
LOS ANGELES – ICG Meeting with GAC
Wednesday, October 15, 2014 –
ICANN – Los Angeles, USA

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Good morning, everyone. If you could please stake your seats.

Okay. Let's get started.

So unfortunately, the GAC is running at least 30 minutes late this morning, so we've got a bit of a lit start with our session with the IANA Coordination Group.

We do have an hour, so I'm suggesting that we do make good use and full use of that hour before we either take a short break or move on to our next item in the GAC's agenda for today.

So welcome to colleagues from the IANA Coordination Group or ICG, as we call it.

We're going to have a presentation from some colleagues. Some are seated up at the front and then some are sitting out there in the seats among you. And I hope that colleagues will feel free to comment and ask questions and have an exchange about the activities under way at the IANA Coordination Group.

Before I hand over and introduce those at this front table, I do want to highlight that the GAC has five participants in the ICG and they are here. I am one of them who has been appointed in my capacity as chair of the

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.

GAC. And then we have four other colleagues. So among them we have Michael Niebel from the European Commission who is here, we have Mr. Arasteh who is from Iran, Jandyr who is the Brazilian representative in the GAC, and Manal, Manal Ismail from Egypt.

So I'm looking to you to help us with this session, and please feel free to join in and help guide us through the exchange.

Okay. So with that, I will introduce you to Alissa Cooper who is chairing the ICG and I hope will get us started with today's presentations.

Alissa.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, Heather, and thank you for taking the time to meet with us today. We in the ICG are really looking forward mostly to having a discussion and question-and-answer session with all of you.

We have some few brief presentations prepared. I will talk a little bit about the ICG overall, and then my colleagues here will talk a little bit about the processes that are already under way to begin developing the components of the transition proposal in the operational communities.

We operate as a very transparent group. Basically everything that we do, almost, is in public and is publicly documented, and you can find all the information about the ICG at our Web site, ianacg.org.

Next slide, please.

So I think most people in this room are familiar with the events that have led us to the place where we are today, but just for a very brief review. The ICG was formed as a result, an eventual result of the NTIA's announcement in March about its intention to transition the stewardship of the IANA functions.

The NTIA asked ICANN to convene global stakeholders to develop a transition plan. And what ICANN did was they initiated a community process which resulted in the creation of the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group, otherwise known as the ICG.

Next slide, please.

So who is the ICG? The ICG is a group of 30 members and two liaisons representing all of the constituencies that you see represented in the alphabet soup on the slide there, and we have a large number of ICG members in the room so I would ask them to please stand up or raise your hand. Go ahead, raise your hand, ICG members. We have folks from ISOC, BASIS, from ALAC, from the GAC, SSAC, RSSAC. You can see them all listed on the slide. So many -- a great many number of them are here with us today. And they -- Our constitution is meant to represent that broad set of communities and stakeholders.

Next slide, please.

So that's who we are. Then the next question is what do we do?

Sorry. Yep, that's good.

So as our name suggests, we are primarily a Coordination Group. We are here to help the landscape of global stakeholders organize their

work and develop a plan for the transition of the IANA functions stewardship.

So our main function is to coordinate among all these communities and constituencies who are working together towards that goal.

With that said, what that means is that we are not here to develop the proposal ourselves. We are a small group of people. We are volunteering our time, and so we are mainly here to help the rest of the community get that work done as opposed to us in this small group doing it ourselves.

As part of that, we are liaising with all of our various constituencies. One of the key roles of each ICG member is to be carrying information back and forth from what the ICG does and what's going on with the other processes back to their home community, wherever that may be. Eventually, when we receive components of a transition proposal, we will be assessing those components based on a number of criteria to determine if they are ready to move forward in the process.

After that, we will be assembling the components into one unified proposal that can eventually be submitted to the NTIA.

And throughout the entire process, we will be serving to inform the global community about the progress, what's going on, providing status updates and so forth.

So that's a brief overview of the ICG charter.

Next slide, please.

As many of you know, the transition is scoped in a particular way. There's two aspects of that that I'd like to emphasize.

The IANA functions as currently specified in the NTIA contract relate to three different kinds of activities primarily. The first is protocol parameters registry management. The second is the DNS root zone management, and the third is Internet numbers registry management. And those three functions are really the core focus of the transition.

IANA does other things. It manages other registries, it has other kind of operational responsibilities. Those other things are not the focus of this transition and not the focus that the ICG is holding. So that's one way in which the transition is scoped.

The other way is that it is focused on stewardship. There are multiple different components that, when put together, create the whole ecosystem around IANA and Internet identifier governance. There's policy development, as everyone knows. We've all been engaged in policy development processes of various kinds. There's other aspects related to the proper functioning of IANA but what we're focused on specifically here is the stewardship.

Next slide, please.

So the way that the ICG has asked the communities to organize themselves in order to arrive at one unified transition proposal is to essentially align along those three functions that are specified in the current contract and to use the existing community processes in many cases which have existed for a long time and have a lot -- we have a lot of experience with in order to develop the components of a transition proposal.

So what this means is that for protocol parameters, we are relying on the IETF community and its standard processes to develop a transition plan component specific to protocol parameters.

Similarly, we are relying on the Regional Internet Registry communities and processes to develop a component specific to Internet numbering resources.

And finally, we're relying on the recently formed names Cross-Community Working Group to develop a transition plan component specific to domain names.

What this does not mean is that if you have not historically participated in these communities or you don't feel that you are a member or you're not sure how to participate, that you are prevented from participating. It's actually just the opposite.

We're using the existing processes to organize the work, to leverage the efficiencies that already exist there, but to also be open to anyone who wants to participate. And so all of these three separate processes, the

idea is that if you're interested in that function, if you say, "Hey, numbers is my thing. I really want to go work on the transition plan for numbers," then you can go and engage in the RIR process which has already started and which I think Adiel will speak to you in a few minutes.

So that's where you see the little people in the middle.

If you are interested in all three of the processes, you can engage in all of them. All of these community and operational community processes are open to anyone who wants to join. It's just that we're using them so that we can organize the work and do it in parallel for the separate functions.

Next slide, please.

So to give a brief update in terms of the work that has happened already and what the plan looks like going forward, the ICG issued a request for proposals to those operational communities in September. And that RFP asks the communities to come up with transition plans for their -- the function that they are interested in. And that RFP asks many different questions of the communities. It asks them to specify what the current stewardship, oversight, and accountability mechanisms are for the function that they are writing about. And then it asks them to detail what the transition plan is and what the implications of that transition plan are for the individual function.

So that's what the communities are working on now. That's what's happening in those operational community processes. And the people sitting at this table are going to talk a little bit more about those individual processes in a few minutes.

And that -- that project, as we've outlined in the time line, we are hoping to have those proposals sent to the ICG from the communities by January of 2015.

Next slide, please.

So now you can see the rest of the time line. And I know there's been a lot of discussion about the time line already this week and in recent weeks. And what I hope you can see from here -- I'm not going to go into every detail of this time line. People should feel free to ask questions and we'll be happy to talk more about the detail of the steps.

It's an iterative process. The submission of proposals by January 2015 is necessary so that we can then, as the ICG, assess those individual proposals, review them, and if they have gaps, if there's something missing, if there's something that needs clarification, those proposals will need to go back to the operational communities. Again, because the ICG is not itself in a position to edit the proposals or come up with substantive contributions to the proposals, that needs to happen in the bottom-up processes in the communities. So any -- any potential issues or problems that we see, we can flag them, but we need to send them back to the communities so that they can work through them and obtain consensus amongst themselves again. And every time we need to do that, we need to give the communities time to, first of all, make

those changes, and second of all, come back to consensus. And I think everyone in this room knows how long and hard it can be to obtain consensus among a group of diverse individuals. And so for each of the steps in the process, we've allotted a month or two to have that happen.

Once that has happened for the individual proposals, we will, as the ICG, assemble the components into one unified plan, and, again, send that out for global public comment. We will take some time to review those comments, determine if we can -- if we need to send the proposal back to the operational communities again for further clarification, and in the end, when we have one final proposal, it will go on to the NTIA. And then there's some time built in for the NTIA itself to assess the proposal in advance of the expiration of the contract with ICANN, which occurs in September of 2015. So that's a brief overview of the time line. Again, I'm happy to go into more details in the question and answer session.

I think that's all I had. We can look at the next slides.

There's just some references. I think these slides are posted or will be posted on -- for the audience here. Feel free to go and take a look at our documents. And there's a lot more detail there.

And at this point, I think I will turn it over to Milton.

MILTON MUELLER:

Hello, everybody. I'm Milton Mueller. I was put onto the IANA Stewardship Coordination Group by the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group. And I'm specifically addressing the names part of the process.

So as you know, the emphasis here is on the proposals developed by the operational communities. And the GAC has placed someone, Elise, and possibly some others, onto this Cross Community Working Group. So you should know pretty much how that works. And Elise should be able to update you.

I want to emphasize one main point, and possibly two if I have time. The thing I want to emphasize is that this process is different. I don't want you to get into the mindset that this is like a typical ICANN policy development process, because it's not. This is not driven by ICANN's bylaws. This is not a situation where GAC offers advice to the board in the same way that they do through the bylaws.

What's happening here is that the action will be in these operational communities, and so the most important way to influence the outcome is by participating in that process.

Remember that GAC advice pertains to the board, and the board is not making a decision here about what is the proposal. The Cross Community Working Group is. And then they're submitting it to us. And we are simply vetting it to see if certain requirements are met. And then it goes to the Department of Commerce.

It's agreed that the ICANN board will not intervene in that process in the sense that it will modify the proposals. So, again, the emphasis here

is that GAC advice to the board would be kind of a fifth wheel in this process. You want to give advice and participation to the Cross Community Working Group.

The other complicated thing here which I'll just address briefly as flag, and, hopefully, we can ask questions about it, is the coordination with the other accountability process of ICANN. That will be interesting. It's -- We don't know how to describe how that's going to happen because we don't know what the proposals are going to be on either one of these processes. So I would just say if you're concerned about ICANN accountability, you have to look carefully at how what happens at the IANA level relates to what happens to the broader accountability process and pay careful attention to that and to the timing.

MARTIN BOYLE:

Thanks very much. My name is Martin Boyle. I am one of four represents on the ICG appointed by the ccNSO. I'm from dot UK.

I think we're now at the stage where the ICG has done a lot of preparatory work and the discussion has been very heavily about process. And the really important thing now is that we're moving into looking at the proposals. And so I'm actually very pleased that the GAC has nominated people to sit on the Cross Community Working Group as members, but that also a fair number of governments are also signing up as participants and will therefore be able to engage in the discussion. I think this is really going to be very important. Because as that process goes on, we need to see the processes, we need to see the discussion understanding the views, the points of views, of the different

stakeholder groups. And that include governments. We need to understand where you see concerns, where you think that measures need to be reinforced. And that needs to come in as early as possible in that process.

I would also flag that in the request for proposals that the ICG issued in September, we do ask for oversight and accountability to be summarized as it is at the moment, and what the community and the discussion are -- starts to see as being part of their proposal to go in. And therefore there really does have to be quite a good, strong link between the work of the ICG, the work of the Cross Community Working Group, and the general discussion of ICANN accountability. The other point I'd like to make is about outreach.

Certainly from the CC community, there is a number of ccTLDs that do not participate in ICANN at all. The ccNSO has identified the operators of those ccTLDs and has mailed to them, and there is a mailing list. But I think for governments, I think governments do have a very useful role here in widening the discussion in their countries and making sure that stakeholders in their countries are involved. And from the CC side, I put my hand up and welcome you being able to engage with CCs who are easier not actively involved in the process.

Thank you.

JARI ARKKO:

My name is Jari Arkko. I'm the chair of the IETF, here to talk about -- or give you an update about how we're doing the IANA transition from the

IETF position. I also wanted to introduce Russ, who is sitting next to me, chair of the IAB.

If you can scan to the next slide.

Actually, one after that, even.

Hmm. Slides -- yeah, there we go. Excellent.

So I just wanted to start by explaining a little bit who we are and what do -- how do we do that, because that's important in terms of how you can participate in any discussion in our process, including the IANA one. So the IETF, of course, is an independent standards organization focused on core Internet technologies, TCP/IP, e-mail, the Web, and so forth. And our broad mission is to make the Internet work better. We're a technology organization.

We're an open organization, so anyone can participate. Much of the work is actually done over the Net. We have a couple of meetings per year as well. But the official part of the work actually happens over the Net. So all you need to do to participate in any discussion is join the mailing list.

Decisions are based on community rough consensus. And the participation is on an individual basis, so it's more humans participating than organization, such as companies or other -- other types of organizations.

Next slide, please.

And, of course, most of our work is technical. We do our technical development. But we do need a registry component, we need a registry of what we call protocol parameters. One example of that is port numbers, as an example, 8 -- the Web, HTTP's port 80. E-mail is port 25. And so forth. And the role of IANA for us is to maintain these numbers. There's actually a separation of roles or duties for different organizations. So it is the role of the IETF community to make decisions -- the policy decisions about what allocations are made or on what basis allocations can be done. In a lot of cases, the allocations are simply first come, first served, and it's like an infinite space.

And then IANA's role is to implement that registry, to map -- to provide a database of what numbers have been allocated, and to act as an interface for people who want to make some of those allocations to go through them.

And then IAB that Russ is heading has an oversight role.

Next slide, please. And a little bit more detail. First of all, there's an agreement between IETF and ICANN or IANA about performing these registry services for us. And that agreement specifies the roles. And I know everyone is talking quite a lot about accountability around this process in ICANN. I wanted to provide my point of view on that aspect for how do we -- we, at the IETF, think about that.

And accountability, I at least think about that in terms of something that relates to a particular topic. And it's not something that you can think about only in the abstract. So what is it that you're worried about? What kind of problems are you thinking of? And if I think about types of problems that we can run into for IANA services, there could be some issues within the IETF policy (indiscernible) process, for instance. And those are subject to, you know, long-term IETF processes that we've developed and that they include things like appeals, if an error has been made, you can make an appeal. There's a NomCom process that can replace IETF leadership. There's a recall procedure in case the leaders have misbehaved in some fashion, and so on and so forth. So we feel that aspect of it is fairly well covered.

There can also be problems between IETF and IANA in terms of the IANA service function. And those are generally subject to the processes defined in the agreement.

In practice, there's a lot of back and forth. We discuss daily about things like this request is not clear, can we clarify that? And those get resolved. If there's any bigger issues, they'll get -- those can get escalated further up the management chain.

Ultimately, the contracts have a clause for termination after six months' waiting period. I don't think we ever need to exercise that option. Things are running very smoothly. But that option does exist.

And there hasn't been, really, any serious issues there between the two organizations. We're, indeed, quite happy. Most of the serious issues,

we've had some, you know, big discussions about whether to allocate some numbers or not. Those are taken within the IETF process and have been dealt with satisfactorily, I think.

So overall, there's been -- this model has worked well for us for a number of years. And we keep making improvements every year. One of the things that we added this year, actually, is an audit, where at the end of the year, IANA will perform an audit or an external entity will perform an audit that determines whether policies were followed as expected. And then this audit is not just available to us, the IETF leadership, but to everyone in the whole world, so we can all be assured that things are running well. And, indeed, the U.S. government is not involved in this process at all from our perspective.

Next slide, please.

How do we deal with the IANA transition? This is like how do we do it today and how do we do it going forward?

We've started a working group to develop a plan called the IANA plan working group. Mark Blanchet, who is the chair of the working group, who is actually standing in the back here in the room. Please talk to him if you want to get involved in the discussions.

We have a draft plan that is being discussed -- it's about two months old by now and has gone through a couple different revisions -- that we keep revising. It's not done by any means. But we keep discussing and developing it.

Now, the IETF community, as we were bringing up this effort, they were very clear about some things. In particular, they wanted the transition to stay with the current operational model, which to us means that there shall be no changed roles of organizations, and we do not believe we need a new organization to deal with any of these aspects. It's -- it's a matter of the existing oversight organizations, IAB, and then the agreements, IETF and ICANN, to deal with this, not to say that no improvements can be made and not to say that there is no work for us to do in the transition. There's quite a lot work and improvements that we can and should make. But the fundamentals have been very clear in the IETF community's mind, at least.

Next slide. I'll leave that as a call for you or anyone in this room to provide as feedback and participate in the process. Again, the IETF is an open entity. Anyone can participate. So if you or your colleagues back in the office are interested and care about what we do, please join. There's a mailing list. There are documents. If you want to participate at the IETF, you should probably read the last item here, the TAO, which explains a little bit of background on how to participate in the IETF.

So I think I'll leave it at that.

Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Adiel, did you have a few words to say about numbers?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yes. Thank you, Alissa.

And thank you as well to the GAC for the opportunity.

I will just give a brief on what we are doing from the number community point of view. As you know, we are one of the identifier operational community that have to submit a proposal to the ICG. So I will give you a very brief update on what we are doing as RIR.

The approach we have taken is a little bit (indiscernible) from a global policy development process whereby each original registry work on the proposal in their region and with their regional community. And at the end, we will consolidate the proposal that will come from those discussions into a single one that will be submitted to the ICG.

We are working as well to have a community-driven team to consolidate -- to consolidate our proposal. And the detail about that team will be published soon.

There is a Web page on the NRO Web site that gives much detail about our process.

So the various RIR have their own process. APNIC has a mailing list where discussion is happening, a dedicated page on their Web site. And they have discussed during their last policy development meeting a strawman proposal that was submitted to their community. And that

proposal is what is under discussion now. The same proposal will probably be shared with other RIRs as well.

ARIN had their meeting last week, where they also discussed this. That resulted to a survey where they are going to collect input from their community, and then based on that input, come up with a draft proposal. They also have a mailing list where discussion is happening.

Same thing for LACNIC and AfriNIC. We both have a mailing list where community are discussing this process. What is interesting here is that it allows us as RIR and the NRO to have a perspective from different region. But, again, at the end, it's request some work to consolidate all those proposals into a single one that will be submitted to the ICG.

The RIPE NCC had -- they have a cooperation working group. And they are developing their proposal through their cooperation working group. The discussion kick off in May last year, and they are continuing to do this discussion online and through their different meeting -- original meeting with their community.

For us at AfriNIC, although we have had our first consultation during our 20th meeting in Djibouti, we are also expecting to have another roundtable during this process in AfriNIC 21 in Mauritius. And we had some brief discussion on our mailing list. But we expect to have more substance about this during the roundtable that is being planned next month.

So one other thing that we are adjusting now is, as you know, the ICG has just published the time line for submission. We are now readjusting our own time line that is published on the NRO Web site to the time line of the ICG. I talk about the team that will be set up, cross-RIR team. We are call it a CRISP team. That will consolidate the proposal that will come out from the five original discussion. And the idea now is to have a team of 15 member, three from each RIR, two from the community, and one from each RIR staff. It will be an open process. They will have a different round of consultation in order to consolidate this.

So that is roughly what we are doing as RIR.

The page that we have created on the NRO Web site, which is NRO.net, will be regularly updated with the progress that is happening at the different regional discussion level. And the final proposal will be published there as well.

So our suggestion and request to the GAC member is their engagement and participation at the regional level to these discussion and these consultation on the numbers side so that we ensure that what will come out from that will have the input from the government side as well.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Many thanks for those presentations. Very informative to the various processes underway to develop the process for the ICG to coordinate. Are there any comments or questions at this point in the GAC?

U.K., please.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thank you, Chair. And thank you, everybody, who has participated and contributed.

Is this working?

>> This one.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thanks. Okay. We're on.

Thanks to everybody, Alissa, and all the team and all the representatives, for their contributions this morning. It's very informative and very reassuring that so much is happening. And it's good for the GAC and the community to be kept informed at every point.

I just had a quick question, actually, for Jari as regards the IETF. I may have missed it. Is there a dedicated session on transition during your upcoming meeting? And would that be -- if you could provide details of that, if that's the case. And will there be transcripts and papers that we can all check into?

Thanks.

JARI ARKKO:

Right. Thank you. We have an upcoming meeting at the early November time frame. And we do have a session in that meeting on -- of the IANA plan working group. And, generally speaking, all of our sessions are -- you can follow them remotely. And there will be minutes published afterwards, and some realtime transcribing, or some cyber scribing perhaps or instant message scribing. I want to emphasize that much of the work happens on mailing lists. So that's where the real discussion is. So you don't have to wait for a meeting. It's happening as we speak.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you.

Are there any other questions or comments that colleagues have on any of the material?

None. Okay. Just to note that with the Cross Community Working Group, as you noted, Milton, we do have participation in that. I was just going to let you know that the other GAC participant is from Thailand, so we have Norway and Thailand participating there. And as was pointed out, we have individual governments as well that are signing up to be participants in that and contribute to that process. And I think that will be the primary focus for the GAC over the next few weeks to contribute to that effort and get it moving along.

So that's the Cross Community Working Group on the domain name function.

Did I see a hand? No. Oh, Iran. Yes, please.

IRAN:

Thank you. In fact, my comment was exactly on the same point that you raised, or you mentioned.

The activities of our distinguished friends from Norway and Thailand in that group which is called Cross Community Working Group, which is different from another Cross Community Working Group, same name, but specifically dealing with names, they act more or less as a liaison to inform and alert and encourage and mobilize GAC to participate in the process.

So the ball now is in the camp of governments, based on whatever they receive from these people and whatever they receive from any other source, actively participate in the process. Otherwise, these two members and liaison would not prepare anything, and there would be no opportunity for GAC as a whole here to propose something in the name of GAC as such.

This is the government to the national multistakeholder arrangement, if they have -- hopefully, many have -- perhaps to be encouraged, to be encouraged to go and do that and provide the information. If there is no sufficient information in that cross-community group dealing with names, therefore we remain limited to whatever we receive.

So this is something that should, madam, appear in our communique, that government are perhaps not only invited, urged to actively

participate to this process in general, and in particular the naming process, which is part of the GAC process. It doesn't mean that you don't activate in the process of numbers and the process of protocols. Yes, they should be also. But names is the heart of the process, and that should be something that we need to alert and we need to mention that without that, we would not have -- this is something.

Another important thing that I would like to mention, with the permission of Alissa, that when we have these time lines for the activities of ICG, we did not have any clear idea about the process of accountability. And even today, we have just a sign of that. We know that one of the track of this group, which is called another Cross Community Working Group, dealing with accountability in relation with the transition of stewardship. How the results of that activity will be injected to the ICG, and how will be reflected, that is something yet to be discussed.

Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you very much. I completely agree, and I just wanted to build on a couple of things that you said, Kavous.

I think, if this hasn't been emphasized enough, but the work is in process. And as he said, the final proposal will reflect the ideas of people who contribute ideas.

So if there's an issue that is very important to you or to your government back at home, the way to have that reflected in the final proposal is to go to the names Cross-Community Working Group or to the other operational communities, send them your words. Write down the piece of the proposal that you think should exist in the end.

If the ICG receives a proposal from the names community working group, one from the IETF, one from the RIRs, and then we receive later some input from other constituencies, the ICG is not going to go through the task of trying to consolidate those or determine if they can work together, because that's not our role in our little group of 32.

That is the role of the communities and that development needs to happen with the broad global community and not just with our small group.

And so it's imperative that the aspects of the transition that you think need to be addressed be directed to those community processes, including the names community process.

And, yes, I agree, the ICG itself is meeting on Friday, and we will be discussing further how we can coordinate and remain informed about the accountability process. A lot of that is to be determined.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you for that. And certainly with outreach, I hope the GAC can perhaps take some inspiration from the approach taken by the ccNSO to maybe try to engage a broader set of governments that are currently

members in the GAC in order to get maximum contributions coming forward from really anywhere and anyone that's interested in participating that way.

I don't see any other requests to speak.

Comments? Questions?

All right. Is there anything that members of the ICG up here would like to add, like to raise?

Okay. All right.

And you're right to point that out, Alissa, that we've got a large -- 32, I think you said -- a largish group, and most are here already and there will be a community session tomorrow, and the ICG will meet all day Friday.

So colleagues from the ICG are mostly here now, if not entirely, and you can talk to them and raise issues with them in the corridor if that is of interest to you.

So with that, I will thank you all kindly for coming and we look forward to working as a GAC on the -- within the Cross-Community Working Group and doing our part there to move that work along, and we look forward to further progress with the ICG and the proposal.

Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: So I have a question for the GAC. We're running a bit behind in the sense that we haven't had a coffee break. So we can either have a 30-minute break now and then come back and continue with our agenda, and we'll try to squeeze it a little so that we're still breaking at around the same time for lunch. Or we can just keep going.

I can see some reaction to -- yes, to a break.

All right. So let's take 30 minutes, and then we'll come back and continue with our agenda.

We can do that when we come back from the break. Yeah.

[Coffee break]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]