SINGAPORE – GAC Sessions AM
Thursday, February 12, 2015 – 08:45 to 12:30
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:	Well, hello. And good morning, everybody. Thanks for showing up. Actually, we realized this morning that we have a big problem with the communique which we didn't see last night. And the question was, like, how do we get around that problem without not telling and so on and so forth. But then I thought, well, actually, we can just be honest and tell it and fix it together with you.
	We forgot to thank our vice chairs in the communique. And this is something that should not happen. So we would like to ask you for permission to put a sentence in thanking the vice chairs with the names and so on and hope that you agree with this and pardon us for that omission last night. Any objections or comments? Because they are -- the outgoing vice chairs, of course. The other ones, including myself, just need to prove that they are up to the work.
	So we would add one line or two or three or four, or five, but the vice chairs and thank them for their excellent work. Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you, Peter. Thank you, Tracy.
	And, after this shock, I give the floor to Tom.
TOM DALE:	Thank you, Thomas. Good morning, everybody. This morning we have a number of things to feed into what was the announced agenda. So what we're proposing to do is deal, firstly, with issues very briefly

around the review of the GAC Web site and GAC travel support. At 9:30 ICANN staff -- sorry -- there's a lot of activity here at the table. It's very distracting. But that's okay.

At 9:30 ICANN staff dealing with the new meeting structure will be here to talk to us about what that means in practice. That's the new way that ICANN will organize its meetings from 2016, which is not very far away. And there is some briefing on that from ACIG as well.

At 10:00, we will have half an hour's discussion led by Sweden concerning the way forward on the GAC open forum concept. There will be a break. And then it's proposed that there will be a discussion on the way to finalize the way forward on the GAC operating principles straight after the break.

Then at 11:30 we have some more visitors to the GAC. The visitors are the ones that the GAC has asked for several times from the ICANN compliance team to talk to us about contractual compliance activities.

And then, finally, Architelos will be here at the end of the session at midday just to provide a briefing on several aspects of new gTLDs including abuse industries and some industry analysis there that members have expressed an interest in. So that's the morning. Thank you, Thomas.

And I guess the first issue is the Web site review. Is that right? That's Tracy and Michelle, I believe.

TRACY HACKSHAW:	Good morning, everyone. I'll be very brief. I remember the survey that went out to GAC members to do the Web site review and thank you for your participation. Michelle will give us a run through. And what I wanted to say pretty much was that this is an opportunity for you as GAC members who have asked several times for the Web site to be redesigned, revamped, reengineered, so forth. If you don't give your feedback or play a part in the process, then it will be redeveloped without that input. So this is a plea going out to each one of you for the concerns that you've expressed, you've expressed some in this meeting, expressed in previous meetings, please document and email them to the secretariat to the GAC list wherever you see fit. Actually, the secretariat is copied. And those recommendations will go into the input into the project.

Just as a quick summary of what's going to happen, the thinking is that the Web site will serve you as GAC members and serve you in your various roles. So think about the roles that you have as a GAC member, whether you are a newcomer, an expert in the area, technical area, policy, and so on. And think about the things that you like to see when you're looking at the Web site in those areas.

My preference on the Web site is you must find the consent within five seconds of when you get there. So I want to use that as a principle.

With that, I'll hand over to Michelle to give you a brief overview of what's going to happen next. Thank you.

ICANN|52
Singapore

EN

MICHELLE SCOTT-TUCKER: Thank you, Tracy. The final report of the GAC Web site review, a copy that's been provided to all of you. I'm not going to walk through each of the recommendations in detail. But, if we could go to the next slide, I'll just walk through the first one. Because from that recommendation, all our other activities flow.

And, basically, the recommendation is to move -- to renew the Web site and move it to a more appropriate technology platform.

The ICANN staff and I have been in consultation with the ICANN technical staff who couldn't be more helpful. They're going to work with us throughout this year on reworking the Web site starting -- building it again from scratch with your input and with your expertise. In fact, they're so helpful that they're paying for it, which is very kind of them, I think. And that's in the budget. We're on their priority list. As I said, that made everything very easy for us.

If we work through to the next slide, ACIG is going to lead this process. But we'll be working closely with the ICANN support team, with the ICANN technical staff, and with you

More importantly, with you. It's your Web site. So tell us what you need. We'll be coming to you for information. We'll be coming to you to get your recommendations. We'll be working closely with you to make sure that this Web site meets your requirements.

If you go through to the next one, next slide, please.

We had developed a set of outcomes and objectives for the Web site. They're at a very high level. The reason we've got those is really so that, in a year or two when the Web site is up -- and we're expecting the new

ICANN | 52
Singapore

Web site to be up next year -- we can go back and then review the new Web site against some clear outcomes and objectives to see if the Web site is actually achieving for it to set out to achieve.

Next slide, please. They're are just some more ongoing working activities. The existing Web site will stay up, of course. And we're not going to let that lapse. Or we will continue to improve the existing Web site because we'll be using that for the next year or 18 months. So we'll be continuing to improve that Web site, continuing to add more information to that Web site. It's quite possible that the two might have to run in parallel while the new one is becoming established. So we'll be continuing to use that functionality. All of ICANN SO and ACs are looking at new and better tools for working intersessionally and working collaboratively. And we'll be part of that process as well in making sure that GAC gets some online tools that will enable us to work more effectively intersessionally as well. And, of course, they'll be integrated into our existing Web site.

Next slide, please.

Tracy has very kindly agreed to be the lead for this project. He's got a technical background. He's the chief technology officer for his country. I think he's an ideal person to lead this. And he's already well-known by the ICANN technical team as well. So, if you have any issues, comments, suggestions, please feel free to talk to Tracy, talk to me, talk to the ICANN GAC support staff. We're all here to help, really.

The existing content on the Web site will be transferred to the new Web site. Not holus-bolus, but will be there. I think the new Web site also has to exist as an archive of secretariat and of GAC materials. So, for

ICANN | 52
Singapore

instance, already on the Web site is all the communiques from the very first GAC meeting. That sort of information will continue to be there. And we'll endeavor to make that much easier to access.

Next slide, please. This is the technical things that we need to comply with. And I must say that ensuring IPv6 specification is part of my contract as well. So I will be making sure that that is certainly the case. I've got some skin in that game.

The GAC register advice is also part of the existing GAC Web site. And there's a wider project going on to look at board advice throughout ICANN and setting up a new system for making that easier to access and follow where that's at as well. So we're part of that ongoing project. And that will end up integrating with our Web site as well. But that's got a slightly longer time frame. So I'm hoping that our new Web site will be up next year. And the new GAC register advice should be operational, I hope, the year after.

I think there's one more slide to make sure that we can use the Web site on a variety of devices and bandwidths. Because, of course, we're all from around the world. We're all using different ways of accessing the web. So we'll make sure that everyone can access it. And, of course, we're from government. So we need to make sure that we're setting the bar pretty high when it comes to ensuring accessibility to our Web site for people who might not be able to access the Web site in a general way.

So that's just a very brief overview. I guess all I'm seeking from you today is any feedback, any suggestions. But, basically, I'm hoping for

your general endorsement to move forward on this review, this revamp of the GAC Web site. Thanks.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Michelle and Tracy.

Any comments or questions directly to them, if you want. Thailand.

THAILAND: Thank you, Chair.   I just want to check whether the space is still available or it will be totally new for the new Web site.

Because you have the space for the member as well, right?

MICHELLE SCOTT-TUCKER: Yes. We are going to be creating a totally new Web site. It will probably have, as we currently have set up, publicly available part and a members only part.

We won't migrate to the new Web site. We will still have the old Web site in existence before we migrate to the new Web site. There won't be a gap between the two. So for the next year or so we'll use the old -- existing Web site with its public part and members only part. And, when the new Web site is absolutely ready to go, we will then migrate to the new one. But we'll probably run the two in parallel for a little while to make sure there are no gaps.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

TRACY HACKSHAW:	Just to reiterate, the content will be migrated as well. So the existing historical content will move across the new Web site, so it won't be lost.

THAILAND:	The other question is that for the member part? Would it be possible to have a geographical distribution? Because when you have the alphabetic order, so it's rather difficult to see which countries belongs to which geographical area. Thank you.

MICHELLE SCOTT-TUCKER:	We'll certainly look at that, and we'll look at doing that on the current Web site, too.

TRACY HACKSHAW:	Jamaica.

| JAMAICA: | Thank you. I have a question. It might have been said before, but I perhaps would have missed it. What's the significance or the rationale for revamping the Web site? And is it purely a matter of the aesthetics? Is it just about look and feel or are there underlying content issues which we're seeking to perhaps make a little better moving forward?

Also, is there a specific timeline on when we can expect the new Web site to be ready?

Thank you. |
|---|---|

ICANN | 52
Singapore

MICHELLE SCOTT-TUCKER: Some of the reasons for revamping the Web site are because the current technology that we use, it's set up on a Wiki, is no longer supported by ICANN. So they're very keen to move us to a new technology platform that they can fully support.

Also, I did a survey of GAC staff and other -- sorry, of GAC members and of other users of the GAC Web site, and the results of that survey were pretty clear that people are finding the existing Web site difficult in terms of finding the information and finding the right information quickly.

Aesthetics is a minor issue, but they weren't that happy with the way the Web site looked either.

So the revamp is largely for technical reasons so I can fully support it, but also so that GAC members can use a new Web site more efficiently and effectively to do their work properly.

In terms of timeline, we're only at the very beginning of the process, so the technical people were loathe to give me any dates at this stage, but we're certainly hoping to have a new Web site up and running and fully functional next year. That's our plan.

TRACY HACKSHAW: And just to reiterate for those who came in late, all these comments and recommendations, please document them, send them in to us so we can have that information.

If you want to recommend content architecture, feel free to send it in. You want to recommend a (indiscernible) geographic distribution,

ICANN | 52
Singapore

please document it and send it in so we capture all that feedback and have it pooled together for discussion with the ICANN staff team.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. One of the next items on our agenda is the issue of travel support. And since Olga is not here, who has, together with others, taken care of this, I'd maybe like to ask Olof to keep us updated about where we are and where we plan to go. Given that the GAC is increasing in numbers, we also plan to increase -- ask ICANN for increased travel support.

Thank you.

OLOF NORDLING: Thank you, Thomas. And, well, currently, the -- since two years, we have travel support for 30 GAC members or individuals per ICANN meeting. So all in all, 90 slots, if you like, over a year.

This has been unchanged since two years ago, and in the meantime, the GAC membership has increased by 20%. So first of all, it seems reasonable to ask for, because this is a procedure where we usually have so-called community request, budget requests, which are due to be filed by the end of February. So we're preparing for that.

We're actually just considering what number to put in, in number of supported travelers per ICANN meeting for the GAC's account.

Out of the 30, currently five are dedicated to observers, particular category, from those reasons that really need travel support.

And so the overall figure is 30. Addition of 20% of the members, of course, as membership increases, it's a higher and higher percentage that come from developing economies. So that we should take into account as well. But 20% out of 30 per meeting. Well, that's 6. So that would perhaps be minimum to be requested. But we should perhaps also mention that there has been a meeting between the GAC leadership and ICANN leadership where much higher figures were mentioned.

So it's perfectly possible to make a request for ten more per meeting or even 20.

That remains to be seen where we end up in the final budget, but perhaps this is something to -- first of all, to be discussed with the GAC membership.

So any questions or suggestions in that regard?

Trinidad and Tobago, please.

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO: Thank you, Olof. And this initiative is something that I, as one of the vice chairs, was involved in.

As you may be aware, the membership increase, if you do a stats workout, kind of coincides with the increase in travel support. And what's been happening, and I think Olof didn't mention it, is that we've

had to reject members who have requested travel support and that's not helpful.

So in some cases, as many as five, as many as ten countries cannot get support as requested, and some of those countries are developing countries who are really in need.

So what we're recommending is something very important to the ICANN Board, that at least ten more, perhaps even more than ten, spots be allocated. And we would really like your support in that.

I'm very willing to continue helping with the initiative if that's something that the GAC wants.

 The issue for us is that many of the countries, small island states, the less developed countries, especially in Africa, the Pacific, don't even know about the GAC, but travel support help them justify their ability to come to the meeting, to their governments, and at least come to one meeting and then perhaps get funding or continue getting support.

So it's very important that we bring more members in. I think we are 150 now. And if you look at the (indiscernible) slots in 150, and 25 of those being countries, it's quite a small figure. So we're looking to increase that as far as possible. So we're looking for your support in that.

Thank you.

OLOF NORDLING: So I think we have Peru and then Indonesia. And Morocco.

PERU: I would like to speak in Spanish, please.

I think it's important and necessary to increase the travel support. But additionally, I think we should start using a criteria not only based on developing countries or developing economies but a geographical diversity.

The meeting is being held, as in this case, in Singapore. So the countries that are very far away, and I'm speaking about South American countries, it's more difficult to participate in this case. In this case it was Brazil, Argentina, and Peru present, and Colombia, I think, if I recall well. But lots of Latin American countries are not present because they have asked for travel support, if I understood correctly. And I know there's a limitation.

So I think that this is another criteria that we may use in the next meeting. The next meeting will be held in Buenos Aires, so no Latin American countries may receive travel support because they are quite close to the area because we are in the same region. And perhaps the Asia-Pacific or the African countries could receive more support.

So I think this is a set of criteria that may be used for future meetings.

OLOF NORDLING: I have Indonesia, please.

INDONESIA: Thank you, Olof. I just want to clarify the support that you got for us is for 30 people or a particular U.S. dollar travel cost, because that will be much different, you see. Just, for example, when the meeting ,this 52,

ICANN | 52
Singapore

will be in Marrakech, I was getting an email whether we need travel support. And I was thinking perhaps I will apply for travel support. But then it was in Singapore, so we do not need.

So I just want to clarify for you.

Thank you.

OLOF NORDLING: Thank you, Indonesia. And perhaps I should make some quick answers.

First of all, to Indonesia's question, well, what a budgeting amount is. We have a bucket kind of budgeting when we do it, but it's -- and it's an internal matter for -- we count as an average, which means that once we've decided that, okay, these are for a certain number of slots, well, the actual amount can differ from the average, and quite considerably depending on the distance for those travelers that have -- that are receiving support.

So it's not a budgeted amount as such, other than a bucket with an average. And then we live with the difference that may occur in practice due to this, that, and the other reason in real life. So it's -- what we do is we count and do the budgeting on the number of individuals. And then we transform that into the ICANN internal budget with an average number. And overall, counting all the travel support within ICANN, we have to adapt from year to year a little bit, but usually it's -- it works out quite fine. Even though the individual differences in costs may be considerable.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

And that brings me to Peru's suggestion really that those are the farthest away to be considered as an additional category to be taken into account when deciding who should get it. And Trinidad and Tobago has said well, actually we shouldn't be in the situation where we have to reject qualified requests for travel support, and perhaps -- so it's two sides of the same coin, in a certain sense. If we have to prioritize, first of all, we come to the criteria in the GAC travel support rules which are principally based on the development stage of the economies. Secondly, also will be the category of small island states as well. But we don't have the distance to the actual meeting included as a category. So whether that can be done as an interpretation by the selection team, which is basically the ICANN leadership, or whether we do need to modify the travel support rules, well, that's something to reflect upon as well. So just as a few reactions, and I see that Peru would like the floor again, but before then, we have Morocco, please.

MOROCCO: Thank very much. I will speak in French.

Good morning, colleagues. I would like to thank ICANN for showing us these figures because this shows the importance that ICANN gives to the number of membership in GAC so that we may have a lot of participation. The increase in the membership of GAC has been already shown. So Olof, you've mentioned a figure, but I would like to know if we consider the high-level meetings or the budget is set aside for this meeting considering that we have high-level meetings every two years, based on the recommendation given at the beginning of the week. Thank you very much.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

OLOF NORDLING: Thank you, Morocco. (Speaking in non-English language.). For high-level governmental meeting you may recall that at last high-level meeting, which was in London, the GAC made a request in the middle of the fiscal year for 30 additional travel support slots. We intend to anticipate on that from the ICANN side rather than having a last-minute preparation of that nature, so there will most likely then be a -- a separate travel support request. But we do it then before the beginning of the fiscal year which starts on the 1st of July this year. So yes indeed, that's a separate. We don't count that here, and I don't think we should sort of mix the two bags. The additional travel support for the high-level governmental meeting is -- well, deserves to be handled in the context of the high-level meeting itself. But that's foreseen. And I think we've got China and Trinidad and Tobago in the queue, and I see that we approach a critical point in time when the ICANN travel support -- ICANN meeting staff will come and brief us about the planned changes in the meeting structure. So China, please.

CHINA: Thank you. And we would like to echo the comments made by Trinidad and Tobago and also Peru that we think that providing the travel support for the -- for the eligible countries to important policymaking meetings is quite a common practice for many international organizations as a very important measure to ensure that the present -- the representative of the meeting to improve the participation, particularly from the -- the different countries which is quite a burden for them to travel internationally. With -- and I think the common practice of other organizations that we have some very clear criterias which countries could be eligible for this kind of support. And normally

this support is based -- this criterias is based on the like -- like the U.N. defined, like, the categories which if the resource is abundant as you have lack of support for other countries that the per capita GDP is below the amount of the -- set amount which considered as different countries and sometimes they provide it to the least developed countries. So it's more or less depend on the -- on the resource that is available.

And as for the -- as for the ICANN's case -- the GAC's case, we think we have two comments on this travel support scheme. We think that firstly we should consider to -- firstly, we agree that we should not -- if the -- the budget is enough, we should not -- to limit the number of the people that can use -- or the -- or the number of the people -- or the countries that can -- can get the support and we should not to -- and we should not to retract the qualified -- the plans.

And secondly, we think that the geography of the representative is also very important. So we have to try first to have -- to have this support is more balanced in the geographic distributions. And also we -- another proposal from us that we might have to consider some is it possible for GAC to convene some regional coordination meetings in the future. Thank you.

OLOF NORDLING: Thank you, China. And well, a quick comment on that from my side. And I'm not in the position to change the way that -- that ICANN plans its travel support, but we can change the numbers, as I say, that we request for travelers. When it comes to the criteria, I think we're very well served to a large degree with the current travel policy that we have

on the GAC Web site which goes into quite considerable detail. And I think Trinidad and Tobago has asked for the floor, and perhaps Trinidad and Tobago, you can fill out in that. And we also have the Dominican Republic, but we have to close -- yeah, Peru, and then we have to close the queue and make -- come to some kind of conclusion, please.

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO: Thank you, Olof. Just two quick clarifications. Olaf indicates about the budget versus the numbers. It's a use it or lose it policy. So if we don't use all the numbers, you don't get the rest of the budget. So that's how it works currently.

So 30 members, if you have 25 applications, the 25 applications will go through and the 5 don't go anywhere. Doesn't move across to the next meeting or anything like that. So the request would be to go for more -- more slots, not for more budget per se. And the budget will work itself out from that point of view. I think that's the way to do it on the geographic issue. What I support what Peru is saying. The issue though is, we don't want to change the intent of the GAC based on the region you're going to. So if you have an African meeting and you say the Africans can't get support, as an example, then it's possible the Africans won't come to the meeting in Africa, and that's not something we want to see happening. Latin America similarly.

So I think the approach we should take really is get absolute -- an absolute increase in support and the geographic issue should be dealt with through that ideally. Thank you.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

EN

OLOF NORDLING: Thank you. And Dominican Republic, please.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC: Dominican Republic speaking. Thank you very much, and good morning, everybody. I'm going to speak in Spanish.

I would like to thank you for the useful information you've provided. Certainly we were not aware of this possibility of receiving this type of support. We perhaps have received information, but we are overloaded with information. So on that basis, I'm thinking that -- and if the information has been circulated, I apologize for what I'm going to say, but it's important that among GAC members we may receive more information and more information is circulated about the travel support criteria. I certainly concur with the proposal made by Peru. I think it's a fair proposal. So as to have this balance among regions, depending upon where the meeting -- the next meeting is to be held. So perhaps the information is there, it's clear that sometimes it's not so clear or not evident for us where to find that information. And that's another point to be improved.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Looking at the time, we will have to wrap up because we have the ICANN meetings team here that will inform us about the meeting strategy that as you know may or will affect the way we work as well and we need to do some thinking on how we organize ourselves best in the new structures. I would like to ask colleagues from the meeting to come up here. Thank you.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

NICK TOMASSO: Good morning, everyone, and good day to everyone participating remotely. I'm Nick Tomasso, VP of meetings for ICANN. And we're here to talk to you as Thomas has mentioned about the new ICANN meetings strategy and how we'll begin to implement the plan that was developed by a community-led committee called the meeting strategy working group beginning in calendar year 2016 beginning with the March 2016 meeting.

I have a number of colleagues here, Tanzanica King to my right who's on the meetings team and is responsible for the strategy, and of course Sebastien Bachollet who was the board member at the time who chaired the committee and led the group discussion for about two years. I see Ana Neves here in the room who was on the -- on the meeting strategy working group and helped to design what you're about to see now. So with that, I will turn the meeting over to Tanzanica King to give you the briefing and certainly ask her any questions you may have after we have done that.

TANZANICA KING: And I'm actually going to turn to Sebastien and ask him to share with us the guiding principles that were used to create the new meeting strategy. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: If you allow me, I'm going to speak in French because obviously you have all the tools available for us to speak in these languages. Suzanne was also part of the working group. Thank you so much for your help.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

Who else? We have a third member, you were here, right, with us.
Thank you. Thank you all for your collaboration in this group.

Can we move on to the next slide, please? So we worked based on a
number of guiding principles in order to try come up with a new
strategy. Let me remind you that the meetings structure did not change
over the last few years. There were several attempts to change them.
So we hope that with this new strategy we have successful resource.
I'm not going to take much of your time speaking about the guiding
principles because I want to have enough time to explain to you that
our idea here was to ensure that we have sufficient face-to-face time
for in the ICANN meetings of the different -- with the different bodies.
Also for the different groups to be able to work within their own groups
and also between and among groups.

The fact of having geographic balance was also an important principle,
so every region will host a meeting and then we have the second
meeting which we will call meeting B, and we are going to have a
certain meeting design that will enable us to accommodate more
constituencies and more participants.

The ICANN has grown and it has an increasing role in terms of the
Internet governance. Thank you for listening to me. Now I give you
back the floor.

TANZANICA KING: ... starting with meeting A, the first meeting of the year. This is very
similar to what we do now, six-day meeting. The big difference here is
we've got a public forum that's split into two. The reason for that is a

recommendation that we try to get information to the Board earlier in the week so that some action or addressing issues that are brought up can be taken care of possibly before the public forum at the end of the week. Go to the next slide, please.

Meeting C, which we're talking about before B on purpose, is the third meeting in the annual cycle. It is a seven-day meeting. We have it broken down, as you see here, with intra- and intercommunity work which before you ask I will try to explain. Intracommunity work is the work that you do amongst yourselves. Intercommunity work is when you're going out and meeting with the different groups. So cross community meetings. Cross constituency. Excuse me. This meeting is also planned to be scheduled in such a way where some people could decide to not attend the entire meeting. So you wouldn't have to do the full seven days. This also has the split public forum of the annual general meeting, high interest topics, opening session, all of that would happen here. Please go to the next slide.

Meeting B. Meeting B is four days. We have three days focused on the work that you need to do that is not interrupted by a welcome or a public forum or high interest topics which is the intention here, to give you all of this time to do your work.

We're starting with one day of outreach. That is not yet defined. Just to make that clear, we still need to work that out with you and with all the groups to figure out what outreach will look like at these meetings.

And then we've got intra-community work happening, two full days of that and inter-community at the end of the week.

Next slide, please.

Nick will go over the geographical rotation.

NICK TOMASSO: As we thought about the three different meeting types and we thought about the geographic rotation of those meetings and we thought about those organizations and countries who have wanted to host an ICANN meeting in the past but have been unable to just because of the sheer size of the facilities that we need, we thought that we would focus meeting B attention on Africa and Latin America so that we can, as I just said, go to places that have wanted to host but have been unable to in the past. It increases our geographic reach. It is -- and as you saw, we have a day of outreach for these meetings. And it's most appropriate to do those -- that outreach in locations where we just haven't had a big presence in the past and engaged a new community in the ICANN model.

So what you're looking at is a 5-year rotation of ICANN meetings. And you can see there's an equitable distribution of meetings across all five geographies. And you can see the meeting type that is going to be in each of those -- in each of those regions. And, even though I said we're going to focus meeting B on Africa and Latin America, we still have a meeting A in Africa as well as Latin America as we roll this out and fully acknowledging that there are large meeting facilities in those two geographies as well.

So the design, the meeting strategy working group was particularly focused on this model of equitable distribution of ICANN meeting rotation.

Thank you.

TANZANICA KING: So our next steps, which you're already witnessing here, some of them, we're developing logistical requirements for all of the three meeting types, for all of our space needs and all the other logistics. We're developing requirements for the three different meeting formats, ways to engage with local hosts. We're developing those outreach programs, as I mentioned before, that we need to work with you and other groups to figure out what that really will look like.

And we are collaborating with ICANN SOs and ACs for scheduling all the three meetings. So we're going to really be looking for input to find out what you want to do with the time in the meetings. We're creating an outline and a big block. But we need you to let us know what you want to do with the time, what makes the most sense for you.

Go to the next slide, please.

This, again, is just talking about the collaboration we want to do, face-to-face meetings, which we're doing right here. And we will be doing webinars, scheduling calls as needed, providing you as much information as we move through the process as to what these meetings will look like.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

And I think our last slide is just the different resources. I won't read through the Web sites here.

But that concludes the slides and leaves us some time for questions.

NICK TOMASSO: Manal, yes.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Nick. And thank you all for your efforts and for our colleagues also who have contributed to this.

I just want to seek clarification on the geographic rotation again. Sorry I missed this part. So is it the meeting B is going to be fixed either Latin America or Africa? Or is this an option if -- because we also are looking into the high-level meeting, the hosting of a high-level meeting, which probably would be taking place either in meeting A or C probably. So -- and I was just seeking clarification whether the rotation -- the geographic rotation would again allow the high-level meeting to take place in all different regions. Thank you.

NICK TOMASSO: We have created the schedule, the geographic rotation and the date and space on the recommendations of the meeting strategy working group. The dates, of course, come from our work in making sure that we don't conflict with other like conferences, Internet conferences that take place. I think that we need to be flexible in how we approach the geographic rotation. The meeting strategy working group was very specific that it was going to allow staff to make the best decisions as to

ICANN | 52
Singapore

the geographic rotation just so long as we committed to an equitable rotation through the geographies. So that is my goal. These geographic rotations all to be determined. And, when there's a need for high-level government meeting in Africa, or in perhaps in Egypt, specifically, then we will maneuver to make sure that we accommodate the needs. But what we have now, we had to put a stake in the ground someplace. And we know -- for instance, we know that Egypt can host a large ICANN meeting because of the facilities that you have there.

So we'll have to take that in consideration as we move forward.

SPAIN: Thank you for the presentation. I want to ask two questions. First of all, regarding GAC meetings, we tend to hold larger meetings than the rest of the community. We start on Saturday, and we finish on Thursday. Should the GAC need to have more meeting days when the meeting B takes place, could that be possible? This is the first question.

The second one concerns the facilities. Could the requirements for the facilities -- the facilities change depending on the kind of meeting that it's going to take place? Or could the requirements for the facilities would remain the same regardless of the kind of meeting that is going to take place? Thank you.

NICK TOMASSO: I'm going to answer your second question, which is easier, first. We'll select the facilities based on the requirements of the meeting. So, specifically, for meeting B, we will assume that our facility requirements will be smaller, which allows us to rotate through places who have not

ICANN | 52
Singapore

been able to host before. That doesn't mean that you won't have this kind of arrangement and what you need in every location that you go.

But what it means is that we don't need a large main meeting room. We won't have a public forum. We won't have an opening ceremony. We won't need a large sponsor area like we have here. So it gives us to modify our requirements from meeting to meeting to meeting and then pick the appropriate facilities based on that.

I hope that answers your question.

And then your first question was: Is there an opportunity to increase the number of days for meeting B? And the basic answer for that is no. Never say never, right? But the design is that you fit your meetings into those days.

Now, I think what's important to note is that there are no conflicting areas -- there are no high-level -- high-interest topics that you would feel compelled to go to. There's no board meeting. There's no opening ceremony. There's no public forum.

So you really have full use of those four days to accomplish your work.

And, as we look at the number of days that you meet now and what we're making available for meeting B without all of the other influences, we suspect that's enough. If that's not the case, please let me know.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Trinidad and Tobago. Thank you.

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO: Hi. I just want to remind for GAC to recall that a paper was circulated in L.A. by the secretariat on the possible options that the GAC could look at and the impact that they have on the GAC and its meetings. So maybe I could ask Egypt to recall what they said, and perhaps Portugal or U.S. will have any further feedback on what's happening. Thank you.

MICHELLE SCOTT-TUCKER: Thanks, Tracy. That paper, which I'll circulate to you again after this session, provided you with some suggestions to think about.

Do we need to produce a communique at every meeting? Do we need to meet with the Board at every meeting? We currently meet for a total of four days. We spread that over more days than four; but in total the amount of time that we meet in this room is four days with one extra day, the Monday, where we work externally with community.

Can we spread that differently? These are the sorts of things you really need to think about and come back with some options.

So perhaps we meet in -- meet and talk to each other for three days. Maybe one of those days we could have the community groups come and meet with us. These are the sorts of perhaps radical options that you need to think about and think about how you're going to work.

Perhaps at meeting B, we don't have a plenary session at all. It's just the working groups coming together to work and progress their issues.

I'm not saying we should or could do any of these. I'm just suggesting some ideas for you to think about.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Sweden. Indonesia. Sorry. U.S., Indonesia, and Sweden, please.

UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. And thank you to Nick and Tanzie for coming in and updating us. I think it's been a useful exchange. Thank you, Tracy, for reminding us that ACIG has done an excellent briefer and has put some questions out that we as GAC really need to consider. So, Chair, you might want to impose a deadline on us for responding to some of those questions.

One thing I did want to sort of endorse -- fully endorse is the concept in terms of outreach. I guess to our minds in the United States we could use this very usefully -- we, the GAC -- that it would be one of our regional -- whatever region we are in, that could be a GAC capacity building. That could be a further outreach to draw more members from that region into the GAC and to have a really sort of focused session, which we have tried to do on occasion. But, if we could coordinate fully with the global stakeholder engagement group, I think we sort of match up the objectives.

I think you've put it very well, Michelle, that we could either do working groups ourselves. Or, pending agreement from the other parts of the community, this is when all of these cross-community -- the increasing number of cross-community working groups could actually have their meeting. So thanks for the refresher. I think we do need to make some decisions. I just don't know by when. So I will leave the deadlines to you all. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, U.S. And thank you for hinting at the deadlines. We'll sort that out. Indonesia.

INDONESIA: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I just want to ask how to accommodate so many big activities related to Internet governance across the world. Some of them -- the day before yesterday, the GAC secretariat, Olof, sent an email related to Internet governance. And you can see in that -- his email you have the CSTD. You have the IGF, the MAG. You have the ITU. You have already set up two groups of Internet governance in -- that's what I read in his -- in Olof's email. And those are groups where each country can have to come to listen, to work together with them. And then, when we get back to our country, we will have to implement some of them, especially in a group where we are tightly connected with them like the ITU working group, for example. Because, if it is agreed in the ITU council and agreed in the plenipotentiary, we can do it at home.

Now, how can we here at GAC ICANN can accommodate all this input? Because most of the meeting strategy working group that was presented, mostly are related to SOs and ACs.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Would you like to answer the question? Well, I think, there's a lot going on all over the place. And we somehow need to digest this. But I think it's also up to the GAC members themselves to feed in and, as we discussed, to coordinate and build bridges between these different

ICANN | 52
Singapore

organizations. So we won't be able -- we won't have less meetings probably. But rather more. Sweden.

SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair.

I think the GAC is moving in the right direction. This would be another move in the right direction, I think. I don't know how my colleagues feel. But I would personally look forward to not having to meet over a weekend, at least on the B meetings. So I think that's good.

Perhaps the C meeting would be frightfully busy for the GAC. It's quite possible. But the GAC will adapt. We'll find a rhythm of the ICANN meetings and adapt to it.

And I have my hopes highest, actually, for the B meeting for having more interaction within the GAC as well, working more focused, maybe to do social GAC things as well. I think we should be permitted to do that and not only socialize with, you know -- we need to socialize as well. So I think this is a good move in the right direction, and we're supportive. Thanks.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Namibia and Portugal.

NAMIBIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you for the meetings team coming up with the suggestion.

I think the fact that we will have different types of meetings, especially meeting B, I would say in the short-term, perhaps, would make it possible for us to bring ICANN to Namibia also one day.

But the geographical distribution of these meetings leads me to -- I think to some lingering concerns at the background. And that is that the toned down meeting which is -- seem to be focused on Africa and Latin America was just a concern in the back of my head that we may then not have the benefit of getting our African and Latin American and small island states, perhaps, community exposed to board -- to the ICANN board to meet the full complement of ICANN offices and ICANN activities because it will be relegated to more technical meetings which may then not serve the purpose of such wide outreach. And it may not be sufficient to reflect the full complement of ICANN, especially in Africa. And I think there is -- sort of a lingering concern, but I hope that the meetings team will look at, you know, the possibility of making sure that we have the full complement of offices available in those technical meetings or in the meeting B type. Thank you very much.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Sebastien would like to react to this.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you for the input and the question, but I think we need to be clear, the meeting B, it's not with people not coming. The Board will be there. The Board will have meeting, and may have meeting with you if you decide so.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

Then you will interact with the Board as you will be able to interact with all SOs and ACs.

The big difference, it's the layout of the facilities. It's not the number of participants, it's not the type of participant, it's not even the subject. When you say that it's the technical -- no, it's dependent on what work you want to do and each S.O. and A.C. constituency will want to do. But everybody will hopefully participate to the B meeting also. Once again, it's a facility issue and not a people issue.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I think we need to wrap up shortly, so I have Portugal.

PORTUGAL: Thank you very much.

I think that I would like to highlight some of the main points that are important for the GAC, and that's what I felt when I was in this -- in this group and that I felt that I should fight for.

So I think that -- I think that we need to develop the work with the other constituencies. It's something that we are not doing at all. So we are here since Saturday and we are closed in this room until today, except on Monday. And -- but still, we didn't have, really, the possibility to have a networking possibility.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

And so I think that with this new format, GAC can do it. And I think still there are a lot of misunderstandings of what GAC is doing, and I think that we have to surpass that.

The other point is the balanced geographic rotation and I think it's very good now that we have this meeting B which will allow us to reach other places that, until now, has been impossible to have meetings there because there were no -- there was not the right facilities, and now we'll have that possibility.

The other two points that I would like to highlight is the outreach with local communities. So we are having these meetings in Nairobi, in Durban, in Singapore, and we don't have any connection with anyone from these countries. I don't think this is normal. I think that GAC has to connect with the other governments, and -- the governments of these countries, and I think the outreach with the local communities is very important.

And finally, I think there is a point that Nick already pointed out as well, but I'd like to highlight again, is that this new format intends to serve to increase the credibility of ICANN with the broader global community. And so that's why I think that we are having these meetings all around the world. Otherwise we will have these meetings only in three hubs or something.

So I think these were my main concerns as GAC member. So that's what I wanted to highlight here.

Thank you.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much, Portugal. I think we have to wrap up.

With that, I would like to thank you, also for listening to our ideas so that there's a feedback. Yeah, thank you very much.

Let's stay in contact. We'll communicate you our ideas or thoughts on how to conduct these meetings from our side.

Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you.

NICK TOMASSO: Thank you very much. It's been most useful to me to hear your comments, to hear the comments from the GAC, and to continue to work with you to develop your needs for each of these meetings.

So let us keep the dialogue going.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:	The next item on the agenda is the reason why Sweden is coming to the front; i.e., the open forum. I give the floor -- Let me give the floor to Anders from Sweden. Thank you.
SWEDEN:	Thank you, Thomas. Great. Good morning.
	So the open forum is supposed to be a way of implementing recommendations in ATRT2, 6.1A, so the first one where it talks about the GAC 101.
	We have, since we were here last, we have had two open forum sessions, London and Los Angeles, and we also had an open forum session at the IGF. These have all been very useful.
	The feedback we have been receiving have been positive, and with some request to have more questions-and-answer sessions.
	So it's been a good experience doing this, and I would like to just mention those that have been working most with it: Thomas, Wanawit, Manal, Imad, Alice ,Ashwin, Olga, and there has also been a few that has been more active online, I could say.
	So the question is now how do we proceed with this as a ways and means, among others, to implement 6.1? I want to inform you that quite likely I will not be able to participate in Buenos Aires, so you shouldn't expect me to do it there. Just, you know, as a disclaimer or to put it out there. But I presented a few options. And basically we continue doing these open forum sessions on each meeting.

An alternative is that we include into the equation a public forum. And you know it would be a public forum with the GAC leadership team, the chair and the vice chairs, I suspect, working pretty much like -- or the template would be the ICANN public forum that's being held later today, which is open session with open mics. People can step up and ask questions.

And the third thing in this equation is to have more supportive material online to give the basic -- basic information that we have been providing as sort of a lecture thing in the open forums we have had.

We have written material online. Thanks to the secretariat for that. But we could also complete it -- complement it with video material, and video material could be in several different languages. It could be from several different regions with many, many different participants contributing to this.

So what I would like to do is I'd like to ask a couple of questions, and I'll ask them one in one, and just starting with the public forum. To be clear, is this possible? We have been talking about it from time to time. Do we want to have it? Is it desirable to have it? When would we have it? How would it work in the GAC week? We just heard about the new planning for the meetings. When would it be reasonable to have a public forum and when could we slot it in?

And I would like to open the floor for that.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Comments, please, or questions? Answers to that question, actually.

U.S.

UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair, and thank you, Anders, for presenting us with these very useful, sort of, thought-provoking questions that we actually need to consider.

I believe I made a suggestion online, and if not you can correct me, but it strikes me that one way we might want to tackle this is to respond to issues or questions that the community might have about the GAC, whether it's on a particular issue, how did we arrive at that consensus decision. And I've been told that there are monthly SO/AC chair calls. And I was wondering if that could serve as a mechanism where our chair could invite other parts of the community to contemplate, again, either a procedural question or a substantive question, and then we could build an open forum around that.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So you mean we could call it an "Ask the GAC" session.

SWEDEN: I think that's an -- that's an excellent suggestion. And we haven't -- I don't know why, but we haven't had time to speak about it during the week. But I think that would be -- that would be a good start.

So should we, then, decide that we're starting with the public forums, inviting themes based on this for the next meeting?

This would require the engagement of the chair and the vice chairs, so how -- Thomas, how do you say on this? Would this be something that would be useful?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yeah, that may be useful. The question is when and how and how often we do it. I think we may also talk about -- a little bit about this. In particular also with the new meeting strategy.

My personal feeling would be that we should do it at least once a year. The question is can we do it more for the sake of time, or is once a year enough? So this is also a question where we may have a discussion on the frequency of these meetings.

Thank you.

SWEDEN: Sounds reasonable to have it perhaps in the (indiscernible) thing, to have this public forum at that time. So should we then go ahead and plan for this, looking at implementing it at the same time as we implement the new meeting structure or something like that? Yeah. My next -- my next question would be, how often do we need to have these open forums? We have been sort of looking at having them at every ICANN meeting but would it be necessary to have it at every ICANN meeting?

EGYPT: Thank you, Anders. Actually I was coming on the previous point regarding inviting the SOs and ACs to join our forum, and I think we have also to work this collaboratively with them because if we, for example, agree to have our forum during the B meeting, for example, and they have other plans so it won't be possible. And again, if we decide to have the forum on one meeting that's going to be highly occupied with the IANA transition and the accountability, again the forum will not be well-attended. So maybe we can agree on a default situation but also be flexible and accommodate the other SOs and ACs and discussions that are going on just to make sure that the forum is well-attended and fruitful. Thank you.

SWEDEN: That sounds -- that sounds reasonable. Feels like we're moving in the direction of a working group or something. I don't really like that. I think we should be -- you think we could -- we could do it without, you know, taking it that way.

EGYPT: I'm sorry. No, I definitely didn't mean a working group. But there was a mention -- it was mentioned that there's a goal between the chairs of the SOs and ACs and so maybe this can be brought up with them and then we can have some feedback. Thank you.

SWEDEN: Just one second, Olof.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

OLOF NORDLING: Just very, very quickly, but Egypt's comment made me think, well, if we really want high attendance to such an event we should really think about the scheduling in relation to other sessions we have during the week. Our sort of box office success all time, that's the GAC meeting with Board. So you could have an open forum typically if we schedule it and have it immediately after the session with the Board. I think many would stay.

SWEDEN: Just (indiscernible), we have monthly meetings with the SOs and ACs as you know and I can bring this up if the secretariat helps me not to forget it. African Union.

AFRICAN UNION COMMISSION: Thanks. I wanted to direct the concern of the attendance of the SOs and ACs. I think if we have our plan mapped up well in advance, I think it wouldn't be a problem if it is known like a year ahead that this is going to take place.

SWEDEN: All right. Great. Good. So we're on the move. On the supporting video material, would you believe -- would you agree that having video online would be likely to be interesting for newcomers to the GAC and for other constituencies as well to learn about how the GAC operates, how we meet, sort of to meet some GAC members and listen to what they're -- how they're describing their work in the GAC and how they are participating? And would you be willing to show your face on the video? Anybody? Tracy.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

TRACY HACKSHAW: And just -- that is a very good idea, and the ICANN Academy is actually considering something very similar. So maybe that's something you could dovetail with that group, putting stuff on their video portal as well as the ICANN Learn environment as well. So you may get support from ICANN to actually produce the videos and make even info -- info-typo graphics, movie infographics and so on. Thank you.

SWEDEN: African Union.

AFRICAN UNION COMMISSION: Thank you very much. I think that's a great idea. And perhaps you could also look at it more broadly as a way of using the videos to outreach those who are not members of the GAC as well. So a little bit more information beyond just, you know, what the GAC does. Thank you.

SWEDEN: Egypt, please.

EGYPT: I think it's a good idea for the information port for newcomers, but I don't think it can be a replacement tool interaction with the community and other SOs and ACs. But from a material point of view that we can have on the GAC portal or whatever for newcomers, I think it's going to be useful. But I'm not willing to show my face on video.

                    [Laughter]

SWEDEN: Thank you.   Then could I ask -- it sounds like a really good idea to connect it to the ICANN Academy portal. Maybe we could also get, you know, operational support to producing these. If I could turn to you, Olof. If you could say something about if we could use the ICANN Academy to produce the videos, perhaps to outline how we should work with them and putting them up. Do you think that would be possible?

OLOF NORDLING: I hope you are aware there's something called ICANN Learning and ICANN Academy and a lot of material available on the -- via the Web site. And that's, well, a repository of -- well, plenty of topics and most certainly it can be expanded with video material and other material from the GAC side, for example. And that's absolutely doable. So it is an option, quite clearly, and we've had initial contacts also on what can be done and considered various formats, but more or less in the -- in a brainstorming exercise so far. So something that can be pursued and, well, whether that's desirable or not is really up to the GAC.

SWEDEN: So if I understand you correctly, if -- as long as we decide to do it, we could get help with the mechanics of it from ICANN.

OLOF NORDLING: Absolutely correct.

SWEDEN: All right. I get the impression that this is something that we should do then because there have been no opposing views and I've been hearing support for it. So let's work -- continue to work with that.

Given that this will take a while and we're not going to have a public forum anytime very soon, the question then is, how we're going to pursue the open forums just ahead of us.   If we're going to do something in Buenos Aires or if we're trying -- if we will try to look at doing it in Dublin.   That's something to consider.   And if anybody is interested in working with this, please approach me or the secretariat or Thomas or anybody or start thinking about it now and we'll take it up later. Manal.

EGYPT: Yes, just very quickly to your point on Buenos Aires. I feel that this 3meeting is going to be highly focusing on the IANA transition and the accountability and I think the timeline also shows that this is going to be a meeting that's focusing on this. Again, I'm just thinking out loud. I'm not sure whether it's going to be a best fit for our forum or not. Thank you.

SWEDEN: That's probably a very good point. I also forgot to say something. The open forum we had at the IGF was also very appreciated. There was a lot of people in the room. It's a very good opportunity for outreach to people that are perhaps not even participating at ICANN meetings. So that's also something to consider to do one of these in the fall in Joao Pessoa or something like that. All right. Is there anything else? Manal.

EGYPT: I'm sorry to request the floor again. Just very quickly then. Maybe I didn't put it right. If, again, it's -- it may be well attended. But we have to take care of the scheduling. I mean, if we're competing with another session that's talking about IANA transition or accountability, we might not end up with the audience that we're looking for.

Thank you.

SWEDEN: All right. That's a good point.

Okay. All right. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. If there are no more questions we can have a slightly longer coffee break, which wouldn't be that bad, I guess. So we will meet again at 11:00 sharp, because we have a very important issue which is the operating principles and, hopefully, agreement on how to move this forward. Thank you.

[Coffee break]

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Take your seats because we have our next guests already in 25 minutes so we should actually move forward. Please take your seats.

Operating principles. Let's wait for two seconds until everybody has sat down.

As you know, we have had some discussions on Saturday and I think it was yesterday, and we are continuing this discussion. We have this paper prepared by our secretariat and the working group. I'm sorry.

And today is the day where we actually should take a decision on how to move forward and agree, if possible, on changes.

So again, the proposal that you have in the paper would be, and taking note of what has been discussed so far, I think we agree there's a need to look at the whole of the operating principles and revise them as there may be many issues that may be a little bit outdated or up for discussion. As time passes, this is a normal thing.

At the same time, at least very many delegations or members feel that two changes should be made, or should be announced, agreed to at this meeting. One is the -- to allow for a slight correction of the election procedures, and the other one is the change of the numbers of vice chairs.

And as there are some different views, divergence of views on this. One proposal, to what extent this is -- I think the problem lies here that we have divergent views, to what extent the number of the vice chairs and possibly some linkage to regions, and so on, may impact, or not, the future discussion on regions and membership and the like. So after some discussions, what I would like to propose to you is, and see and hope that this can be agreeable, would be that, A) we would agree here to start the procedure on changing the election procedures, as Michelle has presented them to you. And with regard to the number of the chair and vice chairs and changes that were proposed in addition to that, my proposal would be that we would not do any other changes with regard

to gender balance and diversity, and we would not change any text than changing the mere number from three to five. And this way we may avoid the problem that we will have the same discussions and unhappiness at the next elections, but we -- it would not in any way (indiscernible) the discussion on further meetings. So this is just a proposal for your reflection; that the second change would just be -- we just replace the number three with the number five and don't do any other changes, any substantive changes with regard to the vice chair. That would be something to think about.

Michelle, do you want to add something? Or -- So then your comments, please.

European Commission.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thank you very much. As you know, the European Commission fully agrees with you on this issue.

What is, I think, even minimum, minimum thing is that we get the voting -- the voting rules right, and that we get out -- whether this mentions facsimile and things like that, okay,I go and buy myself an old thing probably somewhere and vote that way. But the voting last time showed that actually Michelle can do us a favor to help us get this right, and do no substantial changes but modernize the way and clarify them, the voting rules.

Thank you.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

EN

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, European Commission.

                           More views?

                           Colombia.

COLOMBIA: Thank you, Chair. We also agree with your proposal. We think it's important to start making changes, and going from three to five vice chairs would be important to help in the amount of work that the GAC to do.

                           According to the suggestion not to include gender or geographic considerations, we think it could be do it in that way as a first step because we can't assure that we will have equal representation on the nominations for the region. Only changing the number, it's okay for us. For the procedure, it's important to have transparent and clear rules for everyone, not to have the same situation as happen in L.A. And we support the electronic vote for a way to -- to help that in other countries that are not in the face-to-face meeting will be involved.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

                           Singapore.

SINGAPORE: Thank you, Chair.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

Basically we have no problem to increase the number from three to five, but we would like to highlight one problem, and that is by increasing the number to five, we may still faced with the problem of unequal geographical representation because there could be more than one country coming from a particular region who want to take part in the election. And then if you don't come up with a mechanism to sort of ensure equal representatives from each region, then you may end up with the same situation where you may have two members from a particular region.

So we need a mechanism to see that, well, each region still have, you know, equal representation.

So this is one problem we foresee.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. You're right, we have -- we do not have clearly defined and agreed regions that have a role in the election so far, and this is a complex question, and we will need to take more time. It's also the question, and I have heard some people yesterday that we are not sure or not everybody is sure. First of all, we need to find out which will be the region. There is the feeling that we don't have a concept of region that works for elections. So whatever we do, we will not solve this problem now. This is clear. But we may add to diversity in a rough sense with five.

I have Egypt.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

| EGYPT: | Thank you, Chair. And my comments were along the lines what Singapore have raised. I mean, I tend to have this holistic approach, but I also agree if the consensus view of GAC colleagues is to focus on what have has to do with the elections, this is okay, too. But again, I don't see it as a mere number thing, although we very much support increasing the vice chairs to five, but then it's not, again, the numbers only because we can end up with five from the same region. |

Thank you.

| CHAIR SCHNEIDER: | This is also a little bit dependent on how the people vote, in the end. We also need to take our own responsibility and maybe also not just vote for people in our own region but actually also for people in the other region. But of course you are right. |

Denmark and then the U.S.

| DENMARK: | Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have carefully listened to the remarks the previous day and also today. And we think as a minimum, five should be agreed today. We admit that all the things have to be changed in line with what lately Egypt said. But we don't think it's practical and possible today. So we would like to see this minimum changes. Because, if possible, we will also like to see the election rules be amended so be updated in line what the EU Commission said. Thank you. |

ICANN | 52
Singapore

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:	Thank you, Denmark. The United States.

UNITED STATES:	Thank you, Chair, and thank you to colleagues who have preceded me. I think there's certainly a recognition that, on the one hand, it's useful to make this administrative change to accommodate an increase in number but that that, in and of itself, doesn't actually resolve some of the objectives and the goals of diversity and geographical representation.

Also, I'm mindful of our discussion on Saturday or Sunday -- whatever day it was, my apologies for forgetting. It's my perspective that talking about elections unavoidably takes to who has standing to nominate and to vote in these elections.   So I'd like to shift and draw people's attention very briefly to the overtures from our colleagues with the League of Arab States and their request that we need to consider their request for a change in their membership status

And, having spoken a little bit with them and a few other IGOs, I think it helps make the case for a holistic approach to revising the entirety of the operating principles. So I would draw people's attention to principle 15 and principle 18. They do seem to suggest that, yes, of course, we are open to IGO and regional intergovernmental bodies as observers. But there seems to be a qualifier. On the invitation of the GAC through the chair. At the discretion of the chair.

Which may explain the incentive on their part to seek to have full membership status if they feel constrained somehow by the operating principles that, yes, they may be in the room but that somehow they

ICANN | 52
Singapore

need prior permission or approval or an invitation from the chair to actively participate.

It's been my strong impression over the years that there is no hesitation on our parts to having our IGO representative colleagues fully and actively participating in our deliberations.

And, as we have talked many times, the operating principle provisions on membership are very vague. They're completely ambiguous. They use terminology that hasn't been defined. It isn't very clear to people as to what the distinction is between an observer and a member unless you look at principle 15 and 18. And that may explain the hesitation of some IGOs to accept only observer status if they feel they cannot actively participate. So I do think it is imperative that, if we agree on the simple number change and to remove words like "facsimile" from the operating principles, that's all well and good in the near term. But I think it is completely unavoidable that the entirety of the operating principles will have to be reviewed

So one final comment there, I don't know the history of the document. But there's an appendix attached to the ACIG brief. And it appears to include proposed edits from, I believe it is Spain as vice chair or as chair of the GAC working group on working methods is what I'm going to guess. I don't know that those proposed edits have actually been fully reviewed and agreed. So I think at a minimum we need to have some agreement here as to how we proceed with amending the operating principles.

And so I will leave it at that. But I do think we need clarity before this meeting is over. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, United States. And, of course, I agree and I think everybody else that we need clarity. And I think nobody opposes to having a thorough review. And we can decide today that we are going to start this now to look at everything that we -- the question is then what is the procedure, whether it's in the working group on working methods or something else.

But the other issue is, if we start this now, may we start and agree already on a change now as we discussed so far? I haven't heard a no to agreeing on changing the election. We would need to be clear in verbatim what exactly -- if I get your point right. So we would need to see that on the screen what exactly we would change now and what we would leave for later. Germany?

GERMANY: Thank you, Chairman. And, first, I would like to second your proposal. I think it's very feasible. And, in the situation we're are in, probably the only possibility.   In the future we really need to have several considerations of this operational principles. But, for the time being, we need to have a decision, I think. And we need to make it.

What I want to come back to is the question of geographic balance and gender balance. As I stated earlier, it is, from my perspective, not possible to fulfill 100%. And I will mention, since some of the colleagues here in the room are also following the ITU -- and the management team of the ITU consists also of five persons, whether written or not written, there is general aim to come to a regional balance between the management team. But it is in detail never 100% achieved. Because you may have two candidates or two -- two directors opposed from one

ICANN | 52
Singapore

region. And you may have other regions that do not have a representative on the management team. But next meeting that will be changed four years later.

And so far, I think there is this in the back heads of everybody. But there is not a formal rule. This is something, as I understand it, that is an aim, a general aim. Yes? It's the same for gender balances, yes? We should consider it. But I would not insist on formalizing it because we get this thing complicated. And just also recall we now have five vice chairs. Additional one chair. That means we have six people who are really committed to this work. I wonder whether, if we come to a real election where we need various candidates, is it really feasible that we have something like 20, 30 candidates where we can elect? I would think this is rather hypothetic. So far let's stick to the situation we're in. Everybody who is committed to the work and wants to do more, I think has a fair chance to get a possibility to become vice chair. I don't think there are so much restrictions. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Germany. Egypt.

EGYPT: Just to say that, I mean, if we down scale the review only to part that has to do with the upcoming elections, this is fine. But, again, we have to take the elections -- we have to identify all the articles that need to be reviewed in view of the upcoming elections.

Because, as I said, it's not just clarity, like our colleague also mentioned. Clarity is important. Whatever we agree on, it has to be clear. Because

this was not clear at the first elections we had. And, again, this was our very first election. So it was well by the time. But now that we know what we have been going through, we need more clarity on the rules for the vote and how the GAC -- because, even if we consider the geographic distribution, but then the votes -- would the vote supersede the geographic distribution or -- I mean, can we vote for multiple candidates from region? Or, if we have the potential candidates, we should choose from different regions? I mean, we need to have this discussion, even if we're going to downscale and not approach the whole thing.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. If -- first of all, if we don't do anything now, we have exactly the text as it stands.

That's the text we will have to have elections on, if we don't change -- if we don't agree to change anything now.

This is the text that we have, and then we will somehow muddle through it. We have the text that we have.

So, if -- for -- what we -- as I said, what we can do is, with regard to the holistic approach, like it has been done when I remember with Bill Dee from the European Commission and others, the whole text -- was there were people starting to make comments on every -- like you do it with any text. You can make comments on any operating principles. You can ask for some to be deleted. You can ask for some to be added, And then we'll see how far that goes in what time. This is the way to do the whole thing. We can start this now. I think there's an agreement that

would be something that would be wishful. And then see where we are at the next meeting.

But that will have no effect on any vote or not vote in Dublin. Because we won't have terminated that until the -- that won't work for this time. It may work for in two years or for the year after of the elections, if anything. But we can start this now. We can start asking for first round of comments on the operating principles.

So this is how I would see the work on the operating principles where everything is open.

What we can do now -- and I suggest that we have a look at it -- this is the two types of changes proposed. One is what you have on the screen where I would propose to delete the addition of gender and linguistic. And so that is just the up to five and nothing else. I don't know. Is this pdf or Word file? We cannot change it here. But that would be the agreement that we just change the words up to five instead of three. That would be one element. And, if you could go down to the part that is about the election, maybe -- and maybe Michelle, you can make quickly go through the proposed changes again so that people see what we are concretely talking about that we propose here to change now. Thank you.

MICHELLE SCOTT-TUCKER: Julie, if you could scroll down to the bottom of that page, please. That's it.

What I'm suggesting is the key sentence in there is in that red paragraph under the heading "principle 35" where it says "votes may be

cast using a secure online voting mechanism or by any other mechanism the GAC deems appropriate."

That gives us, then, the opportunity to choose an appropriate mechanism. But I'm telling you for Dublin we'll choose online voting because it will be easier

What I'm also suggesting is exactly what I did last time, which is to circulate a draft document setting -- before the election process begins, setting out the how the election process will run. What people need to know, how they're going to do it, when the e-mails will come out or the timelines. As I did last year, I sent you out a document that set all that out. And, if you like, I can set you out a draft document that sets out all those processes so you can say this process needs to be tweaked. This process needs to be changed.   And we can work that through intersessionally until we get an agreed election process document. But that doesn't need to be set out in the operating principles.

The principles are at a high level. They are guidelines at a high level.

What this is saying is that the secretariat must send out this process document for you to work through. Because, at the next election, the situation might be different.   And, at the election after that, the situation might be different. It changes on how many nominees we have and whether it's a vice chair election or a chair and a vice chair election together. So all I'm suggesting, the change that this wording will make is that we can use a secure, online voting mechanism and that I will do what I did last time. I will send you a process document that you will be able to review and contribute to.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

EN

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Just to remind you, we -- in a few minutes' time, we will have a presentation. So I suggest that we continue to discuss this after the two presentations that we will have if we don't get to a conclusion here.

Before I give the floor to the U.S. and to Trinidad and Tobago, just something that I want to raise your attention on, that, actually, according to principle 53 of the operating principles, a simple majority, that actually foresees a vote on operating principles with a simple majority to launch a revision before the 60-day period where you can comment on it. And, then again, a simple majority vote to agree on the revision of the operating principles.

We may want to change this as well in the revision of the operating principles, but this is what is there for the time being.

So, very shortly, Trinidad and Tobago and the United States.

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO: So principle 34 will be affected by this as well or will it not? Principle 34. Yes, we have it up. So principle 34 says "For elections votes shall be taken by secret ballot. It will be a matter for each voting member to decide if they wish to make his or her choice public. This includes taking a vote in person or ballots transmitted by electronic mail. The GAC secretariat will organize the voting procedure and count the votes under the supervision of chair or vice chairs who do not stand for re-election."

ICANN | 52
Singapore

It would appear that 34 might be -- yeah, but it's -- 34 and 35, the -- 35 kind of amends 34. You see what I'm trying to say? It has a different application. 35 kind of almost removes 34.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Actually, principle 34 would say that in case we would not agree to move from three to five, we would remain with three. And we would have an election where all the five current vice chairs, whatever we call, would go for election of the three vice chairs. They would all have to abstain from supervising the election because they're all a party of it. Which is -- I'm not sure what -- whether that would make sense. That's another reason to actually update the number from three to five. But, of course, we may see whether transmitted by electronic mail and blah, blah, blah, whether this is something that would need to be changed.

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO: I'm wondering if we need to delete 34 to fix 35 in such a way that 34 is reflected.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: But I think we should be flexible in this. Because, if we start to go in this, we'll never ever make that change that we hope to make. Michelle, please.

MICHELLE SCOTT-TUCKER: According to principle 53, the process after this meeting, if you agree to change the principles, is that the changed principles, which were marked up like this, will be circulated for a 60-day consultation period.

So at that -- during that 60-day period, we can consult and we can talk about the exact wording and the implications. If we change this principle, does that mean that there's a flow effect to other principles? So we don't to decide the exact -- for these tiny -- for these minor changes like three to five. If we change it in one, obviously, it refers to three, we have to change that to five.

So there's some minor flow-on effects. We can discuss that and agree that, during the 60-day consultation period, reach consensus intersessionally by -- during the end of that consultation period so we come back in Buenos Aires with the wording already agreed. That's how the process should work.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. So let me ask a question, and that actually means what we would agree today is only on starting. We wouldn't agree on changing these operations. So that decision will be taken after 60 days; i.e., in Buenos Aires.

So nobody says yes to anything today. If we agree to making these changes, we can all look at them during our Easter, whatever, moments and come back in Buenos Aires.

Yeah, that's it. So if nobody objects now, we could actually take the decision now in the understanding that we would, at the same time, start -- at the same time, from now on start the holistic revision of the whole thing, and we would ask Michelle to send out -- take the decision that we ask Michelle to send out this draft that will be looked at in the next 60 days.

Would that be agreeable? United States.

UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair, and thank you, Michelle, for that clarification.

I just want to chime in before we leave this topic completely, so that the minutes are clear, I want to concur with Manal's comments from Egypt.

I do think, whether we do -- and we probably need to start it, maybe create a working group solely to focus on these changes to the operating principles required for election. Because it is more than the few that have been highlighted here.

And that, I think, does require some attention, a small working group to go through these. There are quite a few other provisions that probably are ambiguous and stupid, but -- because we wrote them a million years ago and they are out of date. But if they are not linked to actually conducting the election, maybe they can be left aside.

So if -- Not that I -- personally I do not concur with the group one, two, three that was laid out, because that hasn't been reviewed by the entirety of the GAC. It hasn't been approved. It hasn't been endorsed. So I think we need to go back to square one and suggest that we follow Manal's proposal.

You cannot actually talk about holding elections unless you can clarify all of the provisions that pertain to who can actually vote in an election.

 Thank you.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Let me just repeat that in case we will not amend the numbers, we will hold elections. We will hold elections. That is very, very probable. Whether we then think that we can't do them because the operating principles -- we will hold elections.

But of course, you are right. When we decide to set this up now, everybody is free to comment in these 60 days and put in whatever you want. So you are free to put in whatever you want in this. This is your right, if I get the procedure right.

So we only decide to start a process where, hopefully, we take a decision at the next meeting.

So can we get agreement that we start this process? Any objections?

Okay. Thank you very much. So we will then move on to your colleagues, looking at the agenda, from ICANN Compliance Team.

Thank you very much.

MAGUY SERAD: Good morning, everyone. I'm really excited to be here. We've had a couple of attempts of coming and talking to the GAC and has not successfully happened, so I'm really happy to be here with all of you.

My name is Maguy Serad. I am the vice president for contractual compliance. With me also is Allen Grogan.

What I'd like to do is two slides. Give you a very high-level update on what we have accomplished and how and where you can learn more

ICANN | 52
Singapore

about us, and then open the floor up for your questions. We're here to work with you and address any questions you might have for us.

Slide four, please.

So the first thing on the agenda on this slide is a very high-level update of activities in 2014. The contractual Compliance Team now has a global presence in Singapore, Istanbul, and Los Angeles.

The team is staffed with amazingly skilled and committed staff members who have different backgrounds. We've got team members who have a legal background, technical background, business background, and also a very diverse team where amongst between the team here, we can work and have the -- what I call the nuance to be able to work with different people globally. We come from different nine -- nine languages and have the ability to communicate while having an appreciation for the different cultures we're working with, while maintaining the compliance process and approach.

Readiness for 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement and the new Registry Agreement has been an effort under way for the past year. The team has staffed, as I just shared with you. System updates have been completed.   The processes have been updated.   We also publish metrics, communication templates. Communication templates is very, very important alongside of process. It ensures a consistent approach to compliance globally. It depends on the obligations of the contract, it depends on the provisions, it depends on the different aspect of the contract.

We have built a very sturdy compliance templates, communications, and a process to support that.

We have also conducted several outreach activities, not only with our contracted parties to ensure alignment and understanding of the compliance approach but also with the different working sessions and groups throughout the ICANN meetings.

We have completed a proactive monitoring effort on the public interest commitments and other obligations, also. Compliance is not just about receiving complaints of noncompliance or alleged noncompliance. It's about proactively addressing the concerns we hear about within the community, within the different stakeholders, but also to ensure that the contract obligations are being fulfilled.

So the public interest commitment, that's been very hot topic among the ICANN community for the past few meetings. The team a proactive approach where we selected 264 gTLDs under the new Registry Agreement. The effort was focused on ensuring they were compliant with specification 11, and there are reports on that that also have been published and can be provided to you.

We've provided compliance recommendations, statistical data, and trends to guide policy changes and ongoing implementation strategies. Continuous improvement is our motto. It's continuous improvement of ourselves, our process, but also in our communication.

We have participated and continue to participate in many working groups and efforts to continue to improve the ICANN expectations and the efforts under way.

Next slide, please.

Accountability and transparency. It's a very -- two strong words in this space. We, in contractual compliance, provide a service to so many different ICANN stakeholders. And in order for us to fulfill the service, we have to earn the trust of the community. Trust is a very important key for us.

We earn the trust from the community by working in a consistent process that's published, by publishing our efforts, but most importantly, we work with what we call fact-based decisions. We don't just say and take people saying, "I did this; thus, I'm compliant." No, we dive deep into our reviews. We collect data. We review them. We emphasize on the effort so that we can, as a team, close or address a noncompliance issue or an alleged noncompliance issue with fact-based decisions.

So how do we communicate to the world and how are we held accountable and transparent?

So an audit program was launched two years ago. We're in the process of completing the third year. It was an effort to address a perceived misconception that there are a lot of bad actors. Well, the best way to address any perception is to put some facts behind it. So we are in the process of completing year three of the audit program, and parallel to that effort we also launched the audit effort on the new Registry Agreement. And both of those reports are available on our Web site.

In addition to that, we publish our annual report. It's a calendar annual report, not a fiscal annual report. And in the annual report, it

summarizes all of our activities from resources to budget to compliance activities across both registrars and registries.

We publish on a monthly basis a performance dashboard that talks and shares with the community and the world what are we receiving, what are we seeing, and how are we processing it.

We have SLAs, Service Level Agreements, where we all follow consistently to assure that the approach is efficient, effective, but reported on very transparent to the community.

We continue to evolve our metrics. So please take a look. We had shared a presentation in the past where I was supposed to come and talk to the audience. Take a look on our Web site, not just the reporting and the performance measurement area of it but all of it, and let us know if you have any questions.

The next slide is provided for you just as informational. It's an extract from our quarterly report that our CEO delivers to the community where we share not only volume of complaints but also some of the SLAs that we report on.

And next slide, please.

With this, I will stop my update and would like Allen, as my new boss, to address the audience, and then we'll take your questions.

ALLEN GROGAN: Thanks, Maguy.

I'm Allen Grogan, I'm chief contract compliance officer and was appointed at the Los Angeles meeting in October to oversee contractual compliance and consumer safeguards. So let me just briefly describe what those functions are.

Fadi and the board created this position of contractual compliance and consumer safeguards and elevated it to a global leadership level within the organization recognizing that both of these are elements of serving the public interest from ICANN's perspective.

On the contract compliance side, we seek to enforce the contracts, and that includes the public interest commitments that are part of the contracts, some of which were the result of recommendations from the GAC as well as other provisions in the agreement.

On the consumer safeguard side, one of the things that we've recognized is there are areas where we may not, under the four corners of the contract, have the right to compel contracted parties to take certain actions, but there are complex, often intractable problems that the community needs to work to solve, and ICANN needs to play a role in trying to solve those problems.

So in circumstances where we may not have have a contractual right to enforce something, we want to reach out, dialogue with others in the community, law enforcement, regulatory authorities, civil society, civil liberties groups, and collectively work to find solutions to some of those difficult problems and to determine what role ICANN can play in that. And sometimes that may be when somebody submits a complaint to us, it may be a matter of saying we don't have a contract right to take care of this problem but we can refer you to the right parties in law

enforcement agencies or regulatory agencies or elsewhere to try to help address this problem, and we can provide the information that we have that might assist you in reaching out to those other parties.

So with that, I'd like to -- like to open up to any questions that GAC members may have.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Any questions, remarks?

Spain.

SPAIN: Thank you very much, Maguy and Allen, for the presentation.

I would like to ask a question related to what you have just said, Allen. The issues, you might not be able to sort out as ICANN Compliance Team and that should go to other instances, like law enforcement agencies, or maybe to dispute resolution procedure. And in that respect, some examples come to your mind of things that you could not be able to deal with in this framework, you would refer to a dispute resolution procedure, and with a special focus on the GAC safeguards that were included in the GAC advice at the (indiscernible). Thank you.

ALLEN GROGAN: Thank you. This is Allen Grogan again, just for the record.

So let me -- let me explain how we would go about enforcing the public interest commitments that were largely the result of GAC advice, and

ICANN | 52
Singapore

then I'll address more generally how we might work with others in the community to solve problems.

On the specific public interest commitments which are embodied in an attachment to the Registry Agreement called specification 11, once those are included in specification 11, as far as ICANN and ICANN contract compliance are concerned, those are binding and enforceable provisions of the agreement the same as any other provisions of the agreement.

So if somebody brings a complaint to us or if it comes to our attention independently that a registry operator is breaching those public interest commitments, ICANN contractual compliance could pursue that on our own initiative through our normal compliance process. So we would reach out to the registry operator. It might be with an inquiry. It might be with a notice of what we suspect to be a breach. We would collaborate. We would try to resolve the problem.

And that process typically, in ICANN contractual compliance, moves fairly quickly. Our average time from initiating a complaint to resolving it is about 11 days most recently, I think in December.

There's a separate parallel path that a complaining party could follow, which is to initiate a PICDRP, a public interest commitment dispute resolution process. That process could take longer, but in most cases, we expect that ICANN contractual compliance would resolve it through our normal or contract compliance procedures and resolve it fairly quickly.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

There could be circumstances where, for example, the contract compliance department looks at the complaint, investigates it. We believe the registry operator is not in breach of its public interest commitments, but the party that filed the complaint disagrees with our conclusion, and in that case they would be free to pursue the PICDRP process, which would involve initially a consultation between the complaining party and the registry operator to see if they could resolve it informally, and then eventually could lead to a decision by a standing panel that would make recommendations on the actions that we could take.

Separate and apart from what's in the contract, so separate and apart from the public interest commitments that are in specification 11 and the other safeguards that were the result of the new gTLD program, there are issues probably outside the scope of ICANN's limited remit. We get complaints from time to time about objectionable content of one form or another. Unless that's a violation of a specific provision in the agreement or one of the public interest commitments, which is a specific provision in the agreement, that's not something we would pursue as a compliance matter because it's probably not a breach of the agreement. But if, for example, someone is claiming that misleading statements are being made on a commercial Web site, we could refer that party to regulatory authorities in the relevant country to file a complaint or law enforcement in the relevant countries to file a complaint to see if they can obtain a remedy from them. ICANN and our contract compliance department are not a global regulator or a global law enforcement agency so there are limits to our powers and abilities to enforce laws and regulations, but we can -- we can refer

ICANN | 52
Singapore

complaining parties to the appropriate law enforcement or regulatory authorities to help them pursue those activities.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Allen. Further questions or comments?

Yes, Mr. (saying name).

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you. I would like to know if there is a contract between national laws and the PIC of ICANN contract with the TLD registry, how will ICANN handle this?

ALLEN GROGAN: So that's a difficult question to answer in the abstract. It would depend on the facts and circumstances. Obviously, national laws will always override whatever is in our contract. So contract -- we recognize that contracted parties must comply with the laws and regulations in effect in their own countries.   And in fact, there are provisions in our agreements with our contracted parties, the registries and registrars, that obligate them to comply with applicable laws.

So I don't -- I don't envision that there would often be conflicts between the public interest commitments in our contracts and national law, but we recognize that all of our contracted parties need to comply with national laws.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

EN

Thailand.

THAILAND: Just curious, because look to the Web sites on your statistics of
                             complaints. Is that possible to have the detailed assumptions on how
                             the complaints and the statistic is constructed, assumptions of data
                             collections? Because some of these relate to the safeguard that we
                             issue, especially in terms of security in principle 11.3b related to security
                             threats on malware, spam. And some complaints come by TLD that
                             have been specified. And, to that, there might be additional, according
                             to our safeguard, that specifies the immediate action that need to be
                             taken when registrar -- when the registry have been informed on the
                             security incidents and how long it takes for the registrar to take down
                             the domains. Is that possible that kind of complaint will be monitored?
                             Thank you.

ALLEN GROGAN: Yes. So there are -- I think there are several questions there. Let me try
                             to address them. So there's an obligation in the registry agreement for
                             periodic monitoring of security threats like spam and phishing and so
                             forth. The contract language itself is not very specific about how often
                             those -- that monitoring needs to occur or exactly what form that
                             monitoring needs to take.

                             So we have a discussion out in the community to try to build a
                             framework that would establish recommended best practices for
                             conducting those kinds of scans for spam, malware, and so forth. I think
                             there will be a variety of different approaches by registries. Some

ICANN | 52
Singapore

registries will probably adopt that framework. Some registries already have in place processes that probably go far beyond what would be recommended in that framework.

And, yes, we are thinking about how we might gather and present statistics on that. The agreement does require the registry operators to gather statistics and to keep records of those statistics. And I think we're still early in the process. But I think, as we move forward, we would think about presenting statistics.

On complaints about violations of public interest commitments, compliance does present some statistics on that information and does make public some information about complaints. But our general approach is to try to resolve problems, to try to bring contracted parties into compliance and not to punish them.

So our general approach is we first notify the contracted party that we think there's a problem and try to get them to correct the problem. If they correct the problem reasonably promptly, we do not send them a breach notice because they've solved the problem. And that's really what we want to -- we want to encourage good behavior.

Typically, it is only after we've worked collaboratively with them over a period of time and sent them three notices and they've still failed to correct the problem, that we would send a breach notice. And at that point it becomes public.

That information is publicly posted whenever we send a breach notice to a registry operator. And, again, although we publicly post that information, I don't think currently we do a breakdown of statistics by

EN

type of complaint or type of breach. We could certainly think about that moving forward.

 With respect to the public interest commitments, just so you know, we have not -- thus far in the new gTLD program, we have not received any valid complaints of a breach of a public interest commitment

 So the public interest commitments are in place. There are a number of registries that have rolled out strings that have been delegated into the root, including some of the highly regulated strings. And so far there are no complaints filed with ICANN that have been determined to be valid complaints.

 >>CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much. Another final question? Short one in case there's one? If not, then we would like to thank you very much for this valuable information and look forward to future exchange.

ALLEN GROGAN: Thank you. Look forward to it, too.

MAGUY SERAD: Thank you very much. Have a great rest of the day.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Next we have another presentation discussion from Architelos on domain name market aspects. We have Alexa Raad from Architelos. Please introduce yourself and go ahead.

**ICANN | 52
Singapore**

ALEXA RAAD: Thank you very much. The slides are perfect. Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to come talk to you guys about domain name abuse. The mandate was or the question is: What is domain name abuse and what are the best practices? What kinds of things lead to domain name abuse and what are the best practices for mitigating it?

Next slide.

So first I'm going to talk about what -- how do we define domain name abuse? And then give you some basics for understanding not only what the abuse is but how it operates.

And then take those and actually build it into best practices that we've seen throughout the years in dealing with domain abuse across various registries. And, lastly, how do we take the components of the lessons we've learned and what we know has worked and what hasn't worked into a domain abuse mitigation system, if you will?

So next slide. If you can just advance it twice.

So domain name abuse is really defined as those that -- the kinds of activities that are really targeting Internet end users and for malicious or exploitative purposes. And often times these are deceptive. They're meant -- and more and more so for financial gain.

And, increasingly, we've seen that they're being perpetrated by criminal gangs and organized crime syndicates. One thing to remember -- and this is very, very important -- that these categories of phishing, malware, botnets and spam, they're not mutually exclusive. And I'll explain that in a little bit.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

But, you know, you'll hear domain abuse experts talk about abuse is fluid and there are vectors of abuse. What it means is -- if you can go to the next slide -- the way that that domain abuse is actually perpetrated and is distributed, a lot of times you'll find e-mails with domains advertised in the body of the email. These are spam e-mails that go out. And then, as part of that spam, if somebody clicks on a domain name, they'll be taken to a Web site. That Web site might be a phishing Web site. That Web site might have some sort of code and malicious or malware that then gets downloaded onto the device. This malware can then start off a botnet attack, which is a command and control botnet; or it could actually poison the DNS cache and direct the next time the user goes to another Web site, the same Web site, it will change the IP address, unbeknownst to the user. And they'll go to a Web site that looks like their bank, but it's really phishing. That kind of attack is called pharming. You'll see these are not exclusive categories. One leads to another. This is what abuse experts call vectors of abuse or the fluidity of abuse.

Next slide.

So a little bit about spam. There's been discussions of oh, well, should we include spam or not? Is this really an abuse? Yes, there's a lot of spam that targets, you know, counterfeit goods and what not. But the problem -- the way we define spam as an abusive activity is these are domains that are advertised in spam. And they are a distribution mechanism for perpetrating some of the abuses we talked about, the phishing, the malware, the botnets.

Interesting to know, 85% of the world's email is spam.

In 2012, there was a study by Microsoft and I believe one other party. I should have actually had the notation there. But what it talked about was a social cost of spam. What it actually costs in terms of, you know, the spam filters, the time spent, the companies that end up having to clean out the counterfeit goods. It's $20 billion a year. So it's not a, you know, small bothersome type of activity. But, if you simply think about it as the gateway drug, if you will, of abuse, spam is certainly the gateway drug.

Next slide.

So here's an example. We've redacted the name, but it's an email, very recent email from January 17th. And it directs the user to click on this email address.

Now, if you notice -- if you don't necessarily pay too much attention, it could very easily pass for a legitimate address. But there's something odd about that email.

Amazon is not spelled with two "Os. " Go to the next slide.

If you click on that, oddly enough, you will go to a web page that looks exactly like your Amazon login address. But, if you look at this address bar, it's that domain name that was advertised. And this is a phishing attack. It will get you to put in your login and password. Once they have that, they have access to your contact information, whatever banking or login details that you've put into your account.

Next slide.

So what kinds of things actually lead to spam? We've been looking at this for a while now. And the short answer is there is not one variable alone that determines whether a TLD is going to have spam or not.

I know it's not the easy answer. But the right answer is that there are many variable. Certainly, a very, very low price tends to attract abusers because it provides an economic incentive by lowering the barrier to entry.

Lax registration policies: If your registration policies are very, very open or if you have some sort of registration policies but you really don't enforce them. Lack of enforcement certainly leads over a long term to abuse, but also so does inconsistent enforcement.

So, if you think about it, a very simple example is if there's a road that you drive on and it says you cannot drive over 55 miles per hour, if there's no enforcement, or if once in a while somebody gets caught, pretty much the public learns that you really don't have to slow down on that road. And so there is no disincentive, if you will. This goes, by the way, on both the registrar and the registry side. It takes two that the provider and the distribution channel.

Next slide.

So I want to go through a couple of basics. Number one, not all abuse is created equal. Although a lot of times -- and we do the same -- we report abuse on an aggregate level. And we'll sometimes break it out. But some abuses are more dangerous than others.

To give you an example, how many of you remember the whole Sony spear phish attack? You know, the whole excitement over the movie

ICANN | 52
Singapore

"Interview"? That was actually perpetrated by a group out of North Korea called Guardians of Peace. It only took about 40 e-mails, phishing emails for them to get access into the Sony systems.

 The amazing damage to Sony -- you know, the number of people, the stories and the media coverage and so forth, was immense. So you can talk about 40 e-mails, if you will, or a phishing attack. You know, a -- 10 spam e-mails do not necessarily correspond to 10 malwares. So these are very distinct. Some are more dangerous than others, and you can't treat them all the same. Next slide.

 It can also change and morph over time. Again, going back to you hearing experts talk about, you know, abuse is fluid. Criminals are always 10 steps ahead of the best policies that we could write up, the best rules that we could do

 And, when you look at, you know, how -- I showed there was this domain advertised in spam. It starts out, if you don't click on it, if you just see it in your in box, maybe not terribly horrible. But, you know, over a large number of users, it could -- as more and more people open that email and potentially click on that link and put in their information and so forth, now you can see over time it could morph into a different attack. It could morph into a malware. Once it starts to actually distribute, you know, code on to your device and take over some aspects of your device or poison your DNS cache, it becomes something more dangerous over time.

 Next slide.

EN

Now, the one thing they all have in common -- what all of these things have in common is they all start with a domain name registration.

And that is why law enforcement have increasingly started to kind of go to the source of where these kinds of abuses start with the domain name registration.

What we found is a lot of these criminals will register domains en masse and then use them and then dump the registrations and start with the whole new set of new domains to register and use.

Next slide. Next slide.

So another principle is that different top-level domains and, therefore, sometimes different registries, have different profiles. What I mean by that is there are different prices, wholesale and retail, there are different business models that they have, there are different eligibility criteria that are translated into registration policies and, you know, terms of use.

There are, you know, closed registries or brand registries. There are open generics. And there are different distribution models. Some have -- are very, very heavy towards, you know, a few large registrars. Some have very large reseller distribution. Some are registrars themselves. Some registries are registrars themselves. All this means is that there are different risk profiles for that TLD on both sides. There are different risk profiles for the criminals approaching that TLD, but there are also different risk profiles for the registry itself.

Next slide.

So just because you see prevalence of abuse in a TLD, that doesn't necessarily mean that there is mismanagement by the registry. What matters, how you measure the registry in terms of how responsible they are is are they doing effective, consistent mitigation over time and are they doing it to reduce the time to harm. And that's the concept I'm going to cover next. But the point is we've seen over and over and over again that if you ignore abuse, over time your registry will develop a reputation amongst the organized crime and the criminals as a -- as an attractive neighborhood for these types of things to flourish.

Next slide.

The other thing is abuse patterns for a TLD vary over time. If you click twice, if you will.

So here's a day-to-day pattern. We redacted the name of the registry. If you click again, there's the month-by-month pattern. Now, as a general rule, spammers love to send stuff so that users tend to get it on Monday. You'll find a lot of, for example, spam being distributed around holidays that are known for shopping, because that's when more and more people are being attracted to go online, so prime opportunity for phishing attacks and so forth.

But this is really key. You know, there is no steady level of abuse over time. You'll see spikes because the registry may have run a promotion. There may have been a low price promotion, for example, that attracted a certain amount of abuse, and then it goes down. So there are variations every time you look either on a day-by-day basis, week-by-week basis and certainly even on a month-by-month basis.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

Next slide.

Sorry, one thing I should have mentioned. That point on the last slide was very important. The bad actors, if you will, they will look to see the most vulnerable points in a particular registry by testing policies and operations. So if you ever saw the movie Jurassic Park, if you remember the scene where the dinosaurs go to the perimeter to test the fence, before they jump the fence, they're testing the fence. That's exactly what they will do, and they will try, and they're very good at it, to find the vulnerabilities in your policies and operations and where it breaks down. And that's one reasons why you'll see these, you know, wild swings.

So virtually every TLD has at least some abuse. It is an inevitable fact that DNS was developed to be highly scalable and for immediate use. You register a domain name. It's immediately available.

A side effect of that is that I don't care what kind of TLD you have. Even the most restrictive will have some sort of abuse. That's not the question. The question is what do you do about it.

One of the reports that we just put out recently, I don't know if any of you guys have seen it, we've gotten some questions on it, is we looked at the number of abuse in 2014 for new gTLDs, and we found that they already have, you know, one-fourth, comparing like for like, in terms of size of domain names, they already have one-fourth of the level of abuse compared to legacy TLDs. But we can already see the curve rising, which means we've seen the exact same trends. The criminals testing the perimeters, starting with spam, and now trying to see where they can find vulnerable areas and vulnerable TLDs.

Next slide.

Again, another fact. Effective abuse mitigation is good for business. A lot of times this has been -- it's looked at as, oh, it's an additional cost, it's a burden. The reality is it's an insurance for if the registry is a business and if you are a not-for-profit TLD, registry, or if you're a for-profit, I don't care. You're still a business. It is an insurance for your revenue stream. And here's what happens. If you let abuse go, over time the reputation of your TLD is going to suffer. There are block lists out there that will start to put in domain names that they have noticed, with abuse, that is related to your TLD. Over time, these block lists will become resources. Those are the gauge of reputation for your TLD in the outside world. Over time they become resources for application providers, and so forth, to then potentially block out your TLD all together. So they could block it out even -- spam filters, because there is so much spam from that TLD, will say I don't care what the domain name is. If it's associated with this TLD, I'm blocking it all together.

If that happens, then the usage of your TLD is affected. End users, when they go to put in the -- their email address on a form fill, will find out that it's not accepted, much like if -- I don't know if you guys have gone in and put in a Yahoo! email address on a form fill, it will kick it out.

Same thing here. It's got a bad reputation. It will kick it out.

So over time, the reputation is going to be affected, which means then new registrations suffer. Really legitimate use within the TLD suffers. And then renewals of your registrations suffer. So it is good business to mitigate abuse.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

Next slide.

So if you think about abuse mitigation, and this is the concept of time to harm. So try to do this from a visual perspective, but think about, you know, sewer, pollution being dumped into a river. The closer that you can clean up that pollution at the source, the cleaner downstream the river banks and everything downstream is going to be.

It's the same thing with, you know, domain name abuse. It starts out with a domain name registration and an IP address. The longer it goes on, it starts to get distributed in email, gets put in on Web sites. It starts to potentially infect your devices, including mobile devices. By then, if you now, you know, catch the -- and mitigate it, you're effectively not doing much mitigation because what you're doing is damage assessment. You've come to the scene of the accident. The accident happened happened. The parties have been injured, and you're now saying here's how much damage was done.

Time to harm means how close can you get to the point where that abuse was created so that you prevent it from being live and potentially affecting more and more end users. That's the key to effective abuse mitigation, reducing that time to harm.

Next slide.

So best practices. You can't have a policy without operational and procedures that support this policy. You just can't say, all right, nobody drive over 55 miles per hour. You have to have a system of road signs. You have to have a system of detecting when people go over 55. You

have to have a consistent means of providing an enforcement if people disregard that and speed.

So same thing here. You have to have procedures that support it, and these procedures have to be consistent.

If I treat somebody for driving over 55 with a warning but somebody else gets a thousand dollar fine, that's not consistency.

So consistency, aligning these procedures, and then learning over time so that you can continue to fine-tune it, because nothing is static.

The second thing is understand what's happening in the domain name space. I'll talk a little bit about this concept of continuous monitoring versus periodic monitoring and why we believe continuous monitoring is the key. But you also want to use multiple data sources. You just can't rely on whatever comes to your point of -- your abuse point of contact because that is a small subset of what's actually happening.

So there are multiple data sources that are, in effect, the reputation of your TLD outside. If you do not at least consider them, you are turning a blind eye to what others see about you as to how valuable, how reputable your TLD is.

Data is not enough. You need to be able to analyze it, you need to be able to prioritize it. As I said, all abuses are not created equal. So you're not able to deal with, you know, 10 abuses, 50 abuses, potentially thousands of abuses every day. What you ought to do is take the ones that are most egregious, prioritize them and deal with them first to reduce the time to harm for the most egregious ones.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

And lastly, the last -- the less time that abuse is up, the more -- the better it is in terms of protecting end users. So if you think about the fact that most damage in a phishing attack is done within two hours, if you take down that phishing attack in 56 hours, what you've done is damage assessment. You have not mitigated.

Next slide.

So putting best practices to work. You've got to have -- Whatever you have in your policies, your policies have to rationally make sense. You have to have procedures and processes that operationalize or, in other words, put those policies into actual work that is consistent. You have to have a means of detecting abuse. Analyzing and prioritizing the most important cases. You've got to be able to notify the appropriate parties, whether they're registrars, in some cases the registrants of what's happening.   And communicate effectively.   You have to have enforcement.   Enforcement can mean anywhere from suspension to deletion. Suspending the domain name so it no longer resolves. If it doesn't resolve, it's not doing any harm.

You have to keep, as you just mentioned, we heard ICANN talk about documentation. You've got to keep documentation for two reasons. Compliance is certainly one, but for your own purposes, for improvement, you've got to measure how effective you've been. You know, yes, it cost money. Domain mitigation costs money, but as I mentioned, the larger cases, it's actually good for your business.

So the more that you can keep metrics and document it, the better.

The other thing is for consistency's sake and from a legal perspective, it is -- it's a protection for the registry. If somebody comes and says how come you took me down; you know, we're both phishers but you took him down in 56 hours, you took me down in two, why is that?

You've got to be able to say, sorry, for the same offense, I've had the same enforcement I don't care who you are. This is same offense, same enforcement.

You've got to have a complaint and redress. There are times when you're going to be wrong, and you want to be able to have some sort of a feedback mechanism, not just for complaints but also, again, for iteration and for continuing to improve.

Next slide.

So this is what we consider to be the foundation of a really good abuse mitigation system. Up there is your principles. Principles are, for example, you'll find in the GAC saying, you know, we want to have safety for the end users. Well, what does that translate to? Those principles translate to certain policies that are supposed to set guidelines for how those principles are going to be enacted; okay?

You know, if you have principles of transparency and accountability, then -- and, you know, protection of your end users, then you have to have policies that also reflect that.

So your abuse policy has to also be in your registration policy, has to be part of your acceptable use policy, et cetera.

That's not enough, though. That's not where you end. You also have to have processes and procedures that help you carry that out on a consistent basis, and those procedures cannot contradict one another and cannot nullify one another. So in order to enact those policies, you have to have things like WHOIS. You have to have a procedure for doing WHOIS validation, for example, a procedure for doing suspension, a procedure for doing takedown. You have to have procedures for documenting and where you're going to store and for how long.

And then those procedures have to be broken down into work flows or processes that may have exceptions. So there's an exception and escalation path, and those would have to be measured; right?

So all of these things work very -- should work very closely together; otherwise, it's really not an effective mitigation system.

Next slide.

So in terms of data detection, key thing is, you know, choose -- there are already reputable sources out there. Choose sources that are reputable, and you need to choose multiple sources, and the reason is that some of them report only on one type of data and not others, but it also helps to you reduce false positives when you get corroboration of something from separate two independent sources. If two separate independent sources tell you that something is a problem, then it is much easier for you to prioritize that and say, all right, I can know that this is a false positive. My risk of false positive is reduced, and second, I have independent corroboration.

And understand that, again, multiple data sources are valuable because not every vendor, not every block list, not every data feed provider is going to have -- to catch everything.

The data that you get should have some mechanisms in place and validation to reduce false positives. And by the way, this isn't -- validating data -- validating abuse is not something that registries -- is in the core competency of a registry. This is something that actually the data vendors do themselves. In a lot of cases, it is better for the -- for that to be validated by independent third parties than by the registry itself, because the registry will be doing the takedown and the enforcement action. So you want to have some separation and control.

You're also going to have data from law enforcement sources as well. Again, all of these will help you to put together, you know, priority, analyze it, prioritize it, and then understand how you're going to deal with it. And just like I said, there have to be supportive processes and procedures and work flows in place for you to do that.

Next slide.

So a little word about monitoring or, you know, periodic assessment or periodic -- I'll just for simplicity's sake, say continuous monitoring versus sampling. For sampling to work, you've got to assume the following, that all types of abuse are equal. We already showed you they weren't.

You've got to assume that there are no commonalities or correlation between abuse types. We've already shown you that you could look at something that would be a spam on Monday. By Friday, it might

actually be a full-blown phishing attack. So looking at it on Monday may completely miss what may happen on Friday.

It assumes that abuse patterns stay relatively the same over time. And we've shown you that it doesn't.

And because of the -- you know, the huge variations in abuse types and the severity of even one phishing attack versus another, in order for sampling to work, you'd have such a large, large sample that you almost effectively would be doing continuous monitoring to begin with because it doesn't follow a normal distribution curve.

So just visually, here's that same pattern over 12 months; okay?

Depending on how long you were doing that sample, gathering samples from -- you can get very, very different results. The red lines are, you know, you're doing it within, say, 15 days around January, and, you know, within 15 days in -- you know, later on. I think it's January or June. Anyhow, but you're going to see very, very different results.

And lastly, periodic sampling or monitoring is not enforcement. It's simply just giving you a sense of what do I have, what's the scope of the problem that I have, but it's not enforcement.

So next slide.

I talked a little bit about this. You've got to have some analysis and prioritization because you've got to be able to deal with the most egregious ones first. In our experience, we found that analysis means you start to draw a correlation and relationship. If a particular registrar is the source of 30% of your abuse problems, you could actually have a

conversation with that registrar and take care of 30% of your abuse. So analysis and drawing correlation is really important.

If a particular IP address -- if you track the domain names to a problematic IP address and then to a problematic name server, now you know if a particular ISP or service provider may unwittingly or wittingly be tracking a lot of abuse.

So by picking up the phone and having that conversation, you will now take care of a large chunk of your abuse problems. So analysis, drawing correlations, establishing reputation is important. If amazoon.com registered over and over again by anybody other than Amazon tends to lead to problems, guess what? Wouldn't you want to have a rule that says I should -- you know, if somebody tries to register amazoon.com that is not Amazon, maybe I won't make that available right away. Maybe I'm just going to wait until it's proven that it is not a malicious activity.

Again, verifying abuse -- this is not something that is in the core competency of the registries. Things like child pornography, for example, they really have to be done by external experts. But even, you know, just verifying against false positives, this is something that is ideally done at the data vendor level. This is what they do as a sweet spot every day.

Next slide.

So here's a simple -- at the very bottom you can always get detection. There's lots of free feeds available that provide you data. Again, that's not enough. Because that could be riddled with false positives. The

analysis, which is putting that data together to get some -- derive some information, is important. Because that helps you now to prioritize. You know, remove false positives, see where there's corroboration against various independent third parties.

Next step is to add knowledge. You know, can you make this a little bit more -- what are the relationships that you can build? And, lastly, off of that you can do mitigation.

Last slide.

So how expensive is it?

Well, first of all, let's make sure we understand. Again, it is something that's good for business.

Second, responsible registries have already planned for this. This is part of what they submitted in their application. It's part of the AGB. It's part of their specifications. It's part of their contract. They had to include what was their plans for effective abuse mitigation and describe it.

There's two options at a very simple level. You do it yourself or you outsource. If you do it yourself, a medium registry, a medium-sized registry would need half time somebody who has some abuse -- has some familiarity, is a good abuse expert to help do this, to man their point of abuse desk, et cetera.

Or you can do outsource abuse consulting. There's companies that do that. And the cost would be $150 to $350 an hour, based on what you're facing. And, lastly, there are good commercial solutions already

ICANN | 52
Singapore

out there available that are offered as a service that provide it from anywhere from $250 to $400 a month.

So, from a cost perspective, there are a number of solutions that are available. Do it yourself, outsource. And none of them are cost prohibitive in that sense.

That's it. Any questions?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much. We're at the end. But we have time for a few questions. Indonesia, please.

INDONESIA: Thank you, gentlemen. It's very interesting presentations for us as regulators to be careful what this -- what will happen.

What I want to know further is why there are so many criminals doing this? Why they are doing this? I mean, for money? Or for fun? Because I'm not aware many people digging pockets just for fun. They want to get my money or passport or whatever to sell. If they do not get money, it's fun. That's fine.

Number 2: How can we socially make regulations to prevention? In Singapore, in many countries, to reduce crime like this, we just give people who do not get enough money, give them this money. Then they will not rob you or bring deep pockets and the world will be more peace.

Now, can we tell, okay, instead of doing crime, if you want money just come to the government and we'll give you money or something like that? More or less. Thank you.

ALEXA RAAD:
I wish it were that easy. I think there are some law enforcement colleagues of mine who can answer your first question better than I can.

What I do know is that a lot of these guys -- it's no longer that -- it's not the little guy -- you know, the high school kid in his basement doing it for an ego boost. It's increasingly very, very sophisticated organized crime syndicates that are in anything from, you know, prostitution -- and the motivation is money. We're also increasingly seeing state-sponsored espionage that is now engaging in something like this to insert, for example, botnets, command and control botnets for the purposes of spying or for damaging infrastructure of another country.

So, bottom line, there's plenty of incentives out there. And there always will be. What you can do -- and this is why consistently comes into play.

Again, if you consistently, you know, provide the same enforcement over time, every time that they try to -- you know, touch your perimeter, that insistently there's an app that says it's not going to work. They've registered a domain name. Immediately you take it down because there was phishing. Register another one, you take it down. Register a third one, you take it down. Over time individuals and humans, which is what they are, they have a learning capacity. They're not going to try the same thing again. Right?

Which brings me to the second point. You've got to continually learn where they're headed. So why this thing might work here, you've got to learn and you've got to be ahead of them.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Does the very low domain prices affect this -- add to the problem?

ALEXA RAAD: Yes. They're definitely one of the variables. But, again, I caution you that they're not the only variable. Because you can have very low domain prices. But, if enforcement -- on the other hand, you know, it will attract abuse. But, on the other hand, if you're constantly taking it down, taking it down, taking it -- over time, economic barrier is -- economic incentive is one thing. But, over time, even if it's very, very low, if they don't get anywhere, you remove the economic incentive for them that, fine, this may look attractive. But, really, I'm not getting anywhere. I'm not able to send out phishing attacks or I can do identity theft.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. One more final question, if you want. Thailand.

THAILAND: I just want to point out that these are the facts that GAC has the role to fit in the response to the public comments on the security frameworks. These are the topics. And I'd like to stress that from the communique that we used to state two key words, which is also touched by this presentation. First is protocols comparable to the online littering that

we state in the safeguard that we mention. And secondly is the mitigation. We use the word called immediate actions. And I urge the GAC members to really go back and see that it showed up with false positives. You like to take the domain down. But you also have to -- you talk to the law enforcement, and they say that is death penalty for people in the cyber. So how you need to balance that, become a public policy standpoint. So look into your local legal frameworks. Give the input what should be the best definition of what we call immediate action? It might be different from one country to the another. And that role is what we need to give the feedback to the community how we see. And we're coming up with something that will make it safe rather than having a very generic terms that you cannot do the compliance, cannot do the contractual oversights. And best practice is one of the means. But, as our role as the government, we need to give them input. That's all. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much.

[Applause]

With this we would be at the end of the meeting, unless there's further comments or questions on any of the agenda items that we had from Saturday to now. Olga.

ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. And congratulations for your great work. And just looking forward to welcoming you all into Buenos Aires again. If any of

you have any questions or comments about where to go, what to visit, please send me an email, and I'll be happy to help you. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much.

Wanawit.

THAILAND: I take the liberty also we celebrate the Chinese New Year's. And the last time we say Merry Christmas to them, to all the western. And each time for the Asia Pacific that we're under year of goat. So we hope that you have happiness and prosperous. So have to say Chinese first. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much.

[Applause]

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. With this, thank you for the constructive work. It was a pleasure for me. And we also like to thank the interpreters for their hard work. It was a pleasure for us to use your services. And thanks to the secretariat and whoever has been working in front or behind the scenes, vice chairs, and those who give us coffee and everything else. Thank you very much. See you next time.

[Applause]

ICANN | 52
Singapore

EN

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]