
SINGAPORE – GAC Plenary 12
Tuesday, March 25th 2014 – 11:00 to 12:00
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Okay. So let's continue with our meetings. Welcome back from the break, everyone. So a few things to take care of, some GAC business and some scheduling issues.

So regarding what I propose to do next. We did have one hour set aside to have an introductory discussion about the Framework of Interpretation Working Group work, and apparently we only need about ten minutes. So the lead, Frank March, from New Zealand is going to take us through a bit of an introduction, and then we will be speaking about this topic with the Country Code Name Supporting Organization. They're running the working group. They're leading on this issue.

And since we have lost a bit of time, I wanted to propose that we then move, after ten minutes, into the briefing on the high-level meeting from the U.K., and that will give us an opportunity to have that discussion and perhaps finish our morning a bit earlier.

Also, we had planned to discuss WHOIS this morning. So what I wanted to do is ask what is the level of interest in rescheduling a discussion on this issue or to ask colleagues how they would like to deal with that. And if there is interest in having a session on the topic of WHOIS, then we will look at the schedule and try to identify some time for that.

So just to recap, for the next ten minutes I am proposing that we have a brief introduction from New Zealand on the Framework of

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.

Interpretation Working Group work; then we move into discussion of the high-level meeting is that planned for the June ICANN meetings, to be hosted by the U.K. with the GAC; and then on WHOIS. I would now like to see what is the level of interest in rescheduling a session on WHOIS.

So European Commission, please.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thank you, Madam Chair. The European Commission, given the stake we have in privacy in the EU, we would like to discuss it perhaps for 15 minutes. I don't think we need a full debrief. Mainly come up with the main points or main concerns that might be dealt with at the later stage. But just to flag some issues. Nothing very deep or (indiscernible).

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you. Okay. So it sounds like we might be able to cover that off before we break for lunch. Let's see how we do for time.

Okay.

All right. So also on the topic of organizational matters, just a reminder to colleagues that there are some issues that are being worked on outside of plenary, and we will regroup on Wednesday morning in the session called communique overview. And this is where I hope we will have some sort of solution or text wording on several matters. So the issue of dot spa is one of those that are being looked at, as well the issue of whether the GAC would provide any further comment or advice



on the Red Cross/Red Crescent. So I hope that those efforts continue to be under way. And again, Wednesday morning is an opportunity for us to come back and report to the GAC. And I just want to be clear that the expectation is that we are resolving things in the corridors so that when we come back to sum up the status of where we are on the issues in front of us this week, that we have things resolved. And this will make our communicate finalization effort much smoother. It will also make it much easier for us to identify next steps for planning purposes for the GAC. So a reminder to you there.

We will also be confirming the terms of reference for the stakeholder engagement -- well, engagement with governments and IGOs working group and taking care of this kind of business Wednesday morning. So keep that in mind.

And one announcement. It is a pleasure to introduce someone new to the GAC meetings. We have Professor Tim Unwin the, Secretary-General of the Commonwealth Telecommunications Organization. And let's see if I can see whether Dr. Unwin -- There he is, yes. If you can please find a seat in the center of the room, you would be very welcome to join us.

Thank you, everyone. And thank you, everyone, for making Professor Unwin welcome.

Okay.

So let's then move to the Framework of Interpretation Working Group. And New Zealand, if you can take us through that, please.

Thank you.



NEW ZEALAND:

Thank you, Heather. I think maybe even ten minutes will be more than we really need, but I'd like to just bring GAC members up-to-date with where this is at. And if I could just go back a little bit and remind members of the GAC exactly where this came from.

There was a review conducted by the ccNSO of decisions and processes and procedures conducted by IANA since the inception of ICANN about redelegation of country code domain names. What they discovered was that there were inconsistencies, there were ambiguities in the policies. Sometimes IANA had processes falling outside the policies against their own directions and precedents. And, therefore, the ccNSO concluded that the best thing to do was to work its way through the documents that pertain to this. There are two. There's RFC 1591 and there is the GAC statement of principles under delegation of ccTLDs.

Those are the only two documents that are relevant, and the plan was to provide depth and color to the text there so that existing policies were properly documented. And let me emphasize existing policies. There was no intention to create new policy.

But it was recognized that coming out of this process, there might well be recognized gaps and inconsistencies and issues which would need to be addressed, perhaps, by the GAC in terms of its own processes and procedures and policies. And certainly perhaps by IANA.

Now, that working group has worked now for two years. I have taken part in a number of meetings, not all of them by any means. Suzanne Radell is the other person who is working with that group from the GAC.



I can tell you that the meetings were long, tedious, fine-grained discussions around the delicate nuances of the English language, and that the group has reached finality.

Now, there are five -- sorry, four chapters to its report. The first one on consent was, I think, about 18 months ago provided to the GAC for comment. There were some comments made on that. I can tell you the comments came mainly from the United States and from Australia. And the result of that was some clarification around -- principally around, and this goes, actually, right through the document, the role of governments, clarifying the role of governments in terms of their part in delegation/redelegation procedures. There was a response to that and an amendment to that chapter of the report as a consequence.

The next one was significantly interested parties. And once again, comments from the U.S. and Australia, and not from anybody else. And a comment was sent to -- back to the working group which has yet to respond to those specific points. So that is an outstanding issue. Some clarification required there. And then finally, and I circulated this to the GAC list on the 4th of March, a report on revocation and redelegation issues. And again, the only comments I have received on that have come -- actually from Australia in this case.

Now, I can tell you -- the fourth part of it is definitions. The working group very sensibly decided it would leave definitions until the other work had been done, because trying to deal with definitions in advance of understanding what the application of various terminology might be proved to be too difficult. So they're still finalizing definitions, but I think that's relatively noncontroversial.



So I can tell you that there was, as a result of the comments from Australia, a fairly vigorous took place between the co-chairs of the working group, which is Keith Davidson of New Zealand and Becky Burr of NeuStar and the U.S. And I think it cleared the air of a number of concerns that Australia very properly had about the way the reports have been put together. I have had no other comments from anybody else. I don't propose to go through the detail of what was discussed, but the way forward is, and I ask your indulgence in terms of trying to accommodate what we want to do here, for various reasons the working group -- or at least the ccNSO -- does not want to put up a policy paper to the board because that would open a public discussion -- public policy development process which would take a long, long time and involve a great number of issues which really go outside the concerned community, which is the GAC and the ccNSO.

If a joint proposal goes up from the GAC and the ccNSO, then that process is unnecessary. It can simply go straight through.

From the point of view of the GAC, the -- I think the GAC has not given sufficient attention to these papers. We have been very busy. There are lots of things on our plates. It's been impossible for everybody to look at these papers and give them due attention.

I will be discussing with Keith Davidson how we can put together a paper that GAC members will be able to read, comment on, in a constructive way with the aim of taking a joint report forward from the London meeting.

So that's where we are get to.



There will be, I think, some gaps in existing policy identified. And that could well be useful if we -- my suggestion has been that we could be looking at a development of a best practices document, for example, for dealing with cases where governments are simply uncertain as to how to deal with their local ccTLD.

I think there are plenty of precedent out there about how misunderstandings or dealings could be dealt with, and we could produce guidelines as one possibility. But that I leave for future work and future possibilities. So, with your indulgence, I would suggest that, between now and London, a paper will be circulated to GAC members. I would ask you to read that carefully, give it due weight and consideration, consider whether, from your government's point of view, this is an adequate interpretation and explanation of existing policy. Let me emphasize existing policy. It is not supposed to create new policy. And, if we can join with the ccNSO in putting this jointly forward to the board, the ccNSO also has to go out to its own members and seek comment, yeah? So there's still some refinement which is necessary on that side.

But they are working to a fairly tight deadline in terms of their aim to get this polished off.

So I don't know if United States and Australia want to add to those comments. I'll leave it there. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, New Zealand. So I have a few questions. We do have a paper included with our meeting materials that's a summary paper. Are



you suggesting that there's going to be a new paper that is circulated after the meetings?

NEW ZEALAND: The paper that's there deals with the revocation and redelegation issues, and it stands alongside the other papers that have been put forward.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Okay. So there will be more papers. For the GAC in your materials, the summary paper, as New Zealand points out, covers redelegation and revocation. And those have been translated into the U.N. six languages plus Portuguese. So those will be available to you in all the languages you need. And then there will be a paper to help focus us in as we prepare for London when it's expected that we would want to conclude on these points. Is that correct?

NEW ZEALAND: Yes. That's my suggestion as a way forward. Given that we're on a tight timeline, at this meeting I don't believe that we have time go back and look at what's gone before. And I think that GAC members need to have the time to read through the whole context of this area in order to make useful comments and, hopefully, agree to what's been looked through by the working group.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you. Since we will be meeting with the country code name supporting organization, how do you intend to use that opportunity?



Will we be discussing the contents of the report or -- this is the main agenda item for our exchange with them?

NEW ZEALAND: Yeah. I think we can take a look at that paper that's been circulated. The only comments I've received on it are from Australia. But we can go through that paper and make sure people are comfortable with it and perhaps use the time available to discuss a helpful way forward along the lines I've suggested.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you. Okay. So we will discuss redelegation and revocation in particular when we meet with the ccNSO. And you have a paper as part of your meeting materials on the topic that has been prepared for the GAC. Okay. So was it Sweden that was requesting. And then I have United States, then Denmark.

SWEDEN: Thank you. Thank you, Frank, and Suzanne as well for doing this job and Peter for commenting as well. I'd just like to ask, Frank, when you're presenting this paper, if it would be possible for you to direct our attention to the contentious issues or the issues where there have been comments or where there have been debate in the working group? I don't want to put stone on your burden already, but just want to know if that will be easy or difficult for you. Thanks.



NEW ZEALAND: I think that the particular -- I think that would be better that Peter actually go through the issues here. Because that would then be -- save my interpretation of his interpretation of the interpretation of the working group. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, New Zealand, for volunteering Australia to answer the question from Sweden. Okay.

Up next we have the United States, please.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you, Frank, for your very helpful overview. I guess I just wanted to chime in and recall that their initiative, that when they began this project, the ccNSO FOI working group made it clear that they intended to sort of attack the issues chapter by chapter like on a serial basis. And we were doing the same thing. So we did submit individual comments. To my knowledge -- and Frank can correct me, if I'm wrong -- I don't believe we've had a response as yet from the FOI working group to our previous comments, which I don't view as a problem at all. Because I think they wanted to be sensitive to their understanding that the GAC also wanted to look at things chapter by chapter. And then, once all of the chapters were done, we would take a step back and kind of do a comprehensive overview. So, if I've understood Frank correctly -- and I do concur with him -- it's -- this very recent chapter is also an important one. They're all equally important, and they really require our attention. And we may have to agree to a certain amount of intersessional focus on this to



be prepared for the intention by the ccNSO to finalize their recommendations to the board for the June meeting. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, United States.

And this makes it very clear that this is a priority for us before London. And we can plan accordingly, in light of that. Okay. Denmark, you're next, please.

DENMARK:

Thank you, Madam Chair. And thanks to New Zealand for presenting this paper for us today. I apologize that we didn't send our comments on the GAC list. We have prepared them for this discussion today. And -- but I think, in fact, that we very much agree with just the Australian comments that we need to have more focus on the GAC principles and add them to the recommendations.

Another thing that we think that might be worth discussing with the ccNSO is how we take this -- these papers forward to the board and how do we also discuss how IANA should actually respond to these papers. So I don't know if colleagues could agree that this would be something we could talk to the CCs about today. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Denmark. So not only will we discuss some substance in relation to redelegation and revocation, but also there needs to be clarity about the process for finalizing the GAC's views or contribution



and the treatment of the report itself that would come from the ccNSO and the GAC, I believe. Okay.

So are there any final comments or questions before we move in the agenda? No. Okay.

All right. So we look forward to our exchange with the ccNSO. And we already have, I think, a sense of what we're going to talk about and what we need to ask them in that discussion. Okay.

So, next, let's move to a discussion of the high-level meeting. And our colleague from the U.K., Sarah Taylor, is here to update us on that process. And I'm sure that the GAC may have questions or comments to raise on this matter. So, as a reminder, one of the accountability and transparency review team recommendations from the first review team and now the second refers to having high-level meetings as a way to increase awareness of this committee and ICANN and the important work that we do here. And so this is going to be in that capacity that we will have a high-level meeting kindly hosted by our U.K. colleagues in London in June this year. So over to you, please, U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Thank you very much, chair. And thank you very much, GAC colleagues, for making me feel very welcome at my first meeting. I know Mark Carvell is very sorry not to be able to be here. I hope I won't let him down. I know he's watching on one of these remote panels from somewhere in London. And then he'll be very much able to join us back in the GAC in London, as I hope we'll see all of you there. I very much welcome this opportunity to consult you on our plans for the high-level



pre-meeting in London. As you know, our ministry is very keen that we were able to host the second high-level governmental meeting. The timing we think is incredibly prescient with the number of developments that have happened recently over the last couple of months. So on the 23rd of June, which will be the first day of ICANN 50 in London, we hope, after the opening ceremony, we'll be able to move into the high-level governmental meeting probably starting at around 11:00.

There will be lunch and then a further discussion followed by a reception. So that's just sort of the practical logistics of the day.

At the moment, our thinking is we would like to focus on two strategic themes for the discussion for the governmental meeting. And we think that the first of those themes might be around ICANN's role in the evolving Internet ecosystem. And we think that that is an opportunity for our ministers and very senior officials to reflect both on the outcomes on Sao Paulo. We've seen President Ilves's report at that time, as well as we hope we'll have some outcome from the CSTD working group on enhanced cooperation as well. So there will be opportunities, I think, to take stock at the senior level of these really important developments. And we all work very hard, I know, to keep our ministers abreast of these issues as they happen. But, actually, there's no substitute for them hearing themselves from the people directly involved and having an opportunity to engage with each other and with those parties in these discussions. So I hope that that's a good opportunity for them. And we hope that we will be able to attract, obviously, very senior representation from the ICANN board to come



and talk about IANA directly with our ministers but also from the Ilves's panel as well to talk about the work that they've been doing.

And the second theme that we're keen to elaborate on in the governmental meeting is enhancing the role of governments in the ICANN model and the next phase for the GAC. We're very keen, as Heather said, and very mindful of the commitment to use this as an opportunity to outreach to those governments who don't -- haven't yet joined the GAC. We need to make new efforts to persuade them of the value of this group. It's an opportunity for our ministers to acknowledge the achievements of the GAC and reflect on the very good work that has been happening here and the efforts that we -- that all of you -- not me so much. Mark, mostly -- make in relation to the contribution to ICANN and how valuable that is.

I'll be interested to hear your feedback. We've got some time now to have that discussion. I'm also around for the next few days. Unfortunately, I have to leave tomorrow. But my colleague Thomas has very kindly also offered to convene a further session on Thursday to continue talking and planning around the meeting, if there's a feeling that there's a need for that. So I welcome your views.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you very much, U.K.

So are there any comments that colleagues have or questions around the meeting in preparations that you would like to raise with the U.K. or for other colleagues here? Italy, please.



ITALY:

Thank you, Chair. So this will be the second meeting. And I think that you will take the also evaluation, the result of the first one in order to have I would say a better meeting in the sense that we have to improve this line of high-level meetings within ICANN.

So the point that you say -- do we calling this ministerial or simply high-level? Because you mentioned several times ministers. And then it is also important do U.K. government intends to make some organization even involving the diplomatic channels? Or is simply something internal to the GAC? And then it is on initiative of the states to decide and to sensitize which is the appropriate level, possibly ministers, but things like that.

So these are the kind of things that I would like to ask. And also there is an intention to prepare an agenda. Because I think that -- and then perhaps, in order to get ministers, there should be some connected event that attracts people to come over not only for participating to have the event inside ICANN. Thank you.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Thank you very much. So I think, in order to try to take all your questions, of course we're very keen to learn from the colleagues in Canada who hosted the previous high-level meeting. I was having a conversation with Heather this morning about how we can make sure that we build on that success and we continue to use this as an opportunity to enhance, as I say, enhance the role of the GAC and awareness of GAC and of governments in the ICANN process.



Will it be ministerial? Yes. Absolutely. And my minister, Ed Vaizey, will be writing, I hope, to all of your ministers shortly and also through the diplomatic channels. So we're very ambitious to get as many ministers as we can to attend that meeting, and we'll be writing directly to try to achieve that.

In terms of the agenda, absolutely, we're keen to try to keep it focused. We want to really engage ministers in this really important period that we're in at the moment and make sure that they come away feeling that they are much better informed about where the process is. They've had an opportunity to engage with each other on those issues and engage directly and influence directly those people who are operating in the space at the moment.

And I agree with you that it's always useful to -- if we can combine events so that we -- our ministers' time is very valuable. And we need to try to make the best use of that time. And I'm very happy to get back to you on thoughts on that.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you very much. So I have Paraguay and Portugal.

PARAGUAY:

Thank you, Madam Chair. I was going to ask the same thing my colleague from Italy asked. But, more specifically, I would like to know the procedure of inviting ministers. Is it going to be directly to the ministers of foreign affairs or directly to the ICT ministers or what is the procedure? Thank you.



UNITED KINGDOM: I'm very happy to take your advice on the best way to reach your ministers. And please feel free to contact me directly or Mark with your advice. We also need your help to contact them. But our minister's intention is to write directly to his counterparts in each of your countries. And that's what he'll be doing over the next few weeks.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Many thanks. Okay. So next I have Portugal, then the United States and Canada with questions and Iran. Portugal, please.

PORTUGAL: Thank you very much. Well, my question is more or less the same of the previous ones. But my point is that in the past, for instance, I sent the name of my minister. But to them the invitation was not sent to the right minister. Because I don't know why, but you guys sent it to the right minister. So I would like to ensure that this invitation goes to the right minister. So I would like to know whether you -- you are going to ask to the GAC delegates to which minister this letter should be sent. Thank you.

UNITED KINGDOM: Absolutely. As I said earlier, we're very much asking for your help to make this work. I suggest that after this meeting we send a formal message to all of you and ask you to advise us on the correct contact in your ministries. And please do -- we have our internal list. But, as the



Brazilian ambassador was saying earlier, it's always difficult to make sure that we get it right. So your advice and support is really valued.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you very much. And, of course, for those that are represented in the GAC, this is the part of government responsible for ICANN, I think as we see it. So the GAC may well be able to help you with that exercise. Okay. So next I have the United States, please.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Madam Chair. And thank you to Sarah for giving us this overview.

Just wanted to sort of stress to you that we are very, very pleased to express our strong support for the GAC high-level meeting in June and very grateful that the Minister Vaizey has offered to host that.

As many colleagues have already expressed around the room, we share the sentiments that 2014 is a very, very intense year. It's almost a watershed year for all of us. We think that this is a very helpful meeting, certainly following on to our last high-level meeting in Toronto all the progress that GAC has made and ICANN has made devoting most of 2013 to new gTLD matters. We now have this meeting, the NETmundial coming up. And after the June meeting, there is the IGF, of course, that Turkey is hosting. So it's a very, very intense year and one that we welcome collaborating with colleagues.

We really do think the high-level meeting can and should enforce the value of government participation in ICANN both to governments



themselves and, hopefully, to the broader ICANN community. I think we see ourselves as very constructive partners inside this community and hope to reinforce that.

The role of the GAC within ICANN has, of course, been under consideration for many, many years. It's, I think, noteworthy that both of ICANN's accountability and transparency review team reports have highlighted the importance of improving the role of the GAC, particularly in terms of the earlier engagement of the GAC in ICANN's policy processes. So we are meant to be -- and I think we see ourselves as the source of public policy advice. So it's critical that we find better ways. I think we're very grateful at the progress that has been made between the GAC and the GNSO to date. And I think we all need to -- again, we have so much on our plates, but that's a pretty critical initiative from our perspective. Advancing work on these issues is one we believe is a shared goal among GAC colleagues. And we hope that, by focusing on the -- this work in June at the high-level meeting, we can surface just how complex the workload is for the GAC in our national governments and among and between governments. Because I think it broadening the appreciation of the resources that are required to do our jobs effectively. We think that's going to be extremely helpful. We certainly hope so.

So we also look to the high-level meeting as a platform for GAC members to confirm at the highest possible government levels their national commitments to active participation in the GAC and to ICANN.

We also appreciate your statement of support for broadening participation in the GAC for members that we do not yet have. And



certainly endorse that. And just as a -- I guess a little bit of a heads up to you, I don't believe you were in the room on Sunday. So I wasn't trying to steal your thunder. But we had the opportunity with the Board/GAC recommendation implementation working group -- I know these are new acronyms for you, Sarah, so my apologies. We did highlight because they will continue to work with us on implementing completing ATRT1 and now implementing ATRT2. And I flagged the issue of perhaps the GAC might want to ask for additional support, funding travel support for participation in the high-level meeting. If we are having ministers or very senior people come, surely we also want to facilitate the support for their staff and their GAC members to also come. And, if I recall, it was our board vice chair of that group Bill Graham who suggested that we put this in the communique. So I didn't want us to lose sight of that as a statement that we make it very clear, hopefully with your agreement as the host, that we might need to ask for additional funding support. Thank you very much.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Thank you very much. And, absolutely, I think, as you rightly said, this is an opportunity to ask our governments to confirm their ongoing support for the work that you all do. It's a huge amount of effort I know for you all to coordinate input from your own stakeholders organizations and also from right across governments. You have many different departments who have interest in the discussions that take place here. And an ongoing commitment to support your really important work is vital to ensuring that the GAC continues to be successful and continues to grow and develop.



And, if it's the view of the GAC that we should be asking for additional support, then that sounds to me like a very helpful way that we can ensure that we're getting as much participation in the high-level meeting and in the GAC itself in London as well, because these very important discussions, of course, will continue throughout ICANN 50 as well as the high-level meeting. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you. So next I have Canada, then Iran, Indonesia, Egypt, New Zealand, Japan, and Germany and Switzerland, and Trinidad and Tobago. And then we'll have to close the list so that Sarah comes back to another GAC meeting in the future. That's quite a lot of questions. All right. Canada next, please.

CANADA:

Thank you, Chair. And thank you, Sarah, for joining us today. We'd like to congratulate the U.K. on its initiative to host a high-level meeting as part of ICANN's 50th meeting in London this year and to extend our support. The associate deputy Minister of Industry Canada, Ms. Marta Morgan, intends to participate in the high-level meeting, schedule permitting. Some of you remember her from having chaired the Toronto high-level meeting in October of 2012. We're generally supportive of the direction that you've taken with respect to the agenda. From our perspective, desirable outcomes of the high-level meeting include reinforcing the role of the GAC at ICANN, as my U.S. colleague has mentioned. And, in this regard, I think it will be important to anchor the high-level meeting in the GAC and to work closely with the GAC throughout the preparation process.



We welcome your efforts to pursue an inclusive meeting. I think that, given the U.K.'s central location, you're well-positioned to attract participation from developing countries and to pursue an inclusive exchange among governments and with ICANN's leadership in other parts of the community. And, finally, we think that the high-level meeting should facilitate a constructive exchange that advances broader Internet principles. And we look forward to building on shared objectives to ensure that the London high-level meeting is a great success. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Canada. Next, I have Iran, please.

IRAN: Thank you, Madam Chairman. First, one option to consideration our distinguished lady from United Kingdom. Since the issue of the GAC Internet and so on and so forth will be handled by various entities in various countries, not necessarily at every case minister of communications, perhaps you consider the way that Brazil that handled the issue for the NETmundial. You will send your communication to the minister of foreign affairs -- to your embassies and diplomatic channel, whatever you have, to the ministry of foreign affairs. And they would take responsibility to distribute it or to give it to the ministry or ministers or entities handling. Sometimes it's not ministry at all. It might be an entities and so on and so forth involved in ministries. As I mentioned this morning, we have a supreme council which deals with all of them. Has eight ministries, so on and so forth. So this is one point.



Second point I also suggest that, if possible, when you mentioned that reinforcing the role of GAC, perhaps you should say reinforcing the role of government, not necessarily GAC. Because there is a discussion that people are still have some difficulty with this coming something in future that why we should still have advisory role. We're talking about role of government. Let us make it general. Not go into detail, but role of government. You could interpret it in the way that you wish, role of government in the ICANN activity and so on and so forth.

But another important issue that you mentioned and some people in order to attack the governments, as our distinguished colleague from Italy mentioned, if you put also the review or reflection on the outcome of the NETmundial, very interesting subject, because after two months there would be a good opportunity to see the roadmap, if we succeed to have a roadmap in Sao Paulo, how the roadmap will be pursued and should be good to discuss that one and be sufficient. But the most important is that, if you want that the people at the level of ministry of ministerial attend, the agenda should be released as soon as possible because of the schedules of people they have. They have very tight schedules, many meetings, and so on and so forth. It is better to do it as soon as possible. So that would be very interesting and so on and so forth. And then you also should think of what would be the outcome of that meeting. It would not be the normal meeting that having meeting. Might be a declaration, might be something like that that would demonstrate the nature of the meeting and importance of the meeting and differentiate between the normal meeting and that meeting. I do know what happened in the previous high-level meeting. But at least this one should have some sort of declaration. As you know very well



and some of the others, declaration has a legal connotation. It's some sort of customary law. It is not a binding, it is not a treaty, but it has similar nature. It's of some moral binding that people so on and so forth, what they say. And so that should be also considered, just for consideration. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Iran. Next I have Indonesia.

INDONESIA: Thank you. And appreciate the description and explanation of the U.K. representative. And, if I recall a few years ago, U.K. has successfully carried out a U.K. security IT meeting which was open directly by your Prime Minister. And -- well, I should say this high-level meetings also. Because even U.S. vice president was there in video. So that time the U.S. vice president even gave explanation as how important this was as to the IT security and for all of us. And U.S. vice president as well as the British Prime Minister also mentioned how important is the IT security should be taken in a global perspective that all countries should take into account that, to develop the cyberspace, then their security should be made clear that it is secured. You know, more or less something like that. I forget all the details, of course, but -- I believe ICANN -- you can open the Google, and you can find out what the -- what they said word by word.

Now, related to that meeting, I think the U.K. has already enough experience as how you carry out that global U.K. security meeting. Because that time your embassy, but at least your U.K. embassy in



Jakarta actually contacted directly the foreign minister and contacted our minister in Indonesia directly and so on and explained that. And, as a result, we also sent our Vice Minister and high-level delegates to London for a few days at a time.

I think similar things can be done for this GAC high-level meetings. And I believe the British embassy in Jakarta has already known many of us already in Jakarta.

Now, in addition to us, in the addition to that meeting, it is important because in London, as in ICANN, GAC and as chairman -- Mr. Fadi has mentioned several times -- we hope that in London, after the global consultation in Brazil, in London we can have -- we can arrive to some sort of conclusions as how the IANA functions and so on can be carried out by multistakeholders. I don't know how it looks like. But, certainly, in London we have to have some sort of decisions. If not, like my colleagues from Iran said, it should be a moral obligation or moral obligation for all of the important people to decide yes or no we will go with this type of multistakeholders before in September 2015, it will be transferred directly.

Because of that, I think that meeting will be very important. I hope that the U.K. government can do its best to make it sure that the high-level meeting is very successful. For example, I just -- just what I'm thinking directly, you see. When you have the U.K. security meetings, the U.S. vice president directly informed how important is that security. So everybody listen to the Prime Minister and the U.S. vice president address.



Last -- for the last two days, I think still, since last Saturday, here we have brief by Mr. Larry -- no, what was the name? -- the U.S. NTIA -- sorry, I forgot the whole names. And also Fadi has mentioned in the opening how -- what is the requirement of U.S. government in transferring the IANA to multistakeholders. Now, I think we know we have heard it all, both from Larry as well as from Fadi, what is requirements are. But I think it also is very important if the U.S. government can directly address the high-level leaders in the London meetings as what the U.S. wants as why the U.S. wants to transfer IANA and so on and so on and so on. Just like what the U.S. vice president did about IT security a few years ago. That will be even more higher moral obligations to all countries to make sure that multistakeholders arrangement for IP addresses and so on and so on can be handled correctly. As Fadi said, security and stability should be there for the Internet. Thank you very much.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Indonesia. So let's continue moving through the remaining speakers on the list.

I have Egypt next, please.

EGYPT:

Thank you. And it's good to talk at the end, because most of the points I was going to raise were already covered. So, very quickly, I was going to make sure that we'll be able to extend invitations to governments who are not current members of the GAC and to stress the importance of issuing invitations as early as possible to make the necessary



arrangements. And, with the ATRT2 recommendation in mind, I would also bring up the issue of taking stock at the end of the -- doesn't have to be at the very end of the meeting. But maybe the GAC would want to take note of the taking stock of the meeting. And, finally, I would agree with our colleague from Iran that coming from the NETmundial and those same ministers were attending there. So probably they wouldn't -- they couldn't resist talking on the topic again. So thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Egypt.

U.K., did you want to reply, Sarah?

UNITED KINGDOM:

Just to try to respond sort of to the general sentiment. And thank you very much for your very helpful thoughts and suggestions. Just to reassure you that we very much hope to get the invitations out within the next week or two weeks. We will be inviting directly those countries that are not members of the GAC as well to try to encourage the wider participation. And very helpful suggestion to back up our invitations with the demarches through our embassies and offices in your respective countries. So we'll very much look at doing that as well.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you. Next I have New Zealand.



NEW ZEALAND:

Thank you, Chair. I'd like to join others in thanking the U.K. for hosting this meeting. It's clearly timely, perhaps more timely than anticipated when it was first planned.

We find that getting a minister to a meeting like this around the other side of the world very, very difficult. Despite the importance of the occasion, the fact is that anybody traveling from New Zealand to Heathrow spends 24 hours in the air with other time sitting in airports. It's a long, long way to go. And for a half-day meeting, frankly, it's pretty hard to justify. So I welcome the fact that you're going to be getting an invitation out quickly. That will help us. It's very important that the agenda be clearly laid out. And it would be extremely helpful, as I think Paraguay suggested, if there were other meetings that could also attract the attention of ministers so that this is more than simply a half day in London. It really needs to be a very compelling agenda if we are to get our minister out of Wellington and into London for that time. Thank you.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Thank you, New Zealand. I absolutely appreciate that, of course, it's a phenomenally long journey for ministers and their time is very, very valuable. And I know from personal experience there's nothing worse than a grumpy minister who feels that you're wasting his time. So you absolutely have my commitment to make sure that we have a very useful and valuable dialogue. As I say, I'm certainly very happy to look at whatever opportunities there are around that meeting and also to talk to countries on a one-to-one basis as well about other meetings and



events that we can facilitate that will make the journey over useful.
Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you.

Next I have Japan, please.

JAPAN: Yes. Thank you, Chair. First of all, I would like to thank the U.K. government to host the high-level meeting in London.

And I have two requests regarding the housekeeping issues. And the first is related to the invitation issues. We remember that the -- in Toronto high-level meeting, address for the invitation writer was a GAC member. And so we hope that in London high-level meeting also, we write to receive invitation letter for a GAC member not through the diplomatic channel; because using the diplomatic channel, sometimes makes to select to the high-level person for us like to NETmundial. So we'd like to have flexibility for the invitation according to each country.

And the second house is related to the interpretation issues. We would like to request to have interpretation booths for Japanese, even though the Japanese government provide its cost expense by ourselves. So I would be very grateful if you take care of our request. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Japan. Germany, you were next.



GERMANY:

Yes. Thank you. And also from my side, thanks to the U.K. government for this initiative. It's in a timely manner. And I think it can give an impetus for further deliberations in this important issue and to the point of Internet governance.

I have also some question rather organizational questions. One is in respect of the format, just whether I caught your intentions right. This will be only an exchange between the ministers, or is it rather considered to have an exchange between minister or board, or will there be both parts of the meeting?

And I would suppose -- and that's rather a question -- that this meeting will be open to the public. Thank you.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Thank you, Germany. We very much hope that we will have an opportunity to have the ICANN board or members of the ICANN board with us for a period of the meeting, not the whole meeting. Because we will have other things to discuss, I think, including -- although we can look at exactly how we choreograph it. But, yes, we hope we'll have some members of the board with us and an opportunity for ministers to speak with them directly. And, in terms of whether the meeting will be open to the public, that's an interesting question. I don't know the answer to that. I'll have to think about it. But, again, I'm very happy to take advice from GAC members as well and views on whether that would be useful or appropriate. Thank you.



CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you. So next I have Switzerland. And then the final speaker will be China. Switzerland, please.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you. I will be brief. I just wanted to express our support. We fully support the idea of having such meetings in order to raise awareness on a higher political level on Internet governance and ICANN. And we think that the proposal of an agenda is an interesting start. And we're willing to cooperate with others to move this along, because we think it's timely to come up with more concrete information that you can communicate. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Switzerland, China, please.

CHINA: Thank you, Madam Chair. And also thank sincere the U.K. delegation to make the preparation for this very important ministerial meeting.

Just quick is one comment on this meeting. We know that for the ICANN, the GAC is somewhat not the same. You know, they are for the multistakeholder situation to have equal status of the multistakeholders, but not in GAC -- in ICANN, it's a model multistakeholder arrangement. The incumbent's role is something underestimated. And also we think that this initiative of the ministerial meeting is kind of arrangement to enhance the government's participation in the -- in the work of ICANN. And so, also, I think the -- this meeting we're discussing enhancing the government's role in



ICANN. So we are -- we also appreciate this initiative. As other delegates said, we will cooperate with start in this case to make this meeting a successful one. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you very much, China. Okay.

So, at this point, is there anything further that you would like to say, Sarah?

UNITED KINGDOM:

Only to say thank you very much for your very helpful advice. We will reflect on all of it. We very much take the point that it's important to get a very concrete agenda firmed up. We didn't want to do that until we'd had an opportunity to talk to you. You've given us some very helpful suggestions. And we'll now endeavor to finalize that very quickly and communicate that both to you directly and through the invitation process. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you very much for coming to brief us about this. And, as you heard, there's a lot of interest from GAC colleagues and a great deal of willingness to contribute to preparations and participate in the high-level meeting.

So I'm very grateful for your time.



And so next we have a brief session on the topic of WHOIS, at which point, I'm going to hand over to vice chair Australia to run that session. And I will see you this afternoon when we reconvene at 2:00. Okay.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

