don't we take up the document that we've been working on during this week to provide inputs on GAC views on -- in the IANA transition and ICANN accountability tracks? I thought we were going to start with this document. And that way we shouldn't throw the document into the trash bin. It can be good. Can be bad. But it's a starting point.

So then we can agree on those high-level principles to be fed into the process before the January deadline. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Are you talking about the thing that especially Peter and others were starting to draft on the high-level principles? Is this what you were referring to as document?

SPAIN: The ones that were on the table yesterday in different colors --

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: This is the work that we started on the high-level principles. Okay. Thank you.

To give you a quick reaction with regard to timelines, I think this is a very crucial point. And just for your information, it was planned to have a meeting this morning with -- at 7:00 or so with the new team and the old team and some -- Fadi and some of his core staff members. It was then canceled. But not everybody was aware that it was cancelled and so on and so forth.

So some of us met here informally. And we used this just to get to know each other for us internally but also for the others. We didn't discuss any substance. We just explained to each other where we came from, what we have done so far. And -- but there was one message that -- when Fadi asked me about how I see the future of the world and so on and so forth, that I conveyed to him. And I said we need to make not just work and make us understood within the GAC. But one of my tasks that I see, as I said, is we need to make understood by the rest of the community how we work, what are our working conditions, and constraints.

And I used the example of the timeline for the transition process and told them that, knowing how governments work on national

level and then in the GAC, that this timeline for us is an extreme challenge and we can't say now that we'll be able to meet this timeline.

So I urged him to think about that, if they want to be inclusive and include us as governments in such a process, they need to make sure that they provide a timeline and other working methods that allow us to participate. If this is done in a way that we simply can't, then we will tell them and they need to note that this is not because we didn't want but because we simply can't.

So that was the message that I conveyed. Please, for the future, let's discuss also a timeline together in a way that it's -- it allows inclusivity and does not prevent some stakeholders from cooperating because they're simply not able to because of a timeline or other constraints they might have.

So I started to give that message where we'll discuss about the ICG meeting tomorrow. But I will continue to give that message, not as a signal we don't want to cooperate, but we have our working methods that we can't change because we live in a system. And they need to understand this. And we urge them to respect this. Otherwise, we can't cooperate. So to convey that message, I think, is something that is fundamental, especially in this stage that we are.

Any comments of the secretariat? Do you have any proposals or comments?

So we have heard a proposal from Australia that we basically take two -- two, let's say, processes or two speeds. One is to try and work on the document that -- the color, the Benetton color -- "united colors of Benetton" document that we started working on high principles and we would try to get an agreement on them intersessionally as quickly as we can, but in an inclusive process listening to everybody, but with a view to agree on this rather quickly and communicate this to the outside community as the first contribution of the GAC on a very high principle level. I think that makes sense. That gives the signal that we are in the boat, we are working on it, we are contributing. And then to -- I don't really see the second part clearly, but to work on more detailed level based, I guess, on things like the metrics that Thailand has started to prepare for us in a more detailed way. But that will need more time, I guess. But we need to start in parallel with those two processes. We need to get them sorted out.

Is this something that -- to work on these two lines, is this something that sounds reasonable to you?

I see people nodding. Somebody is thinking that -- Yes, Australia.

AUSTRALIA:

Thank you, Chair. And as someone who didn't go to the meeting at 7:00 this morning, I'm really encouraged to hear that that message was delivered. And I think you've -- you've hit the time very well.

Obviously we want to be engaged. Obviously this is important. And obviously it's a challenge for us. You know, I don't need to reiterate this, but to Anders' point, I actually don't know the solution, I think it's a real challenge but I know for me, if this is a substantive document about the transition, I have a minister who is very engaged, and I'm going to have to brief him. So for me to read the document, prepare the briefing, and for him to sign off on it, it's just not going to happen.

So what I'm trying -- what I'm trying to avoid, and I take your point, we shouldn't set ourselves up for failure. So I don't have the solution for that end point, but in terms of being engaged as constructively as we can, I think from my preliminary view, what I understand, I think what you've said sounds very good.

I'm certainly happy if it's useful to reiterate that here to continue to lead or help lead whatever colleagues would like to see happen on the broad principles. And I think having a detailed stream of work following the CWG's agenda or the issues that you've been asked to look at particularly in parallel or following, or however we do it, I think also is extremely useful.

As with all of these things where we have two processes, coordinating between them will be really critical. So if we just set ourselves up in a way that the principles and the detail are happening together, and I'm not saying anything that's surprising here, I hope, will be really important.

So let's just think about it. If we do set up two processes, that sounds sensible. Let's make sure they're coordinated really closely and we understand the timelines, and so on.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Australia. And I think -- Let me ask the GAC whether you agree on having Australia, Peter, as the lead for the high principles track, and then we can discuss about a lead for the second track. And maybe my colleague from Thailand is just going to propose that he and maybe Norway will lead on this one. I don't know whether I'm pushing it somewhere, but I think you're the two that at least have a big role in the other one. So I give the floor to Thailand. Let's see what you are proposing to us.

THAILAND: I like to propose the action that I urge all the GAC member to do. I think Mark did it well. Start off by participate.

I think Heather sending the charter and the guideline on how to participate. They used to call off server. They changed to the participation list. I urge that the GAC should participate in CWG online. There is some process you need to go through, like making SOI, Statement of Interest, and register yourself.

And I think our participation would convey the message that we really commit to work, I think. It will help us for sure as the representative because, from my experience working in these

working groups, they have a list of participations in the finals, which it's expressed that we all interest in these subjects.

Secondly, as Sweden mentioned about a work space, I'm assuming that is a GAC work space. I'm not so sure that most of the GAC member using it. I have a profile there. I try to use it but it doesn't seem to be as well -- well adopt by the GAC member. But I'll try to create a work space as recommended. And it's in the GAC Web site, and I would coordinate with the secretary teams and the Norway that have to put the work space that all the GAC member will participate.

But mailing list is already created for CWGs on names. We try to - - I forgot -- thanks, Mark -- that you mention that we need to have the meeting with CGI on the 15th of November, and the truth that we face is that there will be no funding support. And in the working group still discuss that, how we are going to meet. Is it online or between the CGI and CWGs, that we need to meet on the 15th of November.

And for -- for the record, I saw that we try every possible way to make a summary, but I have to -- through excuse that there are almost something like 30 mail in the list after you participate, on a daily basis, because the people in ccNSO, GNSOs and all that, it's really working very efficiently, from what I see. So I try to summarize what happen in a mail before the Monday meeting, and they resolve for Monday, summarize the invitation, that

might need the GAC to have a looking or if there are issues. On Tuesday, we have the time to work until Friday, and next Monday will go to another scope of work already.

So I'd like to say that we have the rhythm of work that the next six week. I need you all to at least try to help us. That's my suggestion now.

Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER:

Thank you.

Just allow me a remark. Another message that I will convey to those responsible in ICANN for acronyms is that they shouldn't call every Cross-Constituency Working Group CCWG and every team that is implementing something "implementing team" because this is simply a nightmare. And I will stop here.

There are other ways to find acronyms that make it maybe a little bit more easily to understand what this is. Just bracket that. I was waiting to make for years. I've done it.

Okay. We need -- Thank you, Thailand.

We need some leads on the second part, too.

I note and would support invitation of all member states of the GAC, those who have the resources and the interest to participate

in addition to the two, in the CCWG -- CWG, whatever the group that they're in. CWG. And maybe you communicate -- those who plan to participate, communicate this on the GAC list. The secretariat will make a list just for us that we know who's there. But it would be great if could you have one or two countries that would, let's say, take the lead formally, informally, that we know, like who is driving this, who is the center of the speed here.

Do we have somebody who will take this on now?

If not, we will hope that somebody else, that will be sorted out later.

Okay. The secretariat would like to add something about their support to these processes.

Thank you.

TOM DALE:

Thank you, Thomas. Yes, I do, but before I do that, I had a message that there is a comment in Adobe Connect for remote participation. You may want to ask Julia to look at it. No?

Okay. We'll come back to it that while we check it.

I just want to make the point for both streams of work, as they support GAC's participation in the IANA stewardship cross-community group that of course the secretariat is very willing, able, and ready to support both streams of work and we would

like to talk to anyone involved before people leave to ensure that we're providing that support and coordination assistance in way that makes all of the concerns that have been expressed this morning. That is what you're paying us for. So please make sure that we are appropriately tasked as well. We are a part of the support team very much.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I have a comment from the U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yeah, it's just a clarification. Wanawit mentioned the meeting on 15th November. That's the ICG and CWG. Yeah?

But what I was actually referring to is the CCWG, the accountability Cross-Community Working Group, which there is an intention to convene that in mid-November as well. So that's actually the one I was referring to. I don't know if Denmark knows it's confirmed yet, but it's -- you know, the GAC has to be involved in that as well.

I don't know, Thomas, if you were planning to deal with CCWG. This is really alphabet madness. And now the GAC engages in that. This is the accountability Cross-Community Working Group.

Thanks.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: This is a good point. Actually, we have been asked to nominate or invited to nominate or designate two volunteers for a drafting group of the charter which is actually, I think, starting already now, has already started. But we got that very late yesterday, and it was somehow.

But let's -- Okay. What is the time that we have? Do we have to stop in 15 minutes, basically? More or less.

So what are the most -- What are the most important things that we need to -- we need to discuss in the time that is left?

I think we have more -- see more or less clear with the IANA transition part. Should we spend a few minutes on the accountability part and then go quickly to the Web site and things that are left?

So we note that we also will discuss the NomCom process.

The CCWG, the accountability process, we need to define also there a structure on which we work.

The only group there is is the CCWG. There is no Coordination Group. Is there also a Coordination Group in addition to that?

I haven't been able to -- Yeah, yeah, so you need to help me.

Is there a similar structure like with the transition that you have a Coordination Group and working group that is actually working on the issues?

Peter, could you help me?

PETER NETTLEFOLD: Possibly. So I'll start and then colleagues can correct me, which is a good way to go, I think.

So my understanding of the IANA transition process, obviously, is that we have a coordinating group. And my understanding is that's because the proposals will be coming up from the community from the different segments, so someone needs to coordinate.

In terms of the accountability process, I haven't seen anything like that, so I think it's a single group, and I stand to be corrected. And where we are at in this process is there are two steps. So the first step, which you have rightly mentioned, is setting up a drafting group for the charter. I actually gather they're meeting now in a different meeting room, but they'll meet again so it's not the end of the world. So that's just to draft the charter. And then subsequent to that, they'll be seeking volunteers presumably to participate in the group itself.

Now, I guess there's nothing to stop people who help draft the charter being the same people that participate in the group and so on. But the question the GAC needs to consider is do we have someone helping to draft the charter and do we have -- one or two people, I think, we've been asked for for the charter. Thanks,

Tracy. And then do we have people in the subsequent group and are they the same people?

So I think there's a coordinating group over there. I think it's just the one, which makes it a little bit simpler for us, at least.

And I guess thinking ahead, and I'm not suggesting that we have to go down this track, but the GAC already has -- is participating in the ICG. I've got five members. And in the CWG, where we have two sort of direct GAC members and other GAC participants possible.

So we've sort of got two formulations to look at in terms of thinking about how we interact with the accountability group.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Australia, because I remember having seen a matrix where there were also two columns but that was not clear and contested. So thank you for this update.

So I think the charter is nice to have. If we can participate, given the situation we are in, if somebody's, like, having the resources to participate in this.

I think the more important thing, the crucial thing is we have a clear view on who and how we are -- want the GAC to be represented in the actual group, then doing the work, is this common understanding.

Okay. Then we somehow need to have a call for volunteer, whatever process after this meeting for people who would be interested in representing the group.

Do we have a fixed number of people that we -- Is that already decided? That's a charter that will define the number. Okay.

Then Mark is want to go help me.

Just one thing. I think it would make sense that were not the same people who are already in the ICG or in the CWG so that we have a little bit of, also, representativity, diversity in there. It's not a black and white, but if we get other people, new people, I think that might be helpful. This is just a suggestion.

So, Denmark, do you want to say something?

Thank you.

DENMARK:

Yes. We have previous add our interest in participate in this work. Unfortunately, we are not able to be in the drafting group of the charter. I think some of us, most of us are going to Busan, and it will not be practical to do that. But if it's so, we are willing to participate in the group afterwards, the Coordination Group afterwards, if it's so -- if it's possible.

I know I have just been in a session on accountability, not because there was much light about the process but only that the advisors,

there is going to be up to seven advisors. And this expert group, I think it's called, with Larry Strickling and Cute and two others, Karklins, they are forcing that the advisors is appointed at the end of October.

So that means that the work will actually launch in the beginning of November. And there will be really a heavy workload in front of them.

Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER:

Thank you for this information.

I know that this procedure of appointing advisors is not something that everybody agrees on warm heartedly.

Would the GAC want to -- Should we comment on this procedure or is that not feasible or not wanted? Because that would need to be done quite quickly, if we would have to give an opinion on that process.

DENMARK:

According to my knowledge, there is going to be seven, up to seven advisors, that have been fixed and there is a process there. And I think the rationale which we heard was that it have been deemed appropriate that the advisors was not appointed by the

communities but more outside in order to have, let's say, fresh blood in the system.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: So we won't react to this. That means that we will need to somehow get ready by November.

Does anybody -- So we note that Denmark is interested in participating in the work of the CCWG itself; that is right?

If we have -- Australia, you will get the floor.

If we have somebody who has the resources to follow, at least, and report back from the -- from the drafting group -- I will have to check myself to what extent, for instance, I could do that because I am not going to Busan, but I will have to keep my service running as the only one left in Biel at home. But if somebody is able and willing to follow and report from what is going on in the drafting group so we know -- we have some information on how this charter is going to look like and maybe intervene, if necessary, that would, of course, be something that we would be very happy to know.

Australia, you wanted to add something?

AUSTRALIA: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

I hesitate to say this because, in part, it's as an outgoing vice chair suggesting that the incoming vice chairs consider doing something. But I do see as the elections have turned out, Thailand will be participating in the CWG and then providing input into the regular GAC chair, vice chair calls. And I think in terms of coordinating things at a high level is potentially useful.

So to the extent that one of the incoming vice chairs feels able to, and with that caveat, it may be useful if that was to be factored in. Because if we have one of the incoming vice chairs on the accountability stream of work as well, whenever the chairs and vice chairs have their calls, there can be an overview of how all the processes have been going and so on.

So I hesitate to say it, but to the extent it's possible, it may be useful to consider that.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER:

Actually, I would like to thank you very much for that suggestion because personally, I think it makes sense so let's not put any pressure but invite the vice chairs to think about this, because in terms of channels for communication, it's something that would be very easy to use, actually.

So let's note this and give the vice chairs some time. You can always step up and say yes, I'm ready to do this. You can do this

now. You can do this later. We're flexible on this one, but I think it's a good idea.

Thank you.

U.K. and then Denmark.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Thanks. And, yeah, grateful if the vice chairs could consider. I'm not going to consider volunteering because I -- I've kind of step forward on the CWG as a participant. That's sufficient loading for me, I think, on top of everything else I do.

But a reminder that this is -- the CCWG is a longer term thing. And the second reminder is we have to have a GAC process for approving the charter once it's drafted. Because, as I said before, we are a chartering organization. So whoever does lead on this has to initiate fairly quickly a process for consulting the whole committee on the final draft of the charter and then respond with reaction to approve, hopefully. Thanks.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, U.K.

Before I give the floor to Denmark, we will have to -- after Denmark I will close the list for now. We have two -- three more things we have to spend at least one or two minutes on.

If somebody realizes there's something important that we have not discussed that we haven't -- do not have on our radar yet, please communicate it on the emailing list, make it known and we will take it up, because our time is limited.

In that case, I would like to, let's say, take the agenda as something that is not really binding literally but is a flexible thing and I would like to give the floor to Olga who would want to make a few comments about the NomCom process.

Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Chair. Argentina is ready to help you. Now and through our period.

And apologies for not being with you this morning. I went to a -- I was invited by the cross-community working group on country and names -- I don't remember exactly the name.

It's leaded by the ccNSO with participation from the GAC and from the GNSO and other SOs and ACs.

It was a very interesting meeting. They are very interested in the work that we are doing in the geo names subworking group. They requested us a little bit more time for submitting comments, which I said that in my modest opinion was okay. But I told them

to send an email so I can share it with the working group and with the whole GAC if you agree.

We also made some interesting exchanges. And we will work close -- a little bit closer. The problem that I personally had is that the calls of that working group were at 3:00 a.m. or 4:00 a.m. Argentina time. So I can handle 7:00 a.m. or 11:00 p.m., but that was weird. So -- and then I was traveling. So I will promise to engage more with their work. And I will keep you updated. This is one thing.

Other thing is that about the NomCom proposal from Argentina to review the active participation of the GAC in the NomCom, Argentina proposal had a quite broad acceptance. We had agreed to work with us from Estonia, Spain, Chile, Jamaica, United States, Sri Lanka, Iran, Peru, Colombia, Paraguay, European Union, Hungary, Japan, Vietnam, Thailand, and Argentina, of course. So I have also submitted this information to the secretariat, if you can help me setting up an email address.

Also some of us we're drafting a text to submit comments. If someone else wants to join us in that effort, let me know and I will copy you the draft that we will submit before the due date which is 21st of October. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much. Any comments on this one? We'll take note, and we try to follow whatever is going on there and react intersessionally, if that is necessary.

Any other issues in addition to the ones that we have on the agenda that we should talk? I don't see anything now, so I would maybe hand over the Secretariat and you wrap up the things that we haven't touched upon. Denmark, yes.

DENMARK: Sorry. But I had indicated to the last question on the cross community and accountability. I think, if it's possible for the GAC to be in this drafting group, I think it will be good. Especially one thing which I think is important. It is the borderline between the two tracks. That is we want to see that the accountability issues with a link, with the absence of the U.S. government, are treated in the first strike in all of them. So that is only one thing which I think the GAC should have a great focus on.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Since the group is working now, I think we'll find out what the schedule is for that group, communicate it to you, and invite everybody to reflect on whether somebody has the resources to participate in this one. We'll keep you updated. We can't solve it now unless somebody steps up right now. But, otherwise, we need to move on.

Spain, yes.

SPAIN:

On a totally different issue, as you asked, we had another question to ask.

I am not clear whether the current vice chairs are going to continue their work until Marrakech. And one of the remarks made by Peter Nettlefold has made me doubt about that. I thought that the current team will go on, except for the chair, until the Marrakech. And, according to the GAC operating principles, they will be on this table in Marrakech. I would like to have clarification about that. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Spain. In fact, Peter, you should sit here. I don't know whether you were late to hear my invitation.

The way I read the operating principles, all the terms go until the end of Marrakech.

And we had the situation with the chair that we have. But no matter what the formal situation is, this is what happened the last time as well.

There will be -- there is a transition team with everybody who -- of the old and new team that should work together anyway. And so let's not be -- have a formal discussion about this. We need to

work together. And we will. This is at least how I understand it.
Peter, do you want to react?

PETER NETTLEFOLD: Yes, thank you. And thanks, Gema. Yeah.

First of all, Australia, I am very happy to continue to the end of the Marrakech, if that's what the GAC wants. I'm not sitting at the front because, yes, I was a few moments late. And so I didn't want to disrupt the meeting by forcing my way into the table. So my apologies.

And, in terms of suggesting that it be one of the new chairs, my understanding is the processes will go well beyond the end of the Marrakech meeting. So I was just mindful that, if Tracy or I effectively were to take this on, we would no longer be a vice chair before the process finished and you would lose that continuity and feedback into the leadership group. So I was simply just thinking through the logistics. And I'm sorry if I suggested or me sitting here suggested I was not going to help any more, because I'm certainly happy to.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you for that clarification. I think it's understood.

There is one other thing that we need to have a decision on by the GAC. As you know, it has been the -- the chair has been Heather, who was one of the five representatives in the ICG so far.

Since she is leaving or has left, there is another meeting -- the next meeting is on Friday. That means tomorrow. And the GAC needs to communicate to the ICG who is -- who will -- is replacing Heather as the chair in that group. And they need to know this before tomorrow morning because before the meeting starts.

And so we've discussed this. And, yeah, there is a proposal that the new chair will follow the old chair in this. I would be ready to -- yeah, to do this. It's a decision of the GAC. So we need a decision of you, of us all now that we can convey to the ICG that they know who is going to show up for the meeting tomorrow.

[Applause]

Okay. I take this as a yes to that proposal. So we will convey that message. And I will do my best with your help to be there and -- yeah. Looking forward to working with the other four and everybody else who is part of that structure and so on and so forth. Okay.

Thank you very much. Then I would like to hand over the -- if there's nothing that we -- that is popping up that we absolutely have to discuss in terms of substance to the secretariat, just one word. Thank you for the work that you started on the Web site.

As one of those who have criticized not you but the Web site itself, I'm very glad. And I think I see this as a -- the Web site has two roles. One is it's a window for us to communicate to the outside world. And the other one it's a tool for us to use as a working tool. And we need to develop both things. And I would like to thank Michelle and Tom for the proposals. And I invite everybody else to give them feedback because we will be the ones who will use this Web site. And we will have to use it because -- if we get this right, it's an efficient tool. So please, everybody, make your comments, tell the secretariat how you work, what you would like to have. Because the more they know, the better the Web site will be for us. And I'll stop here and hand over to the secretariat. Thank you.

MICHELLE SCOTT-TUCKER: It's good when the chair says everything I was going to say anyway. The online survey is available until the end of October. I'll send out the email again in the next few days or possibly next week so that the link is foremost in your mind. But I really do need your feedback about the Web site. You can't complain about it if you don't give me any feedback.

So please, fill in the online survey, I'd really appreciate it. Tracy.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Yes, I'd like to support the chair and Michelle in that regard. The Web site will be a challenge to redevelop. So it needs time. So the information that you provide to us now, soon, will give us enough time to work together on rebuilding that site. If we don't have information, we can't spec it out to give it to anybody to do and so on. So we can't work in a vacuum. So we do encourage you and appeal to all members who are interested, to work collaboratively online and see the amount of work we have to do in between meetings to provide that input. I heard it said that the working spaces were challenging.

So look at it, see what you can improve, send your feedback in via survey. Send in additional comments, if you need to, and let us get that Web site up and running as fast as possible. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you. If you give me 30 seconds, I will start this discussion and tell you what I think is very quickly important. Important, for instance, is what we already partially there. But it should be easily accessible. What are the work streams? What are the issues? What are all the working groups and the names and a small line about what the actual substance is. Who is participating there? And then, ideally, there would be a structure -- a link to a space where we have some kind of workspace to work on documents on the Web site in a way that it's easy for non-technicians like me to actually be able to use these tools.

This is very important because some of these workspaces don't work because people don't find access to deal with this.

I'll stop here. I think this is something that is at least to me important that we have a working space where we find information easily. What is going on? And then have easy access to participate in what is going on. Thank you.

TOM DALE:

Just a couple quick comments to wrap up, because we've clearly run out of time to deal with substantive matters. We're talking about working methods, so next time we will not run out of time.

Can I firstly, draw your attention to the fact that, as usual, the timetable for securing agreement to travel support for GAC members in relation to the meeting in Marrakech is going to be very tight. And an email will be sent out by the GAC secretariat, probably by Julia, very soon in the next few days with a very tight deadline.

This is quite separate from ICANN fellowships. Okay? This is the GAC travel support for the Marrakech meeting. So please pay attention to e-mails from the GAC secretariat over the next few days. And please respond quickly if you wish to make a proposal for travel support for the meeting in Marrakech, because there will -- the approval process within ICANN, who pay the bills, is quite tight in timing terms. So please pay attention to that. It's,

obviously, a very successful part of what GAC and ICANN do to try to ensure broad involvement in GAC discussions. But we have to try to work with the process, if you wish to get travel support.

Second point is that, in relation to GAC work planning, in general, a number of points have been made. And we've taken those on board where we did prepare a -- back in August, I submitted to the GAC list a discussion document concerning just how and why GAC work planning should be structured. Because there are a number of different ways. And, if you're not careful, you can produce a lot of documents that become out of date very quickly and no one ever uses. There wasn't a lot of feedback on that, but we will refine that process in the light of discussions here today and resubmit that intersessionally and, hopefully, have a more substantive discussion in Marrakech.

I would reread Michelle's request and others for participation, please, in the survey -- online survey concerning the GAC Web site. And remember we're surveying not just GAC members but anybody who would have a view about using the GAC Web site out there in the real world. I think that's all. Thank you, Thomas.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you for covering many items very efficiently and in a little time.

[Session transcript continues in transcript titled "GAC Marrakech Planning"]