
LONDON – GAC Meeting: Transition of US Stewardship of IANA & Strengthening ICANN Accountability
Sunday, June 22, 2014 – 10:30 to 12:30
ICANN – London, England

PETER NETTLEFOLD: Thank you, everyone. This session is to discuss the transition of U.S. stewardship of IANA and strengthening ICANN accountability.

As an update for those members who may be wondering, Heather is feeling unwell this morning, and I am still not clear whether or when she'll be joining us. So I will be take the lead in chairing this session for the time being.

First, many of you will know Patrik Faltstrom as the chair of SSAC and will have seen Patrik present to us and meet with us in that capacity before.

For this session, Patrik is not in that role. Patrik will be explaining his view of the IANA function from a technical perspective as background for this -- for the GAC's discussion in this session.

So I'll hand over to Patrik now. I believe Patrik has some slides and a discussion to present to us.

JOHN JEFFREY: Thank you very much, Peter. And thank you, everyone, for inviting me to be able to explain from my perspective what the IANA function entails.

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.

I will also -- This presentation consists of three parts: A general description of what IANA function is today, a description from the Internet Architectural Board on their view of the IANA function and their interaction with the current IANA functions operator, and with a status update on the work that we in the Security and Stability Advisory Committee is doing on this topic. We are giving that update on the various public sessions that we have in SSAC, but as we do know that all of you in the GAC are very busy, I take that advantage of presenting that as well.

So the first question, what is the IANA today? Of course it depends on who you ask. Some popular answers are a traditional name used -- and this is the text that is in RFC 2860. It might be viewed as the contract between the U.S. Department of Commerce, NTIA and ICANN, or a small department in ICANN now headed by Elise.

So not even what IANA is is something that is very clear, and that's why you see, and I personally like that people try to say the IANA function, the IANA functions operator and be clear of what terminology they are using, in similar terms as it could be unclear what people mean when they use the term "ICANN."

Next slide, please.

So where does IANA get its authority?

That also depends on who you ask. Some popular answers include the Internet community, the IETF, the U.S. government, and I will come back to that later on.

Next slide, please.

So what does IANA do? There are a couple of things here, and doesn't even fit on one slide. It has more than thousand registries for protocol parameters. It handles the Internet numbers registries, and that includes the top-level blocks of autonomous system numbers, IPv4 and IPv6 addresses.

It is the top-level registry for .ARPA and handles everything -- all the second-level domains that are needed for well-functioning Internet, except for E164 numbers, that is managed by RIPE NCC according to an agreement between IETF, the International Telecommunication Union, and RIPE NCC.

Next slide, please.

It is the top-level registry for .INT. It is doing the root zone management. So IANA is doing all of these things, and it works with the root zone management together with the root zone partners, VeriSign and NTIA.

Next slide, please.

Regarding the root zone management, which many people do believe is the only thing IANA does, if we look at the various steps taken to actually manage the root zone, IANA staff is only handling one of those things, which is the change request validation, because the submission is done normally by the TLD administrator. The change request authorization is today done by NTIA. Root zone modification is done by VeriSign. DNSSEC signing of the root zone is done by VeriSign. Distribution of the root zone is done by VeriSign. And publication of the root zone, which is the service that all of you and all the Internet users

are -- are -- are in need of, is managed by the root server operators, where, for example, the organization where I am employed, Netnod, is one of the 12 organizations that publish the root zone.

Next slide, please.

Regarding DNSSEC, which is a relatively new function, IANA manages the root zone key signing key. And the key signing key is used to sign the zone signing key, which in turn is the one that is used to sign the root zone. So that is how one -- what one called the chain of trust is going from IANA to the current zone signing key operator, which is VeriSign, that is using it as a daily operation when it is re-signing the key.

One thing that we in the community, all of us including all of you in the room is looking at is how to deal with the root key rollover, which means how to change the key signing key. And that is something that is one of the open issues at the moment from a technical point of view.

Next slide, please.

The change request validation implies that anyone, of course, could try to change -- to send in a change request to the root zone, but it's, of course, validated that the change request is coming from a current administrative or technical contact. The technical change -- technical checks are applied, so that the change is technically valid and technically sound regarding protocol syntax and semantics, and from an IANA perspective, there is no difference between, for example, ccTLDs or gTLDs. Anyone that is a TLD administrator do send the same kind of change request to IANA.

Next, please.

If we look at what the U.S. government role is for IANA functions, they are signatory to IANA functions contract and they ensure that the policies developed by the community is administered via various contractual obligations. That includes various Service Level Agreements and restrictions against IANA staff being involved in development of policy. So that is the core of what they are doing. But it's also the case that to be able to serve all -- all of your -- all countries and everyone on the planet, it's also the case that the U.S. government facilitates licenses that are needed to provide services to sanctioned entities.

It also provides oversight in a couple of other matters where that is needed. General auditing.

But the licensing is pretty important.

Next, please.

It is -- Regarding the change request authorization, it only verifies that ICANN has followed the documented policies in processing root zone and registration data change requests. It doesn't approve the content of the change request. And it's really important to separate the two.

Next, please.

If we now go to the protocol parameters to show how the IETF has been working with similar issues as we are doing in ICANN at the moment, my view is that IETF has come further regarding how to view -- how to manage IANA, how to interact with IANA than what the ICANN community has for domain names.

First of all, regarding protocol parameters, the Internet Architecture Board is the one that provides oversight of and commentary on various architectural principles regarding protocols used on the Internet.

Next slide, please.

So regarding the protocol parameters, the IETF has always published its parameters separately from its standards. So the IETF has always been extremely clear on what is the policy development process that develops a policy that then is handed over to someone that is the policy implementer. And that handshake and the separation of rules is extremely important when you later come over to things like looking at whether SLAs were fulfilled, doing audit and various different kind of things.

The Internet -- The IANA has evolved since the early days when this function was run by Jon Postel personally.

Next slide, please.

Can we make sure the slide actually fits on the screen?

Okay. So what the IETF -- Okay. Can you press the button for the percentage and choose 50 screen, I think is there. No, the pop-up menu for the percentages. To the right.

Okay. Let's say this is good enough. I hope you all will be able to get this. We'll get the slides later on.

What the IETF has done is that they have looked at this, and the Internet Architecture Board was discussing this, and they differ between

policy, oversight and implementation. And they're looking at which one of the organizations are doing what.

So we have protocols, we have the IETF community create the policy. The oversight is done by IAB. And then you have the implementation that IANA is doing that actually consists of two steps.

Next slide, please.

With so regarding the protocol parameters, what the IETF is doing is that the IETF community is developing the policy, and then you have oversight by IAB, and then it's handed over, the policy, to IANA, and IANA do the work in two different step. The first one is evaluation, and that might be done in coordination with a technical expert that is taking care of objective decisions as compared to subjective decisions.

And the technical expert is appointed by the IETF. So the expert or the organization that take care of objective decision is appointed by the policy development process. So IANA is completely isolated from any kind of objective decisions. IANA is only doing subjective decisions according to rules that are set by the PDP.

And then when that evaluation step is done, then it goes over to publication and maintenance and actions.

Next slide, please.

So the IAB has developed a couple of policies regarding how to handle the stewardship and their view of stewardship. And for stability reasons, these are the kind of conclusions that IETF is working with as goals when they are looking at how to move things forward.

For example, if you look at the last one, IETF realizes very explicitly that coordination with other Internet related institutions is very important. For example, the IETF is the organization that develop the protocols that use the IP addresses. The IP addresses are managed by the RIRs, the regional registries, so coordination is needed between the two.

Next slide, please.

So, for example, if you continue down that path, we are to remember that the IETF, as the protocol developer, so far has only allocated one-eighth of the IPv6 address space for use for the Internet. Seven-eighths of the IPv6 space is not assigned yet to any specific protocol use.

Next slide, please.

So the IAB principles are not new. They have guided the IAB in its work for over a decade, and they were reaffirmed at the IETF89 at London, actually at this very hotel. So for people like me, it's the second time in three months we're here at the same hotel, same hotel rooms.

Anyways, and you can, on this URL which is very, very long, you can see the actual policies that IAB is using for their work on the stewardship issues.

Next slide, please.

If we look at what -- If I'm now taking on my chair -- the role as chair of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee, I will give you a brief update on where we are.

Next slide, please.

We are looking at the situation related today on a function in the form of a work party. That's how we do our work. And we launched this in London as I announced there on the plenary on Thursday.

The work party is developing a terminology to help describe the roles in the IANA function. And the primary roles we talk about is the policy provider that hands over the policy to -- policy to the policy implementer for implementation.

So this separation of roles that I was talking about in the IETF is something that we in SSAC see being extremely important, and the policy implementer is the policy that accepts and then implements the policy developed by the policy development process, handed over by the policy provider.

Next slide, please.

So the actual management of the implementation of the policy consists of two different paths.

Can we scroll down, please?

So first of all, we have the blue path with letters where you see the policy development process up to the left develops a policy, hands it over to the policy provider that then, in one way or another, is negotiated with the policy implementer whether the policy is clear enough.

It might be that the policy implementer finally accepts the policy and promises to implement it according to the SLAs, which it will later be audited upon.

It might be the case, depending on the policy, that the policy provider also appoint an appointed expert taking care of subjective decisions.

Then when the -- after the policy is in place, a requester that would like to have some actions happening based on the actual policy comes from the far left corner where you see the requester sends in a request to the policy implementer. It might be the case that the policy implementer has to go to the appointed expert to have the policy evaluated. The result is coming back, and then it might be the case that the implementer has to ask a third party for action. Response is coming back, and then finally a response is sent back to the requester.

So this is from our perspective, having clear roles and a clear terminology like this is something that is essential to ensure that the actual -- that the various roles and contracts and agreements that are later created end up being stable so that people understand what each party is doing.

Some of you might immediately see that, wait a second, we don't have any arrows for audit, we don't have any arrows for appeals, et cetera. But those are things that are relatively easy to build and add given that you have some basis, base foundation like this. So that those arrows are missing is intentional, because the importance here is to get a clear picture of who is doing what.

Next slide, please.

And that was all. Yeah.

So what we are doing in SSAC at the moment is that we are looking further on the current situation with IANA, and we are thinking about

also writing more technical documents that -- in the cases where technical implications exist that impact security and stability.

And we expect that to be ready in the third quarter of this year. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Many thanks, Patrik. And good morning, everyone. Apologies for being late this morning.

So that is a comprehensive presentation about IANA and the different components of the IANA functions. So quite a bit of information to take in. But what I suggest is, if there are any questions now for Patrik on those aspects, let's take those now. And then we will have a briefing from Theresa Swinehart from ICANN about the two processes for comment and developing proposals and so on looking at the IANA stewardship issue and enhanced accountability.

So I can see Norway has a question. So please go ahead. Can we get a microphone for Norway, please. There's some sort of issue.

NORWAY:

Hello? You can hear me? Okay. Yes, thank you. Good morning, everyone. And thank you, Patrik, for the presentation. Just one sort of comment or question regarding, if you scroll back to slide 6, and I think sort of all the different roles and responsibilities, I had regarding the change request validation, I think in our mind this is actually the essential thing regarding the transfer of the IANA function, the stewardship regarding validating the change requests. And that is

actually the one thing that needs sort of to be sorted who is going to do that or not and under what conditions and requirements that should be validated against? I think most of us are very happy with the Internet Architecture Board oversight over the protocol parameters, et cetera. So I think that's all a lot of technical issues that need to be sorted. But I think that also will be sorted in the future in a very well manner under the IAB.

Also one other thing I wanted to comment is, of course, one of the oversight or stewardship things is that there will not be any major policy changes done after the transition. Because, of course, if there are many major policy changes, that, of course, influences on to validate or how to validate against. So, of course, to control that not policy changes going astray, that is also one important issue. And I think for gTLD registries, that is something which is very important. And I think also for ccTLD registries and countries that is also one very important aspect.

So that is, of course, I think, for you have this slide at the end with the all different flows of information and requests. But I think the core for us, I think, is concerned about how the policies are changed and also who is actually validating the change requests on which basis. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Yeah. Thank you very much. It's actually the case that, first of all, I completely agree with you. And this is the reason why we in SSAC has only developed this flow chart in very general terms. Because what we see is that some of this discussion, specifically for the ICANN community, to some degree, from our perspective is unclear about

whether the discussion is about the policy development process or whether it is about the policy implementation part or whether it is about the handover between the policy development and the policy implementer, who is validating whether the policy is clear enough? How do you handle cases where the policy is not clear enough? How do you afterwards audit and validate that the policy implementer was actually following the policy or not?

And one thing my vice chair Jim Galvin came to me and said, once again, not being a native English speaking person, I mix up the word "objective" and "subjective," which, of course, is something that is really important here that I should not make mistakes about and I actually did. So let me put on the record that the whole idea is that IANA function, the policy implementer should do only objective decisions and not subjective decisions. The reason the IETF do have appointed experts is to minimize the pressure and remove subjective decisions from IANA, just to make that clear.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you for that answer. So can we get slide number 6, please, on the screen? All right. So do we have any more questions? Iran, please? Okay. I hope we are working on the microphone issue. It seems to be fairly widespread. But, if we can have the moving microphone in the meantime. Thank you.

IRAN:

Yeah, good morning, madam. I hope you are well.

Thank you very much for the presentations. It is quite a complex matter, complex issue, very complex. We need time to digest that. You have mentioned for the time being the scope of the work and work process.

Policy developer. Policy provider. And policy implementer.

The question -- the first question I have is do you envisage or do we envisage that the same routine process or the same structure of the work will be continued exactly as it is when this stewardship is transferred? Or whether there might be some changes in that? Second, currently, without making any judgment to the quality of the actions or the work which is done, once it is transferred to the multistakeholder, that still we don't know what is it, would you envisage that there might be some period of transitions which may cause some difficulties in the processing of the matters? Because this has been done by IANA for years, 14 years. And then, once it's transferred to the multistakeholder, the constituency of that still needs to be clarified whether this transition will be smoothly or will create some difficulties. And, if the problem is created, what is the impact of that on the whole process? At this stage I just limit my question in a very general manner. And perhaps you may - if you're in a position to reply to that. And I thank you very much.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Thank you very much for those questions. I think the answers to those questions are the ones that we are seeking with the process that we started in London, which means that I am not the individual that are going to respond to those. This community is to respond to those questions.

What we believe from the security and stability advisory committee is that, whatever those questions are, our suggestion to the community is to try to explain what the various roles are. For example, and to help that discussion, we are providing this flow chart which we think is one easy way of if it is made clear who is doing what to get good answers to, for example, the questions that you answered.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you. Norway, go ahead.

NORWAY: Yes, thank you. Just to clarify the -- my question is that what I meant was that, actually, we're going to see the slide is the validation and the authorization that's sort of to the core of what sort of I think is very important for us. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Are there any other questions or comments about this? Ah, Sweden.

SWEDEN: Morning, colleagues. And thank you, Patrik, for your very good presentation. I would like to ask you, Patrik, as chair of SSAC, is it your understanding from the NTIA's presentation from March that what they're looking at is a suggestion for solving the issue of change request authorization only and not making any other particular changes? You understand my question?

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Yes, I understand your question. And the answer is not -- it's not simple. And one of the things we in SSAC are currently looking at what the IANA function actually -- what the IANA function currently is, what ICANN as the IANA function's operator is actually doing and also what the role of the NTIA under the contract that they have announced that they would like to -- that they don't want to extend what kind of implications that has. So that is continuous work that we're currently doing. And, if you're going to say something that will be part of what we're going to produce in the third quarter this year.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you. I felt that was a very good question, actually. Okay. I don't see any other requests. Ah, U.K., please.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Thanks very much.

Just very briefly, it is on the timeline that I wanted just to double-check, third quarter. Are we talking about in time for the Los Angeles meeting? Just to underline, you know, whenever we in administrations talk about this, the first thing that comes to mind is security and stability. Is the system going to be rock solid when we go through this transition? And so your inputs are going to, you know, relate directly to what we are going to be saying to our ministers and so on. So thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Let me -- we are -- it's a pretty new thing for us to give a timeline at all. Actually, in the previous document we tried and we failed miserably. So that's why it's a little bit dangerous to say something like closer than third quarter.

But between friends, if only you listen to what I'm saying and the rest of you hold ears, we are actually very close. The documents are very close. And we're going through more or less editing, final editing of the documents and make sure that everyone in SSAC do feel as the members of SSAC do stand behind the text. It's up to everyone reading it to detect the whole documents or part of the documents that they think is in favor -- like to use the text, it's really important that SSAC members do feel comfortable with the text. So we are as far as in that process which normally in SSAC has been -- can take from a few weeks to maybe a month. It's a little bit difficult because of the summer and holidays and other kind of things. But we're not saying anything more than a third quarter. Because, if it is the case that some individuals do feel a bit uncomfortable, it might take a little time to shift around text. But it's no longer the case that we're sort of writing the document. But third quarter is what we're saying. Now the rest of you can start listening again.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you. So at this point, I'd like to hand over to Theresa Swinehart from ICANN who is going to give us a briefing about the processes currently underway as announced regarding IANA stewardship and enhancing accountability. But I hope, Patrik, you are still going to be -- yes -- available for further questions about the security and stability

aspect and the details of the IANA functions. Okay. So we'll just take a moment here. You have some slides.

THERESA SWINEHART: I do. They're actually up.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Great. So over to you, Theresa.

THERESA SWINEHART: My apologies for needing to move. It's actually that I couldn't read them from over there. It's a pure eyesight issue rather than anything else.

So, first, thank you very much for the opportunity to be here. I think, since the last time I've been at a GAC meeting, it's grown tremendously. So it's wonderful to see that.

I also wanted to just thank everybody who has provided comments in to the processes and to reiterate really the importance of the input from the GAC and from governments into these dialogues and to please let us know if there's anything we can do to help facilitate that in an easier way. And we've been working with Heather as well.

We had the opportunity to do a briefing on the status of the two processes a few weeks ago. But I wanted to give an update of where we are now and then, obviously, be ready to answer any questions and engage in any dialogues. So, if I could have the next slide, please.

Just a quick recap of history, which is quite short. I suspect late last year, when we were all planning for this year, we didn't quite anticipate that we might have this very unique opportunity to be looking at the transition of NTIA's stewardship role in the context of the IANA functions to the multistakeholder community. But it is truly a unique opportunity and one that I know has been under discussion for many, many years and part of the ICANN dialogue for many years. So this is a really wonderful opportunity for us to come together to address these important and related issues.

So, as I think everybody is hopefully aware, but just to have us all on the same page, on the 14th of March, there was the announcement by the U.S. -- by NTIA with its intention to transition the stewardship of the IANA functions to the global multistakeholder community, that is its role there.

And it had asked ICANN to convene the global stakeholders to develop a proposal to that transition, a proposal which would need to meet certain criteria which I'll get to in a second. It asked ICANN to serve as a convener in part based on our role in relation to the IANA functions as an administrator since 1998 and our responsibilities as a global coordinator for the Internet domain name system. The multistakeholder community, of course, has been setting policies that have been implemented by ICANN for more than 15 years. And many of these policies have been developed within the respective communities so the IETF in the context of their work or the Regional Internet Registries in the context of, obviously, the IP addressing. So one of the important factors of this process is that it is beyond the immediate

ICANN family, if you want to put it that way. It goes into the broader community and is engaging with all the stakeholders in that context.

Next slide, please.

In the context of the guiding principles or the criteria which any proposal would need to meet, I think these are quite important. And they're very useful and important guiding principles.

The transition proposal must have broad community support and address the following four principles: It has to have the support and enhance the multistakeholder model; it needs to maintain the security stability and resiliency of the Internet DNS; it needs to meet the needs and expectations of global customers and partners of the IANA services, hence, the involvement of those customers is extremely important; needs to maintain the openness of the Internet. And it was also made very clear that a proposal will not be accepted that merely replaces NTIA's role with a government-led or intergovernmental organization solution. So reinforcement of the multistakeholder model overall.

Next slide, please.

Since then, as many of you are aware, we launched a dialogue with the community to establish what a process would be that would be acceptable to the community. Input of that was received. And comments were received through the course of the period up to the 27th of March.

Next slide.

Since then, a draft proposal along with the scope of the work for the coordination group was put out. And then a revised -- let me rephrase that. The proposal of the process was put out for public comment on the 8th of April through the 8th of May. And it asked for everybody to comment on the proposed draft principles and the process for what would be going forward to develop a proposal.

All the materials were translated. And then also, in addition, there were over 700 email exchanges that were received and dialogue with the community, 60 process contributions. And thank you also for everybody here from the respective governments who had provided input. Had broad participation from the global community including governments, technical community, and everybody else.

Next slide.

So developments since then: There was also a panel session at the NETmundial conference which Heather and others participated in as well in order to create assurance and ensure there was as wide a range of stakeholders aware of these discussions that were taking place. ICANN's own engagement teams engaged very much in the different regions, as did all the partner organizations so the Internet society, the IETF, the Regional Internet Registries have all done extensive outreach as has in the name space the ccTLDs communities and respective organizations to create as broad awareness as possible. Next slide.

So on the process of next steps, the input that was received and all the exchanges and dialogues was compiled. And what became very clear is a few areas, one that is ICANN as a facilitator, we should really not be defining in any way what the charter or the work process is of any

facilitating group would actually be. So we very much focused the revised document that was posted on the 6th of June which defines the process to develop a proposal and the next steps to focus on a few areas of where we had received some extensive comments. One was that the naming of the group that is pulling together the facets in order to come up with a proposal meeting, the criteria is actually not called a steering group but a coordination group. There was quite a bit of reaction to that. There was also some reaction about ensuring that ICANN as its role as facilitator is not involved in any selection of the members themselves. So there is no role for the chair of the ICANN board nor the chair of the GAC in selection of the members.

Self-selection was viewed as very important by all the stakeholder communities. So that is now in place. And each of the community representative groups is responsible for self-selecting. There's a delineation between the distinction of affected and nonaffected parties. And there's a revised composition to ensure that there's a broader representation of stakeholders. And that was all based on community input.

Next slide, please.

There was also some feedback to ensure that our role as ICANN is not prescriptive in any way. So no prescriptive input in any way about the roles and responsibilities of the coordination group. That is, the coordination group itself will need to establish its own working methods and modes of operation.

I just came from the GNSO meeting where this was raised. We received quite a bit of input around what a charter of the coordination group

should look like or how it should function. But it would be inappropriate for us to be making that determination. ICANN, as a facilitator, that's actually the responsibility of the coordination group itself. So we've strongly encouraged the coordination group to look at all the input that's been received in any of those contexts. ICANN is to maintain a neutral role as a convener and facilitator. And, of course, we received a lot of input around the importance of diversity and participation in the overall process. So the coordination group is encouraged to adhere to that including with their own internal selection processes. Next slide, please.

So, as far as next steps go, this is the conclusion of the process dialogue of what kind of process is in place. Namely, there's a coordination group with representation. The next phase is for it to begin working. And how it works will be for the decision of the coordination group itself. There's been a call for the names from the respective communities. The suggested deadline for the submission of those names is the 2nd of July. We've already received quite a few names as input.

And there's a tentative face-to-face meeting at -- in mid-July for the coordination group to begin looking at its charter, looking at its working methodologies, and to begin undertaking how they're going to conduct the important work of pulling together the input from the respective communities, in particular, the customers for a proposal that meets NTIA's criteria. There will obviously be remote participation available for anybody who can't physically attend that meeting. Next slide.

This is just a visual -- it's in the document online -- of the composition of the coordination group and the breadth of representation.

I think one area that's very important to also highlight here is that the coordination group representation, of course, has a huge responsibility of engaging with their respective communities and ensuring that there's ongoing dialogues there. It also, though, has responsibility for taking the input from any of the areas where it's coming in from.

So the coordination group and their working methodology will really need to be clear to the international community on how they're going to be adhering to transparency and accountability and inclusiveness in how they're going to be conducting their work. Next slide.

So, in the discussions when the announcement came up, one area that was, of course, of great interest to the community was ICANN's accountability and what would happen with its changing relationship with the U.S. administration and the context of the transition of NTIA's role of the stewardship of the IANA function. So it became very clear in the meeting in Singapore and also discussions earlier that we needed to have a conversation around the accountability space of ICANN in particular. The proposed framework for a process with questions for community input was posted on the 6th of May. The proposed scope is to look at the contractual relationship with the U.S. government and the perceived backstop with regards to ICANN's organization wide accountability provided by that role such as the renewal process of the IANA functions and to take a look at the existing accountability mechanisms where there may be gaps, where there may be needs for

strengthening things and how to address the points that have been raised for the community.

We received a request for an extension on the comment cycle for that. We have done so, of course, by one week. It's now extended to the 27th of June. That was to respond to community requests. And we are trying very hard to be sensitive to both the importance of this process running in close parallel with the other process. We've been very clear and heard very, very strongly that ICANN accountability in the context of this transition is extremely important. It needs to be hand in hand. It's an interdependent aspect of the transition, so these need to be running closely in parallel to each other and inform each other.

Next slide, please.

In the document that you'll have seen posted, it's a non-exhaustive list of existing accountability aspects that ICANN currently has. This helps also inform the dialogue that does need to occur on areas that need to be strengthened or if there's gaps in how to address any of the areas around ICANN's accountability with that regard.

Next slide, please.

There's a call for input and dialogue on the proposed process. And I would really encourage the input if there's ideas and suggestions on the -- whether this is the right process to be using, suggestions on how to refine it or improve it, please to also provide those. What the output should really be focusing on is, of course, ICANN's accountability more broadly and also identifying the key elements for strengthening it to address the absence of its historic contractual relationship with the U.S.

government and really to prioritize those elements for development and refinement. As we've all seen in earlier stages of ICANN's reform, some things can take several years and some things can be done quite quickly.

So it's also important to prioritize areas and focus of work, especially because we have a volunteer community and we do need to manage for that as well.

It should set forth the timeline and mechanisms for the implementation of the improvements identified, also in the context prioritizing those, and then the timelines expected and how to adhere to those.

Next slide, please.

The proposal based on community input is a self-selected working group containing experts identified by the community, and the listing of the subject areas and suggested subject areas follows.

That self-selected working group would then have the opportunity to be looking at the different subject areas that are relevant for coming up with an approach on how to deal with the accountability and the strengthening of areas and coordinate community dialogue on that, and prepare a report that would obviously go out for further public input, and ensure that there is coordination, obviously, with the other process.

So that describes the composition or the proposed composition again.

Next slide, please.

These are some of the subject matter areas that are listed. It's not, of course, exhaustive in any way, but these are obviously some areas that

are relevant to accountability more generally. And we're certainly not the only organization that has ever addressed this, but these are sort of common subject areas in this space.

Next slide, please.

So the next steps is there will be discussions on Thursday with the community for broadly on these two processes, and to please look at candidates for the working group and also input into the overall process, and if that's a good direction to be going.

So with that, I think I'll stop on the two processes and maybe take questions around anything.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Many thanks for that presentation.

So are there any questions around these processes?

Italy, please.

ITALY:

Thank you, Madam Chair.

First of all, thanks to Patrik to have explained the complexity of understanding the IANA functions and then the stewardship functions. And thanks to Theresa.

Let me focus only on this, starting from the first slides presented by Theresa; that is, the role of ICANN in this problem of IANA transition.

So ICANN, we play a role, we understand, as facilitator of the -- enlarging the discussion in all the community. And this is something similar to what ICANN made in preparation of the NETmundial; that through the 1net, tried to connect all those that wanted to give an opinion.

So then -- But, of course, the problem of involving the voice of anyone in the world is not an easy task because, in the end, there will be the need of listening to many even dissenting voices.

In my opinion, of course the role that will be played by the so-called ISTARs with the addition of the country codes organization will be a key role to assure the continuity and a smooth transition. This is something that we have to be played in the interaction with the rest of the community and is not an easy task because this is the condition to have a smooth transition and a continuation. This is very important.

And so the problem now is on timing, of course, because roughly we should -- if we want to reach a position where the U.S. government may interrupt the stewardship, then a final project will be prepared by June of next year, let's say, because the contracts are ending in September. And I think that there should be also a consultation in the U.S. government, and so on.

So this is a really important issue, this timing.

So then the role of the GAC inside ICANN, because it will not be only a government represented in ICANN that could have a say on the problem. And so what I see is the fact that we need to, first of all, to understand, and we are in the early phase discussing this. And then

maybe the role inside ICANN should be also to try to ease a little bit the definitions or the boundaries of what we have to put into the definition of this project.

So this is something that has to be done with an important -- as an important issue, and the participation in the coordination group is essential. And it is not clear enough. I saw the last picture that -- with all these participant -- participating actors, and this has to be clear as soon as possible, in my opinion.

So this is what I would like to recommend in order to be in time to prepare this important project.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you very much, Italy. And just a point of information. After we have our briefings, the GAC is going to take a bit of time to talk about the process points involved with the two processes, and hopefully come to some kind of agreement around how we are participating or how we're represented and so on. So we'll be spending a bit of time to deal with some of those issues that I think Italy is wanting to flag about participating and governments, in particular, participating.

Okay. So Argentina, you're next, please.

ARGENTINA:

Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Patrik and Theresa, for the presentations.

I have a question about the composition of the coordination group.

Could we review again your slide with the....

My question is about how this composition was decided, and if it's totally fixed or it could be improved somehow, considering the -- Can we check the slide, please?

CHAIR DRYDEN: Yeah. You're looking for the slide? Thank you.

ARGENTINA: There. So it's -- No -- yeah. Thank you very much.

Considering the size of the GAC, that we have 100-plus representatives, my question, if this composition could reflect more the size of our advisory committee and not only with two. I'm glad it's a woman and a man in the small draw, which is good, that is a good sign.

I wonder if it's -- if the composition of this group is totally fixed or it could be improved somehow.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Argentina.

I wonder whether that's something we can talk about in the GAC, in fact; whether we want to comment on that or how to approach it.

Okay. So noted.

And next we have Australia, please.

AUSTRALIA:

Thank you, Chair, and thanks to Patrik and Theresa for those very informative presentations.

I also have a process question, and thanks to the chair for setting the context for this question.

As the GAC, we'll be looking at the way how we can most effectively engage with these two very important processes.

So for the first one, the IANA transition Coordination Group, I think it's quite clear, at least at the moment, that it's intended that the GAC would have two representatives participate in that group.

For the broader or related accountability process, it seems clear that there's an intention that the GAC would participate, but less guidance.

Has there been any thinking to assist the GAC, if the GAC goes away after this session and we decide that perhaps we would like ten people on that group, how would that be received? Is there any guidance you can give to us as we go forward to try and figure out how we can most effectively participate?

THERESA SWINEHART:

Sure. I'd be happy to share with you a conversation I had also with some of the S.O. and A.C. leadership on this.

The community should come up with the numbers that they think that they need for the accountability group. Obviously, one would want to

have an effective and efficient group to be able to conduct the group; that is, the -- those that are selected are not the representatives, so to speak, without needing to go back to their communities and engage.

The proposal outlines that those selected have expertise in different areas of accountability. So I would, with that, assume that it's actually bringing together expertise from the different stakeholder groups. But those expertise would not necessarily represent the positions of those communities, so to speak. They would have the expertise that are along the lines for the accountability space.

I would also guess, and this is just from a process standpoint, that of course the respective stakeholder groups would be having views and input into that process as representatives, and that's where the real legitimacy would be coming from as well.

So there's some hard work to do. Accountability is a very specialized area. There's a lot of experts that, you know, are in government and are in civil society and are in business that can bring ideas to the table, and the purpose of that working group is really to bring that expertise together, but then have a process that also enables what the process is to go out to the community and ensure that there is input.

So there is no fixed number, is the short answer. And some of the rationale behind the thinking there is the longer answer.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Okay. Thank you.

So next I have Singapore.

SINGAPORE:

Thank you, Chair.

First of all, we'd also like to thank Theresa for the very comprehensive briefing.

We have one question, that deadline of 2nd July, I understand some of the communities are trying hard or working hard to meet the deadline. So my question is what would happen if after this deadline, some of the committees are not able to give the names to the Coordination Group? Obviously you allocate certain seats to various communities, so what happens if no names are given to Coordination Group? Would the July meeting still proceed as scheduled? Or they can give you the names after the 2nd July?

Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART:

Obviously those names that are by the 2nd of July can begin starting to pull together and begin the work, of course. The names submitted after the 2nd of July would then come and join the work as it's going, in progress, forward.

But in order to begin the process, one has to set at least some milestones and some benchmarks on that.

So at this point, let's see where we are on the 2nd of July. We've already received names, so many of the communities have already started selecting them. Those that are selected can start beginning to

do maybe some preliminary work, and then as the other names come and join, they can move forward with their process.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you. So I have Netherlands, China, Brazil, Iran, and Namibia, and then I will move to close the list so that we can have some GAC discussion of these issue report.

So next, the Netherlands, please.

NETHERLANDS:

Thank you, Heather. And thank you, Patrik, for the -- let's say the breakdown of roles and responsibilities. I think that's one. Major parts in understanding and how to model, let's say, to have the cornerstones for the model to be developed. And thanks, Theresa, for the -- I think the two most important streams we are dealing now within ICANN, probably, and outside ICANN.

Just two remarks, I think, on two topics. First of all, within all these different roles and responsibilities, we begin with talking with the word "oversight" which has now been replaced with "stewardship" or something else.

I think one of the most important things from governmental aspect of oversight is always independence, meaning whatever function you have been -- you are dealing with, somebody who is ultimately ticking the box should be completely independent of all the actors and even also all the ones who are the real stakeholders from the different functions of IANA. I think this is one of the most important things from our point of

view. Especially because there are commercial, political, other interests, which are in, let's say, every organization.

And probably also, no offense, but I think ICANN has also an interest. So the interest itself from the organization ICANN should also be balanced and not having influence in this kind of oversight mechanism.

So that's a point about oversight.

The second point is about -- let's say the kind of input we as GAC are able to be given.

I think it's a good -- very good start that it's free formed, that we don't have any guidance. And I heard what Australia said. I think it's even positive not to have guidance on this, because we as GAC can really, from scratch on, be able to give input and not being dependent of other bodies for this, the work in this Coordination Group.

I leave it at that. Thank you.

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

CHINA: Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

I am a newcomer here, so if I ask some naive questions, please excuse me for that.

And first, let me congratulate the presenter on the very excellent presentation.

And I have questions regarding the two aspects, one is the Coordination Group and the other is the two processes you have mentioned.

On the Coordination Group, I have two questions. One is what is the mandate of this Coordination Group? My understanding is that they will actually draw up the roadmap of the transition of the stewardship from the current one to a multistakeholder process, if that is correct.

But my question is after they have come up with a conclusion, is it going to be final or is it going to be approved by a wide -- wider participation of the stakeholders?

And my second question regarding to the Coordination Group is that my understanding of your answers to one of the previous questions was that a GAC can have more than two people. I would like you to confirm that. And also, the -- and in your presentation, you mentioned that each community may select their representatives by themselves. So I don't know whether you are the right person to answer this, but I want to know how GAC is going to select their people which will be serving on this Coordination Group.

And my question concerning the relationship between the two processes, you mentioned in your presentation that these two processes will be separate but interdependent.

So I want to know, we all know the accountability process might take a longer time than maybe drawing up a roadmap for the transition. So I want to know in what way or what aspects of this accountability processes -- process may effect a timely transition of the stewardship? Because we all know that the contract will end next September. Next

September. And what aspect of this accountability process will have to come up with outcome or conclusions before the U.S. agrees to this transition?

So these are my questions.

Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART:

Thank you. I hope I have them all in order. So on the mandate of the Coordination Group itself, it is to come and to pull together the input from the community and, in particular, from the customer areas, to put together a proposal that meets the criteria that have been set out by NTIA that I had listed at the beginning.

So one could equate it with -- I don't know an analogy. You have -- you have different proposals, and then you -- it's a bad analogy because it's more of a U.S. one, but you have different tiles -- yes? -- and you're creating a mural of what the proposal will be that fulfills the criteria set out.

So, for example, the IETF is -- will be working very hard on areas that are within its area and its policy development processes there. They will have an aspect that is relative to what the full proposal looks like, as will the IP addressing community and the names community, and obviously the input from all the governments and civil society, business, technical community. And that has to be put together into a proposal that fulfills the criteria that have been set out.

So that is the mandate of the Coordination Group and the work that it will need to undertake.

On the final -- what the final product looks like, that will have -- the Coordination Group needs to get consensus on it. So it will need to go through consultation mechanisms. That will be for the Coordination Group to sort out how their working methodologies will be in order to ensure that they have a final product that has the support needed.

That would then be provided to NTIA as what the proposal would be for them to then look at.

On the self-selection, there's actually two groups that are self-selecting. So for the NTIA stewardship transition process, the one that is this Coordination Group, there would be self-selection for the proposed two seats. Obviously that doesn't prevent government input through the GAC and obviously government input directly.

For the enhancing ICANN accountability working group, that is the one where I was saying that there's no limit on the numbers, and the focus is really on areas of expertise around accountability that would be relevant.

On the two processes, you're absolutely right, they are interdependent and they will need to inform each other, which is one reason why it's important that the work begins, because then the mechanisms of ensuring that they're doing that can be put into place and established very well.

And as you note, there's a time frame. This is a unique opportunity, and it's one that the community has worked for for very long. So we have a

window of opportunity, and we should be moving forward in the work in order to do that, but that's really for the community, you know, to be moving forward on in order to achieve the time frame that you had mentioned.

I hope that answers your question.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Theresa. And the questions about the GAC we will --

THERESA SWINEHART: Yes, of course.

CHAIR DRYDEN: -- deal with those in our GAC discussions about how we select people and what are the rules around how they are participating in the process, or what are the expectations that the GAC has around how the GAC participates in both of these processes. So we will take a few minutes after we finish with our questions for Theresa in the GAC to discuss those matters and hopefully come to decisions about at least some aspects of the GAC's participation.

Okay. So next I have Brazil, please.

BRAZIL: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I'd like to thank both Patrik Faltstrom and also Theresa Swinehart for the presentations.

I'd like, first of all, to welcome and we are very glad to see we have been one of the countries who have offered comment on the draft proposal, and we are very glad to see that some ideas we have presented have, together with other councils, delegations, have been incorporated. We are very glad to see that interaction. I think this will serve us better to -- to act on the collective wisdom of the group.

I have three points. One, the first one is that maybe if we oversimplify the task before us regarding the (indiscernible), it might be seen as a more legal than technical issue. I mean, basically we are talking about replacing the contractual relationship with the U.S. government for a contractual relationship to the wider community.

This in itself entails a very huge challenge. This is something completely new. Speaking from the point of view of government as a diplomatic exercise, this is not something that I can think of any precedent in regard to this. So I think this will be the heart of the discussion we'll have. Of course, there are also technical issues to be considered regarding the roles of the different actors in this, but first and foremost, in my personal opinion, it will be a more legal and contractual kind of discussion than anything else. Especially because from the technical point of view, and I agree with what was said in the Singapore meeting, the presentation, that we do not want even for a nanosecond to harm the operation of -- the operation of all the system. So we want to make sure that things will continue to work in a proper function.

So the second point, from a logical point of view, also, we have some difficulty to see why you should not incorporate the accountability discussion in the transition discussion. Since the issue (indiscernible)

accountability must be in any decision we make in regard to the transition, and think of in terms of the contract. It must also incorporate rules on accountability.

At one point, and I think when Theresa was mentioned, that there are maybe different speeds. I can understand from that point of view that there are some things in regard to accountability that must be put in operation as soon as possible that maybe cannot wait for a more extended transition period. I think from that point of view, I think it's understandable. But anyway, I think the accountability should be part of the discussion of the transition.

The third point relates to one recommendation that emanated from NETmundial, is that the process should be coordinated or steered by a group that would represent community extending beyond the ICANN community, those institutions that are already part of ICANN.

So as I look at the proposed composition, and I'm not sure if we have there thought of some space for participants, interested participants that have a legitimate stake that are outside of those supporting organizations, those groups that ordinarily integrate the ICANN meetings, so I'd also like to ask for clarification whether there will be some space. I don't know what would be the procedure for that, but at least to think of something that would go beyond the ordinary ICANN community, and this is in follow-up also to what was discussed at NETmundial.

Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you. And thank you, also, for the contribution. And you're right, it was very informative and helped inform quite a bit.

On the last point, what would you -- Do you have examples? And you don't have to respond now but you raise an important point, and so having examples would be of great help and interest.

BRAZIL: I'm afraid I'm not so familiar with the operation of ICANN and the issue. But I understand there was an extended discussion on this. And I think this was kind of consensus we had that this transition exercise should not be restricted to those insiders that would extend beyond. For me, I'm only seeing from a conceptual point. I do not have a practical recommendation to give in that regard. I was just thinking it was something that was in the discussion. I don't know how that would fit into this thing that we're putting together.

THERESA SWINEHART: Because there's quite a few that are listed that are outside of the ICANN community. And so, as one is looking at trying to ensure that one is fulfilling the full breadth, if there's any suggestions, it would be helpful. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you for that.

And I wonder whether I can ask Patrik to comment on whether this concept of security and stability, as you understand it, encompasses things beyond the purely technical and whether it could include, you

know, the stability of the institutional arrangements and this kind of thing? Because they're quite closely linked when it comes to the IANA functions and -- yeah.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Thank you for that question, Heather. As I said earlier, we're not done with our examination of the situation in SSAC. But, as you saw on the picture that I provided, we think that from a security and stability perspective, it's extremely important to separate the policy provider from the policy implementer. Because, if you don't, everyone will question whether the policy implementer is doing their job or more or less. And that is, of course, not only technical issues. That has to do with clear instructions, that you know what people are doing, that you can audit, and lots and lots of other things which are not technical.

So I think to some degree the answer to your question is, of course, no. Because stability implies organizational stability and contractual stability, that people feel trust in the organization. So, for example, people do feel comfortable when someone is sending a request to make a change done, that they are sure that the change will be done or there will be a clear no accorded with explanation for the change request according to the policy that is developed in the policy, in the policy development process.

So, from a stability perspective, the important thing is that requests are handled according to the policy that is developed by the policy development process. Done. And that's not only technical.

Thank you. Okay.

So next, I have Namibia, then Norway, then Switzerland. So Namibia, please. My apologies, Iran. You were next in the speaking order.

IRAN: No problem. I can go at the end but don't forget me. No problem. Give it to the others. I have no difficulty. But I still have some question at the end.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Please, go ahead.

IRAN: Yes, thank you very much. Thank you, Theresa, for the presentations.

I have one -- seeking one small clarification. In one of the slides you mentioned indirect stakeholder. What is indirect stakeholder versus direct stakeholder? Do you have any description for that? In one of those slides you mentioned indirect stakeholder. So you can point that -

-

THERESA SWINEHART: Was that the reference to affected versus non-affected? Was that the terminology?

IRAN: No. In one of the slides one of the lines was indirect stakeholder. You can find that.

THERESA SWINEHART: I will find it.

IRAN: There are many questions.

THERESA SWINEHART: Yes, thank you.

IRAN: I understand we have two processes, one is transition and the other is accountability. And you mentioned that they should inform each other. I believe that the issue is much more vital than informing each other. The way that we understood the transition, we are dealing with policy development. We're dealing with the policy providing or provider and policy implementing. All of these have direct relation with accountability. So the result of the accountability actions or process should directly be fed to the transition group or coordination group for review, examination, and appropriate implementation. So it's more than informing. It's applications.

Then the two processes you mentioned that they prepare inputs. We understood that this should be understood as having two steps, a step one preparing, compiling input. And once it's finished, they put it for the second round of consultations in order to be finalized. I request you kindly to continue that.

The last or last of questions is what was the rationale that you limit the GAC representation to two? Why? Why you marginalize the government vis a vis the whole thing that you mentioned? What is the

reason for that? I think we have been marginalized for years and years and years. And we're starting to see what is the way that we have a better, wiser, and appropriate representation? And I think this should be left to the GAC to express its desire and also its wishes and practicality and needs of representations. But we should not be given from the outside that you have only two and that's that. Or maybe we could do three also. This is something that is very important.

This must be considered carefully, I think. maybe you will not be here after we discuss your presentations in the GAC.

One issue was raised by Brazil. And you asked a question, and it was answered. I wanted to just emphasize that. Indeed, in NETmundial a reference was made to going beyond ICANN community. How you do that? How you outreach that beyond community? And how you reflect that in the output, because that is very important. That was emphasized in the NETmundial that we should not limit to the ICANN community because the multistakeholder, as was mentioned there, they had another group which was implicitly considered by now explicitly in the statement. And that is users.

And that is why we go beyond the ICANN communities. So I would like to know how you reach or how these beyond ICANN community are outreached. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Iran. To your point about how the GAC participates particularly in the coordination group, we will be discussing that in the

GAC. And, hopefully, we can get some clarity about how we will proceed in the GAC on that.

And I think we have a few more speakers. So we have Namibia, Norway, and Switzerland in the list. So we will take those questions for Theresa.

And then we have another brief presentation coming from the cross-community effort and the leads on that from ccNSO and the GNSO Council. And then we will have our opportunity to discuss things as a GAC. And so this will mean running over, I think, 30 minutes to 1:00. But I think it's time well-spent. But I think it's important that we take this time and address these matters. So we will be running over. Just one moment. Okay.

So please, Patrik, go ahead.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Let me comment on the number of representatives in this coordination group.

We have -- a few of the other groups here in ICANN have been talking about how many people should be representatives on the coordination group. And important thing is to talk about why you need representatives. We think from SSAC that, if it is the case that the outcome of the work and the coordination group depends on the number of representatives, then we think the coordination group has failed. The coordination group should be able to collect the interest from the various parties regardless of how many representatives there

are from each group that are appointing people. That implies that it should be enough for each group to get one person.

The other reason for having multiple representatives could be that the group itself do have multiple subgroups or equivalent or multiple interests and the group itself find a need to have multiple representatives to have all voices heard.

But I think we should need to think about why we want a certain number of representatives regardless of what the outcome of -- the answer of that question is.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Patrik, Namibia, you were next, please.

NAMIBIA:

Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Theresa, for the presentation. I also want to thank my esteemed colleague from Iran who asked my second question on the interrelationship between the two process committees. I will confine myself to the first question or my first concern or my first comment. And that is the status of these two committees. The status in the sense that the -- they will be feeding into the ICANN board in terms of the outcomes with the implication that the ICANN board will then further any outcome because they will have to then submit it to the U.S. government. And, as we have heard earlier, there is an interest -- ICANN as an organization also has an interest. What would then be the status of the effectiveness of the outcome of these two committees there? Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART:

So I think, as I mentioned on the first process, the work of the coordination group ensuring it meets the criteria that would then be provided to NTIA. So that would be the process there.

Obviously, the input in the dialogue with the broader community, right, they would need to go through some consultation processes to ensure that they have both broad consensus and broad support in also meeting the criteria that have been sent out.

With regards to the accountability aspect, obviously, if there are aspects of that that relate to ICANN's bylaws or revisions, the board would have a fiduciary responsibility with regard to specific elements of that process. But that is within the context of that. The other one is within the context very much about the board does not have a role in that. So that would go directly over. Does that help your answer? Is that helpful? Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you. Norway, please.

NORWAY:

Thank you. Thank you, Theresa, for the presentation. I think maybe you just answered my question. The point was that these -- we're just wondering if this group is going to produce the final result that is handed over to the NTIA? And, if you're doing so, will there then be any consultation, as you said, before the broader community before you do

it? This goes to the importance and discussion we had about sitting in that group.

So -- and, as you said, you produce something and you bring it to the whole of the community, to the broader community at least to have some hearing before you bring it further on. That's the crucial point. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART:

This is a really important element and I think useful for making clear to the coordination group and the expectations on how its charter is done and also how its working methodology will work to ensure that it is being transparent in its work, that it is accountable to the broader community, and that, obviously, the selection of the representation on the group itself is also accountable to their respective communities and the dialogue there.

And there were many suggestions provided into the comment period on different ideas on how the coordination group might function.

And it would -- I think it would be useful for the coordination group to look at some of those suggestions and working methodologies on how they intend to conduct their work. But they will be accountable for what they're undertaking.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you. Switzerland, please.

SWITZERLAND:

Thank you, Madam Chair. I just wanted to briefly support what my colleague from Brazil and others have said about opening up either the coordination group or creating an additional layer to this to whoever is outside ICANN. Because we think it's very important that this group is balanced and this process is done in an accountable way towards the ICANN community. But the ICANN community is growing, and ICANN is taking efforts to make this community more inclusive. But we are not yet there where the ICANN community equals the global community also in terms of geographic representation and so on and so forth. I don't have to go into the details. So we would very much also welcome to explore ways in how to try and bring in everybody into this process. Because the accountability towards the global Internet community's fundamental for the acceptance of what will be the outcome of this process. And either from enlarging this coordination group, if that is too complicated, I think an alternative would be to create regular exchanges, for instance, using the IGF and other fora to have an open debate with everybody who is not that rooted yet in the ICANN community to get these views in as well. Thank you very much.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Switzerland. It could be the case that we could make some sort of recommendation to the coordination group about them enabling that outreach or that exchange so that inputs can come in from outside the regular structures at ICANN. Okay.

So, at this point, I think we have about 10 minutes for a presentation from the chair of the GNSO Council and the chair of the country code name supporting organization who have been working on a kind of

cross-community framework to enable inputs to come in a cross-community way into both of these processes either of these processes. And so they're here to talk to us about that and explain a bit about this effort. This is really another point of information for the GAC so that we are aware of the various activities happening at ICANN and hopefully getting a good picture as a result of the briefing that we've received this morning.

So at this point can I hand over to Jonathan and Byron to explain their current efforts. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

Thank you, Heather. And thank you, GAC colleagues, for inviting us to this briefing session of yours. I hope what we say will be both informative, naturally, and complementary to other things you've heard this morning. We don't have a formal presentation. And I don't think we need to take a lot of your time. But I do think it's very important and really appreciate that you've recognized it as such by putting it on your agenda that we fill you in on the work that we have commenced and propose to do.

As you are very familiar, the NTIA in its initial direction requires of us a multistakeholder process to work on the design of this transition.

Byron and myself are respectively key -- occupy key leadership roles within our respective communities within this ICANN ecosystem. And, as such, I think we view it and our communities view it as incumbent on us to work within this bottom-up multistakeholder model that we have

to pick up the baton that's been handed to us and initiate the appropriate mechanisms for doing this work.

Our typical method for doing this kind of work, which straddles more than just our own groups -- in each of our groups, as you've heard from Patrik, I suspect, this morning and in many other sections as there is indeed within the GAC, we have our own methodologies. But we also have some established practice at working more broadly across the entire ICANN community. And the term of reference we have for this is a -- is working in a working group type structure and a working group that we call a cross-community working group.

So what we have done is put out an invitation as our constructive contribution for the call for the work to be done to form a cross-community working group. This is in no way an attempt to undermine the work that you've heard of that of the coordination group or conflict with that of the coordination group. ICANN has a key mandate as you know from the NTIA to act as a facilitator and coordinator and also to recognize that there are stakeholders in this that go beyond the ICANN community. So, as I said, we have, just immediately prior to this meeting, put out what we would call a -- probably the correct word is something like a strawman charter, an initial very early draft charter for the work of this cross-community working group. And we expect to form then a drafting team that will come together and. Ideally, based on this strawman charter, but not necessarily so, build on that and create a charter which will then describe the scope and work of the working group.

And I should say that there are many -- you know, there are some good current examples of this cross-community work that has concluded with successful outcomes. So this is going to take hard work. It's no doubt a challenging prospect. And we do have some work to figure out exactly how it meshes in with the work of the coordination group, which is necessarily broader. But I think we are optimistic that we can make some good progress and pull together a very effective cross-community initiative. So I think that's the sort of high-level view of what we intend to do. And I'll hand over to Byron to provide perhaps some of his own thoughts and initial detail.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thank you, Jonathan and GAC colleagues, for welcoming us here. I think Jonathan has provided a good overview of what the intent is. I think it's probably also important to describe a little of how this came to be. And where this originally started to formulate was around discussions with the directly affected parties of the IANA functions. And just making sure that we had a voice that could feed into this process as the directly affected customers. And by that I mean the cc operators, the G registry operators, the root zone maintainer and actually some of the root operators.

And, when I say directly affected parties, of course, I'm speaking in and around the name space in particular.

So those parties came together and began the discussion of how can we ensure that the voice of the directly affected parties feeds in to the process, whatever that process may be, in an effective and meaningful and constructive way.

And that really became the genesis for discussions around a cross-community working group because, obviously, there are a number of parties just in that -- in those four communities.

But we determined that it would probably be beneficial to open it up to the broader SO/AC set of communities within ICANN. And to that end we have, actually, as Jonathan just mentioned, late last week sent invitations to the chairs of the SO/ACs to participate in this CCWG. And I think it's also important to note that we recognize that there are communities outside the ICANN environment who also need to be part of the entire process. And one example I'll give you where not only do we recognize it, we're actually working on it, is certainly within my community, the ccNSO, where we have 150 countries represented inside the ccNSO. And we represent the vast, vast majority of domain names in the global ecosystem. But, clearly, there are a number of countries that are not part of the ccNSO. So one of the responsibilities that we feel is to make that we reach out to those country code operators who are not part of the ccNSO, whether that's through the regional organizations who we're working with and who are key contributors to this process as well as ccTLD operators or managers who are not in the ccNSO nor a regional organization. And our intent is to make a concerted effort to reach out to those parties as well to make sure that they have an opportunity and, certainly, an awareness to participate in this process.

So that -- I think the genesis is important here, that it was really around the core directly affected parties making sure that those of us who interact daily with IANA, who receive the services of the IANA functions have an important and relevant voice in this discussion. But then also

making sure that the other SOs and ACs can participate in that discussion.

Hence, an open invitation to all the SO/AC chairs and beyond. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Many thanks to both of you for keeping us updated on this cross-community effort and pointing out to the GAC that you're seeking participation or contribution from this committee. We certainly haven't got to the point of reflecting on those questions with all the different activities underway currently in relation to these issues. But, nevertheless, this has, I think, been useful for us to understand fully what is in process here at ICANN.

Okay. So at this point I'd like to thank all the presenters for coming to brief us today. It's been enormously informative for us in trying to understand all the efforts and some of the interrelationships between them.

So now if I can ask that the GAC stay until 1:00, we will have to go over so that we can, hopefully, come to decision on some of the process aspects about how the GAC will participate and what are the expectations for the GAC to participate in those processes. Okay. So we'll just take a few moments to allow our presenters to step away. You have a question, Iran for one of the presenters.

IRAN: Yes, Madam Chair. I'm very sorry. Patrik in the last moment gave some explanation of the effectiveness of the group, the size of the group. And I fully understand that. Once you deal with a complex issue, you have a group. The larger the group, the more difficult to arrive at any conclusion, yes. However, that does not mean you compromise the rights of a constituent of that group. You put the finger on the GAC and the others. You have so many. And once you GAC, you minimize the number. So that is not acceptable. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you. Iran.

Okay. So thank you very much to all the presenters for coming this morning.

Okay. So for the GAC, we're on agenda item 5. There is an overview brief that you should have in hard copy that should help focus us in on the questions for the committee to consider at our meetings here in London.

So the brief notes that there is the IANA stewardship process as well as the enhancing accountability process. And then what I am seeking now are views from the GAC regarding the structures, objectives, and timelines proposed by ICANN. And we've had a sense of that via some of the questions that have been put to the presenters.

And then options for the GAC to provide input to both of these processes, noting that we would want to nominate people for both, potentially, both processes. And then how, in fact, we would want to do that in the GAC.

So if we start with the Coordination Group and the proposal we have there to have two appointed from the GAC, some options have been proposed regarding the GAC's participation. And I will just briefly go over those to help structure our discussion, and then I will ask for views on that.

So again, if we take the IANA transition coordinating group first.

So option one proposed is that the GAC Chair and one vice chair participate, and the vice chair position could rotate so that all participate through 2 September 2015.

A second option for discussion would be the GAC chair would participate supported by the GAC contact -- by a GAC contact group, so-called. And the contact group would self-nominate and work with the chair and GAC secretariat to ensure regular updates to input and from the broader GAC membership. And a third item is put forward for discussion, and that is two nominees to be selected by the GAC, in which ways we would need to agree on a process to put them in place and to select those nominees, and then to ensure that there is an understanding about the rules of engagement or the basis on which they would be participating and what are the expectations for them; for example, to come back and report to the GAC about what's happening or to seek views.

And so I think we need to be clear about how the mechanics of any nominations that we would put forward for participation in the Coordination Group.

So can I invite views on those options to get us started.

Brazil, please.

BRAZIL:

Thank you, Madam Chair.

Well, just to start with the discussion, I would -- we have in our contribution indicated our preference for the GAC itself to select its members.

We think the representatives should represent not their national position or group, regional positions, but the GAC as a whole to the extent possible, but those should be selected by the GAC.

In regard to a discussion we had before in regard to the number of representatives, and I'm -- I'd like to refer to one point that was raised by Patrik, and he asked us why do you want to have more than two members. I think this is an important question we should reflect upon.

In that regard, I would mention two reasons why we would recommend more than two representatives. First of all, it's governments. It is not in our, let's say, collective culture or operation to select two members for anything. Usually we act on the basis of regional groups which entail at least five representatives or four because that enables us -- we have mechanics to allow us to select members in that way. So this is one reason, practical reason.

The other is that as we look at the constellation of participants coming from the other group, we see from each one there is just one or two, but we have maybe three or four representing private sector, three or four representing technical community, three or four representing civil

society from different institutions. And the government representatives, as a stakeholder, is -- we are congregated in just one of those bullets. So I think this is an additional reason, because by having more representatives by GAC, we are not touching on the balance. We are, in a way, trying to address the issue that governments are in a single -- participate through a single channel, and the other stakeholders, they participate through multiple channels.

So I would point those two practical reasons why we could maybe argue for more members. The way of organizing ourselves for selecting members is facilitated by having -- being able to act on a regional basis. That would be one of the criteria. And the second is that by having more, we are in balance with the other stakeholders that are represented by more than one institution in contrast to governments.

So these would be my initial comments.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you very much, Brazil.

And I think you've touched upon an important point about how to capture some kind of diversity or to enable diversity geographically as well as in terms of views.

Okay. So next I have Switzerland and Norway, and I saw other hands. Okay. So I have Viet Nam, China, Italy, and Namibia. Great.

So next, please, Switzerland.

SWITZERLAND:

Thank you. We assume that it will probably be difficult in the GAC to have a consensus vision on this issue among the different member states, so we would also think that -- we have less strong feelings on -- we didn't have time to go into detail on one of these three proposed mechanisms, but what is very important is the full range of views of the GAC, and there will be quite a range of views, we imagine, is made sure that this is conveyed to the group or to those, in the end, developing a future model. So we need to find ways, and whether what Brazil has just proposed, enlarging the number of governmental representatives is something we should look into. Maybe there's others. But we should be confident that the full range of views of government is taken note of in this discussion.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you very much, Switzerland. And I would expect that governments will be able to comment directly to the Coordination Group in addition to any GAC views that we could put forward, and that could certainly include a range of views on a matter like this.

As well, I expect there will be a lot of interest in the accountability track of work where I think there's a lot of expertise in the GAC to contribute to that process as well.

So continuing through the list, I have Norway. Please.

NORWAY:

Yes, thank you, Chair.

I just also give sort of not given this much thought and so it's sort of preliminary comments on this, but we also very much agree with Brazil that representatives in this group should represent the GAC and, of course, not sort of the national governments. And that's very important.

Just also to comment your proposal on -- on representation of one option could be to have the GAC chair and vice chairs to represent. That also the GAC chair and vice chairs are elected by the GAC to represent the GAC, so that would then solve that representation issue.

To cover the diversity, of course one option could also be to ask for wider representation from the GAC into this group, and then, for example, the chair and the three vice chairs, so that you also capture the diversity which we already have in election of the vice chairs. So that's also another option that -- to consider. Ask for four.

But I think also, just that the points, it doesn't necessarily needed many representatives in this Coordination Group as long as we have the process of having possibilities to comment on documents and issues. So of course that's -- we have to weigh that against what processes we have available.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Norway.

Viet Nam, please.

VIET NAM:

Thank you, Madam Chair, dear colleagues.

So first of all, I would like to thank our colleague from China who asked question what is meant of Coordination Group. And the answer to me is very simple. Is to build proposal to submit to NTIA.

So what I'm thinking is that who we are? We are GAC. We are representatives of governments. So we need to speak the voice of government.

So we are here, GAC representatives. So we care about the benefit of our nation of government and our people. So to me there are three questions. The first question is that how this story -- I mean, the IANA transition -- so how this story will effect the Internet development, our countries.

The second question is that what is advantage of this advantage of the new model in comparison -- comparisons with the current model in (indiscernible) national securities.

And the third question is that what we -- what -- what we want the new model would be.

So we need to answer the first question, what we need. So we need to bring this answer, what we need and what our opinion, to the Coordination Group to contribute to the proposal.

So from my point of view, so in this case we don't need too many people. We need, I think, only few people, but they need to speak our voice. So my suggestion is that we need to form a group, working

group, to view our report on this matter and to clarify what we want, and the representative of GAC should be someone from this working group.

And of course we regular to ask from our GAC members to contribute to the report, and we clarify our need, and we contribute the proposal. I think it is one of good ways.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Viet Nam.

Next I have China, please.

CHINA:

Thank you, Madam Chair.

First, we support the proposal that more GAC representatives should be added to the Coordination Group to ensure the full and the diversity of opinions to be represented.

GAC should participate in the discussion of IANA transition as a whole. In fact, involvement of governments should be ensured.

Secondly, we also support the idea that setting up an IANA transition committee with the GAC proposed by some GAC members.

The security and stability of the operation of IANA function is highly related to public interest. So the government, as the protector of public

interest, whose opinion and advice should be respected and considered in the cooperation group.

Moreover, the participation of developing world in the process of IANA transition should be facilitated and ensured.

As for the enhancing ICANN accountability, we think the ICANN accountability and transparency is the basis on which ICANN should effectively perform the duty of coordinating Internet critical resources and the necessary process into globalization of ICANN. In this regard, we have three comments.

First is about the legitimacy. ICANN should establish a future-oriented accountability system with the core elements of root zone management in order to make it transform into a widely accepted organization by the international society, not serve a particular country or Internet group.

ICANN should carry out its activities in the scope of international law and the (indiscernible) by global community.

Second is about the transparency. ICANN should regard global public interest as its foundation to improve the government's framework and decision-making procedure, while acquiring trust by all governments and the Internet community, and safeguard the interest of global Internet users.

Third is about the inclusiveness. It's essential for ICANN to enhance the participation of developing countries and to promote the role of governments to improve its accountability. ICANN should respect each country in terms of public-policy making, law enforcement and jurisdiction and the culture diversity.

So we would like to cooperate with other governments and the global Internet communities on these issues.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, China.

Next I have Italy.

ITALY:

Thank you, Chair.

So looking at the coordinating group regarding the IANA transition, we have to -- I try to make as simple as possible in this sense. First of all, we knew that the regular number is two number to take part in the Coordination Group from the GAC. So first of all, I verify here that there is a sensitivity, high sensitivity on the IANA transition. This is a positive sign.

But we have also, each one of us, all the GAC members try to figure out how many resources, attention, time, and so on, is able to dedicate to this task. And so it is clear that the two persons that join the Coordination Group should take the task of dedicating not trivial amount of time to follow this group and then to inform the GAC as a whole on what's happening. And it is also clear that, if I take an example, let's say Brazil and Switzerland are the one that are joining the Coordination Group, they do not represent the states that they are coming from. They are sort of an interactive two persons for the whole GAC.

And if I take the example of the security and stability committee, they created a working group inside the security and stability committee. And so this is something that we might do even in the GAC. Verify how many members would like to participate in a working group, and then dedicate this time, attention, and so on, to follow and to create opinions. And so in this way, I agree with the observation from China that we should not limit to have only the two persons that are going into the Coordination Group.

But if we find that any delegates don't like to be out of this exchange of opinions and creating models for the IANA transition, then we could decide to insert into the discussion the whole GAC list. And this is something that it should not exclude anyone. And maybe those that are not interested or that don't have time, they will simply be passive. But in any way, they will have all the information that is needed.

So I encourage to go in one of these options that are quite easy.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Italy.

Namibia, please.

NAMIBIA: Thank you, Madam Chair.

The method -- and this is actually one of the pillars for the existence of the GAC, I think, because that is one of our core -- or sort of our core mandate.

I am of the view that actually we should take all three options and not only one. Interesting.

I like what Brazil said in terms of the representation and the level. I do think that GAC should actually nominate five people, five representatives, because it will also assist in terms of capacity building for GAC members, and especially, of course, from the developing world where I come from in Namibia, to be part of this coordination committee.

So geographical representation is essential and important, and, therefore, I think we can sort of have the chair and one co- -- or one nominee, but also sort of three others and report them to the -- to ICANN so that we can then increase the two to five eventually.

And of course we, the GAC contact group or the GAC committee that we intend to set up, I think that would be a critical vehicle for our input into the process.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Namibia.

Next I have Germany, please.

GERMANY: Yes, thank you, Madam Chair.

Like other colleagues, rather than giving a concrete proposal, would I ask, rather, questions.

One question is what do we really consider to be the mandate and function of the colleagues participating in these working groups? Are they really actively representing the GAC and negotiating on behalf of the GAC? From my point, that would be a bit difficult. Or is it the other way around: They are reporting, rather, to the GAC what happened in this group and so that the GAC can make up its mind and may come to a consensus advice in respect of this process. It would be another perspective. Their role would be a different one, and probably this would also lead to other consideration in respect who should participate.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Germany. Okay. I have Australia, next, please.

AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. Thanks to all these who have spoken before. It's always easy to come in towards at the end particularly after the intervention of my German colleague, because I was intending to make a very similar point. I don't have a particularly strong view about any number being better than the other in terms of the number of GAC representatives that would be participating in either group. But I think it's very important that we have clarity about what those

representatives would do and why. So I think thanks to Hubert for really emphasizing that point.

I quite like the suggestion following on from that that the role be one of information gathering and reporting back to the GAC or some subgroup of the GAC so that the GAC can then form a consensus view. I think we've talked about this kind of tension when the GAC participates in other processes. When the GAC, for example, has had liaisons to the GNSO, which was some time ago, I think it was particularly challenging for those GAC members to interact quickly and on a regular basis on behalf of the GAC without going back to the GAC and checking and so on.

But, at the same time, I think that has led to the issue with the GNSO where the GAC has become, potentially, in their view and the view of some others in the community, less effective in that we're not engaged. So I think we'll need to deal with that tension however we go forward. But I quite like the idea of this being an information gathering function reporting to the GAC to facilitate the GAC coming to this consensus, if possible. Although I hear -- I take the point from my Swiss colleague that coming to consensus on this may be a challenge, but -- thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Australia.

Next I have Japan.

JAPAN: Yes. Thank you, Chair. In addition to the consideration of the way of the GAC representing member, we think we should also consider the mechanism like making special working group or corresponding group in the GAC for selecting a GAC representing member to be able to collect and cover the GAC opinion and redirect them to the discussion of coordination group appropriate and flexibility. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Japan. I have U.K., then Canada, Thailand, Norway, and Iran.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. It's a long list. I'll try to be very brief. The point raised by Germany and Australia is very well taken. But I think we need to work out a formula which allows us agility to engage with the coordination group.

We can't just attend the coordination group and report back. I think we have to know the extent to which we can be contributing to the work of the group in situ, if you like, rather than simply in listening mode. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, U.K. Canada. Please.

CANADA: Thank you, Chair. I do -- I take note of many of the comments made about the effectiveness of the participation of GAC. And I do feel that coming forward with a consensus view of the GAC in this process will be

more effective if there are a number of diverging views that are brought forward. It's going to not be as powerful as if there is a more united view of the GAC on this group. Therefore, I do think there is a lot of merit in two aspects. One having the GAC group that would be providing information to the GAC as a whole and then also having the issues work through the GAC so that, by the time that we are participating in the coordination group, there is as much as possible a coordination of the views so we have more of a united approach.

And I do also take the points that it would be valuable to have one of the elected representatives of the GAC being in the position on the coordinating committee. And it would be sensible, I would think, at least to have the chair in that role. So three thoughts to have the elected representative, to have the GAC contact group as an information sharing mechanism, and also, as colleagues have pointed out, to have a working group to work through the issues so that we can come to a more consensus view. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Canada. Thailand, you're next, please.

THAILAND:

Thank you, Madam Chair. I also would like to echo Australia just mentioned. I don't have any strong will on the number of the GAC representatives that should be participates. But what we consider is a rule of procedure that has been stated. And until now I don't think that I have quite understand who and how the GAC could come up with these rules of procedures, of which working groups or who are working

on the rules and procedures for the representative that joined these two groups. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Thailand.

So I have three more speakers currently, Norway, Iran, and the Netherlands and Russia.

NORWAY: Thank you, Chair.

CHAIR DRYDEN: And Hungary -- just a moment, please. And Hungary. So, at this point, I don't hear a great deal of disagreement. It's more about getting clarity and fine tuning things. So there is clearly a need for engaging the committee fully. So I see some nodding, good. All right.

And, in terms of whether it's, in fact, the elected chair and vice chairs that are playing a role or whether we are seeking nominations, that's where I don't see complete clarity. So that's something I'd like to hear from the next speakers on, if we can. I think having a contact group -- I'm not hearing a strong view, but there seems to be quite a bit of openness to using some kind of contact group whether that is, in fact, the chair and vice chairs with additional support in a contact or working group or some other formulation. But I think if we can determine whether we're looking at using the chair and vice chairs or seeking nominations outside of that or even a combination of those two, that would help us come to some sort of decision on this. Okay. So I will

continue moving through the speaking order looking for better clarity on this. But it is clear that we need to be able to reflect the range of views that will exist in the GAC on this and engage the GAC fully. I think that's a point where we have agreement.

Okay. So I will continue. Next we have Norway, please. Thank you.

NORWAY:

Thank you, Chair. Sorry for interrupting you earlier on. Now, just also a brief comment on what Germany and Austria said. We think it's very clear that representative from the GAC cannot in any way represent other countries. So -- and that is the discussion we also had with liaisons to other communities earlier on. Also the discussion we had with the GAC chair's position at the board that you cannot vote on behalf of other countries so on. So we think this working group is a very good one. We have a working group in the GAC that bring forward views to you that you bring to this working group. So we would prefer that the solution that we use the chair and the vice chairs as our representatives in this committee. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you. Next I have Iran, please.

IRAN:

Thank you, Madam Chairman. First of all, I agree with Germany and some other colleagues that not no matter how we select or elect the members of this for the time being, quote, unquote, contact group, they have not been given the task to negotiate on behalf of GAC. They just

convey the views of GAC and back to GAC in order to have the final decisions.

I don't think that this is a transfer of responsibility for the entire GAC to a few people. But we have representations to convey the views of GAC and to defend those views in the group. For the time being I think that the issue that follows. First of all, all government members of GAC, government non-member GAC, they are free to contribute to the issue to the coordination group.

Point one. Point 2: Among the three options that are on the table, the second option, which is chair and contact group, seems to have more support. The issue is that how the member of the contact group is elected or selected or what is the composition of the contact group. One composition was saying that the three vice chairs. The other would be the representative of the regional groups. The other would be representative of the developing and developed and so on and so forth. But we should have -- we should avoid examples that we have recently - - I don't want to name. Unfortunately, half of the users were not represented in a particular event, unfortunately. And that is we have to avoid.

Finally, the two countries in one continent representing the entire government and they dominated all the decisions. We have to avoid that. I am sorry, I cannot go into further detail on that but that is the bad experience and bitter experience that we have.

So we should have better representations. In our view, regional representations, and these regional representations we can follow the examples that there is an ICANN bylaw for these regions, if there is no

other combinations. And then these grouped together with the chair with responsibility and accountability to fully consult the GAC on the matter, report back to GAC with the group, and take decision of GAC conveyed at a meeting and make this dialogue, could be something we should work out. What I suggest, Madam Chairman, we should not decide at this very moment. We need a little but more time to reflect to see various options that have proposed and perhaps to have another session of an hour or so to come to some sort of conclusion. It is very difficult to make a decision at this stage. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Iran. Next, I have the Netherlands.

NETHERLANDS: Thank you, Heather.

I want to concur with some remarks I've heard and introduce one new thing.

I would concur that at least, let's say, the leadership has regional -- they're elected and have regional diversity. So that's something which is -- that we have to take into account which you already have. It will be a lot more complex to choose a complete new election scheme.

Secondly, I would say that I have heard from several members -- I think Japan, Switzerland, Canada -- that we should have some kind of two-layered process. And the working group task force and some, let's say, between the ones who are attending the coordination group and the

GAC. Because there are a lot of proposals and ideas there that we should digest and analyze to give it to the GAC plenary.

The third point is more a concern. I think we -- proposals will come out of this coordination group which are not necessarily according to the view of the GAC because they will be made in consensus with other parties. So I think it's very important to have the possibility as a GAC to also evaluate on the final proposal or the interim proposals on this. And not, let's say, having the expectance of the constituencies outside the GAC that having GAC inside means that they agree with everything that happens in the coordination group. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you for those comments, Netherlands.

It seems to me that we -- once we have clarity ourselves, we can also communicate to the coordination group exactly the basis on which the GAC's representatives are participating. So these are all matters we can address in a straightforward way.

So next I have Russia, Hungary, and then Switzerland. And then I think we need to close this session and bring it back. Okay.

So Russia, please.

RUSSIA:

Thank you, Madam Chair.

Hello, everybody. Let me speak Russian. The coordination committee is being created without a charter, and that's how it's going to be created.

And so our participation requires some sort of a charter and rules to be defined. And so I'm hoping that our discussion of this issue will not stop here and that we will have another opportunity within the bounds of this conference to discuss this issue.

Number 2: Obviously, the involvement in the coordination committee must present the interests of all the countries. And so the most -- the best way would be to be sure that we have the chairman and the contact group that would formulate the opinions of the governments. That option would probably be a good compromise solution.

And the third point: The solution that we need to come up with by the end of the transitional period, that decision requires the involvement of not just ICANN and the ICANN community. It's not just for ICANN to decide. So here, from this point of view, GAC, if it's working just within ICANN -- GAC is then not a comprehensive representative of governments. Governments being stakeholders.

So I would like to suggest we think about this as well and to find some sort of a solution to ensure there is intergovernmental organization participation as well. There might be a need to create some sort of a liaison position and entrusted with doing some additional tasks. But, in any event, we need to make sure there is more representation of the governments. And it feels like the GAC does not have enough of a mandate to do that. Thank you very much.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you for that, Russia. Next I have Hungary, please.

HUNGARY:

Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm just reminding us the words from Vint Cerf who during NETmundial on this transition issue expressed his views saying make it simple and don't screw it up.

So I think we have made it clear that the representatives of the GAC in this coordination group is to convey a common position of the GAC and report back to the GAC. So that's as simple as that.

And it has been already said that there are natural candidates, elected officials. So I think we may come to some kind of compromise on that and get to the work.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Hungary. Switzerland, please.

SWITZERLAND:

Thank you, Madam Chair.

I was listening to the different suggestions made by my colleagues for ensuring the representation of GAC in the IANA transition coordination group. I believe that the exact number of representatives of the GAC in this coordination group is not worth matters the most. What matters the most is the fact of having trust as the GAC as a whole in these representatives who will have to speak on our behalf, who will convey the GAC views in this coordination group. I think this is the most important aspect. Because, if there is no trust, then the GAC in this -- representatives will continue to have problems and difficulties in order

to reach consensus and to convey a clear view from the GAC on the IANA stewardship transition. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

So, at this point, I think we can pause in this discussion. We will bring back a proposal based on the inputs we've had in this discussion to you. And we will find time to meet again, hopefully, to conclude not only on the process points we've discussed in relation to the stewardship coordination group, but as well the enhancing accountability track of work. So we might have time on the Wednesday morning, but we will confirm what time we will meet to discuss again. But, in the interim, we'll come back with a proposal that we hope finds some sort of balance and clarity based on the inputs we've had today. Okay? And Tom from the Secretariat would like to say something.

TOM DALE:

Yes. As Heather said, we will prepare a revised proposal taking into account the many comments and suggestions this morning.

Can I just make a particular request, though, that most of the comments that you have made relate to the IANA stewardship exercise and the proposed coordinating group. I just remind you that the briefing also covered the separate currently parallel process of enhancing ICANN accountability and the processes that are being proposed there are quite different at the moment to the coordinating group. So, if people have particular views or could develop any views you might have on the -- on possible GAC involvement in the ICANN accountability exercise, which is a little bit different, I'd appreciate that. And perhaps if you'd

like to convey those views to me as we prepare a revised proposal because we're trying to cover both committees or working groups or whatever that is. The IANA stewardship transition and the ICANN accountability exercise as well. That will be helpful. If you have any views, please let me know. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you for that. Just as a reminder to the GAC, the chair and vice chairs, we meet regularly throughout the week. So this is something that we'll be looking at and handling in those particular capacities in order to return a proposal to you.

So we will build on the views we've heard today and ensure that we are taking those into account to come back with a proposal on both those processes. Iran.

IRAN:

Yes, Madam Chairman, not to make the situation more difficult, I think among the three options for the accountability, perhaps the chair and the contact group is mentioned. So we should have the same thing. So, if we agree on the composition of the contact group, we could apply for both cases. So I think that is a -- in the meantime, people who have discussed or who have commented may get together informally and try to exchange some views in -- with a view that giving something to the Secretariat, one or two options, how the compositions of the contact group be established. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Iran. Okay.

So please be in the room at 2:00 when we restart our sessions this afternoon. Have a good lunch. Lebanon, you are asking to speak.

LEBANON: I think 45 minutes for lunch is going to be extremely short. Let's be reasonable, please. Nobody's going to be here by 2:00. Sorry.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Okay. So we will see some of you at 2:00. Thank you.

(Lunch break)