
MONTREAL – GAC Operational Matters Discussions
Monday, November 4, 2019 – 15:15 to 16:45 EDT
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So, this session is on operational matters, and the agenda will be, if we can go to the following slide, please, Gulden, the agenda will be first to confirm the GAC Board topic 3 that we discussed yesterday. Then we will get to know the vice-chair election results, and then we'll talk about the planning for the next GAC high-level governmental meeting. GAC empowered community guidelines review. GAC advice and Board response assessment advice tracking process and finally the GAC record keeping. So we're already starting a bit late. If we can go directly to the topic 3, and Rob please over to you.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you very much, Manal. This is Robert Hoggarth, for the record. Good afternoon and thank you for all your patience where I think this is an unusual circumstance where typically during one of these annual general meetings, we give you a whole day off. But we didn't do that today and my apologies. I will confess one of the ways we thought we could get more attendance in the room is to announce the election results so I'm glad there is an

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

interest level there. The conversation yesterday on the Board preparation session focused on potential changes to the third topic, Switzerland raised some issues, and had some excellent suggestions. The U.K. added onto those, and with the help of both Jorge and Paul, actually it's all their work -- I just transcribed it. We've got a revised document that is up on the screen here that reflects what we could ask of the community. I'm sorry, what the GAC would ask of the Board during your meeting with them tomorrow. I e-mailed it all out to you yesterday evening. I'm sure you all immediately looked at it after returning back from your dinners. But I hope there's been an opportunity to take a look. And this is the opportunity to suggest any changes or revisions. After we finish this topic, I will proceed with transmitting this to the Board so that they can work hard on preparing their answers to you. Thank you. So at this point it's if you, madam chair, or any members of the GAC have any comments, suggestions or changes, I'm happy to take notes and make the adjustments. Otherwise we will proceed with this material. I would note that I didn't receive any e-mails that suggested any changes up until now. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Rob. So any comments or suggestion for changes to the text as it stands on the screen? So basically 4

questions. To what extent does the Board think the recommendations of the CCT review and other relevant reviews have been addressed. When does the Board anticipate that these recommendations will be implemented? And how will this timing impact the timing of in any subsequent new gTLD rounds? And finally what can the Board do to help ensure that the CCT review recommendations aimed at other parts of the community are implemented? Okay, I see no comments. So I think we're good to send to ICANN Board. And before leaving this topic, I would like to bring to your attention an e-mail that I circulated this morning, I think, with the slides that we have received from the Board. I have sent it again. I sent it some time ago but just to bring it on top of your inboxes, so that we're ready for the discussion hopefully tomorrow with the Board. So please make sure to go through the slides before the session. If nothing else on this, we can move to the following topic.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Yes, thank you. Just one note that I would like to reflect. Switzerland did provide you some feedback via e-mail after you sent out those slides, so that may be incorporated and perhaps Jorge would like to take the lead on those comments tomorrow. That's up to you guys to decide. But just to also let you know that the Board support team has advised me that once I share with

them the new questions, they will be putting that into the slides that the Board intends to provide to us, so the final version you see up on the screen, tomorrow may be slightly different from what you shared with them Manal but it shouldn't be materially different. Okay, so we can --

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Rob. And apologies, Jorge, for missing your inbox -- your e-mail. I'm just trying to catch up with my inbox and I'm very sorry and thank you for sending some feedback. I will make sure to look into it immediately after the session. So over to you again Rob. I'm sorry.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you. Again this is Robert Hoggarth. And Gulden if we can go to the next slide. This is actually, as I explained to you in Marrakech this is the potential to have going into Marrakech, and the nomination makes period there was the potential for us to have the first election in 2 years in the past couple of elections there were not as -- there were not more nominees than seats available. In the case of the vice chair election for this 2019 period, to select vice-chairs for 2020, we had 7 candidates for the 5 seats. Thank you very much to all the candidates who put your names forward, or who accepted nominations from others. This

is a very good sign of interest in contributing to the committee. An opportunity that as you see with a number of the candidates who actually are leaders of the various working groups, and although I don't know what the future holds for many of you, but with respect to openings, working groups or the opportunity to volunteer and participate in future proceedings, we certainly hope that all GAC members will consider that. It's always exciting when we can see a process where you're all coming together and making decisions like this, so this is great. We met the quorum requirements in the electronic balloting process. Very happy to see that we had over 100 ballots cast. Several people actually updated ballots over the course of the election. So that gave us some comfort that the system worked as reliably as it did a couple of years ago. I can report that there were no ties so we will not have to hold a paper ballot run-off for the elections so that's a good thing. I don't think you all wanted us to drag you back here on Thursday, although again it's very important process so we would have been more than happy to do that. So I'll go to the next slide and share with you the results. Based on the votes cast the elected 2020 vice-chairs for the coming period will be Olga Cavalli, Luisa Paez, Pua Hunter, Rodrigue Ragnimpinda and Jorge Cancio. So thank you all very much for not only volunteering some of you know what you're in for. Some of you don't. And thank you all very much to those of you who cast your ballots and participated in the process. For those of you who may not be familiar with how

the leadership conducts its affairs, the operating principles guide us that these new vice-chairs will take on their term of office after ICANN67 so after the Cancun meeting on those terms of offices will extend through the ICANN 70 meeting. As GAC trip holds the new vice-chairs will be asked to join the mailing list of the leadership team and will be invited to start participating immediately if we would like in the various meetings of the leadership team. So thank you all for that. Next slide, please. Any comments? Sorry.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, please, Rob. Before leaving this, before moving on first of all I would like to very, very much thank the -- all the 7 candidates for putting forward their names, thank you very much, and I still rely on all 7 of them to get the work done. Actually, we are ... volunteers so thank you for your interest to lend a hand here, and as Rob mentioned, to the 5 vice-chairs we normally start having everyone on the GAC leadership mailing list, and on the GAC leadership calls immediately after the results so that we have a smooth onboarding, and a smooth transition. So congratulations to everyone. And I wonder whether any -- yeah, Olga. I thought people might want to speak to this as well. So, Olga.

OLGA CAVALLI, GAC VICE-CHAIR:

Thank you, Manal. Thank you for the confidence of colleagues and thinking that I can do a second term as vice chair. Thank you very much. It's a big honor on big responsibility. I would like to congratulate Luisa, Pua, Rodrigue and Jorge and I would like to say that the 7 candidates were very good. Unfortunately, there are only 5 seats. And I would like to say that we have a great chair. I think Manal has been the best chair that we can have, and we have to work with her. So this is a comment to those not so much engaged. I'm glad to see new people trying to become vice-chairs and joining working groups. It's important that the GAC really gets involved in all the working groups. They have the experience that we had in Work Track 5 is that we were few and the legitimacy of the GAC belongs to us. If we are active in all the cross-community working groups and all the cross-community efforts that are in ICANN, our presence will be well respected and considered. So this is a request to all of you, join the working groups. Join whatever activity that we do. And we will try to support our chair as much as possible because I really think that she's great and she does an immense job for all of us. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Olga. And I have to say you are a role model. I still remember the results of our elections and immediately

afterwards you were on Board, and helping significantly, thank you very much. So shall we move to the following topic.

ROBERT HOGGARTH:

Great. Thank you very much. This is Robert Hoggarth. The next topic is something that I've mentioned at a couple of the past meetings. I'm going to give a little bit longer introduction to it because I know a number of the participants today were not here for the last high-level governmental meeting. For those of you not familiar with the consent, and as a reminder for those of you who are, coming out of the accountability and transparency review team, review efforts the first and the second, the concept of holding a high-level governmental meeting was adopted generally by the GAC, and by the ICANN organization. The consent is to bring together senior level government officials every couple of years, to engage in ICANN activities. To give you an opportunity to demonstrate to your bosses, to other people within your government, that what goes on at ICANN. To get them more involved in had the work of the organization, and to help them have frankly a much better appreciation of domain name system issues and the type of work that goes on in this multi-stakeholder community. There have so far been 4 HLGs here in Canada, back at ICANN 45. In the U.K. at ICANN 50. Marrakech, two times ago back at ICANN 55 and most recently just

a year ago in Barcelona Spain. Generally if you're planning as many of you do -- for large events you need to make decisions about when the next one is going to be fairly early in the procession. Literally if we were to stick to an every 2 year schedule the next potential would be a year from now. If we can go to the next slide. I noted some aspects of the importance of the concept of the meeting. Already touched on those if you want to grab a shot of this, I'm not going to go through it in detail. Again the concept is generally though to really build better and stronger connections with your governments, and to leverage ICANN to give you all an opportunity to educate your colleagues and senior officials. Looking back at Barcelona we had the largest attendance of any of the previous meetings, there was a substantial amount of interest, and its challenging logistical effort to pull it all together so we like to have as much time available to us as possible to plan and prepare. Gulden, next slide, please. So no decision yet has been made about either the timing or the location for the next high-level governmental meeting. This is a decision is made by the GAC. It's not a decision that's made by ICANN. In fact, the language is very precisely worded. The high-level governmental meeting takes place in conjunction with an ICANN meeting and so it's really an opportunity for a host government to run the affairs in partnership, we as GAC support staff work very closely with those individuals and with those planners. Now, the typical case is candidates come forward on

their own to volunteer and say hey we would like to do the high-level governmental meeting but we've got some challenges recently. They are arguably a good challenge. The obstruction organization particularly the meetings team has been able to achieve a timetable where you can see 2 years from now where the meetings are going to be. So in some respects that's a constraint as well as an opportunity. In terms of identifying what would be some good prospects for the potential meeting. So that's a general overview Manal just sort of setting the stage. Again it becomes really a matter of conversations among GAC members and particularly the leadership, in terms of what direction you want to go. But to remain consistent with the spirit of the ATRT recommendations we are looking at that. I use the term carefully too -- about every 2 years. So with that, if you have any comments or will entertain comments from the floor, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Rob. I think you did a very good job in covering everything. I just want to stress the fact that it may sound a little bit early, but it's not because it takes around a year to prepare for this high level meeting, to have it on the agenda of ministers and senior officials as early as possible, to extend invitations from the host country to the invitees, so just to note that it's about time, if

not late. So please, keep it in mind, and we look forward to GAC members who will be hosting future meetings, should very wish to host the high-level governmental meeting, please reach out to GAC leadership, Rob, myself, or anyone. Back to you, Rob.

ROBERT HOGGARTH:

Thank you, Manal. This is Robert Hoggarth. Gulden, we can go to the next slide and the next topic. We've talked also and I think you had actually mentioned in your opening remarks Manal -- at the opening plenary -- that there continues to be community focus on the empowered community administration, and all of the various opportunities and responsibilities that go with the GAC being a decision al participants in the empowered community. It's now been two years since the GAC put together guidelines for how the committee would operate within that regime, and I think it's fair to say that over the course after couple of years there's been good experiences, an opportunity to test out how the guidelines and procedures work, and there have been some opportunities to identify where they can be improved tightened. Adjusted. Other aspects to be added. A couple of examples where some additional work may be necessary is the rejection process timetable. The good news is that none of you have seen fit with respect to recent Board decisions to petition, to reject the actions, but this is a consent, a structure, a set of

principles that will be a part of ICANN for the remainder of its existence so it's very important that there's a longer view taken with respect to these processes. Something may not happen for the next 5 years. Something could happen in the next 5 months. The issue is, trying to create a fundamental infrastructure, a set of processes and guidelines for all of you, that when a situation does arise, you're prepared. The good news is that the guidelines were very well considered. And written so we've really only identified a couple of areas for potential improvement, but Manal has been reaching out to the legal team. She's asked us to do a review of the current guidelines just to see where there may be areas that we could recommend improvements. Our expectation is that we will at ICANN67 present you all with some recommendations for how these guidelines could be updated, adjusted, evolved, whatever word you would like to use. So we will look forward to sharing that with you. I'm delight that had I've been approached by a couple of you already, I guess after Manal's opening plenary remarks. To help us out in that regard. And if any of you are interested in helping to contribute to the effort, we would be delighted to have your brain and enthusiasm associated with the work.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you again, Rob. And I think, yeah, I think the initial guidelines are very well drafted. We just need to review them, maybe on following GAC leadership call and then we can propose something to GAC colleagues over the mailing list, subject to discussion in Cancun. So.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you, Manal. This is Robert Hoggarth. With all that said there is actually some ECA work that we are looking to you for some feedback on. I gave you warning on that prior to the meeting, in your preparations I sent out an e-mail with respect to a fundamental Bylaws amendment, and if we can go to the next slide, Gulden, I'll give you a little background of that. I'm not going to read the slide to you. You can look at it up behind me or just allow me to give a summary. The consent of bylaw amendments to the ICANN bylaws is actually two-fold. When you talk about the empowered community. There are the regular bylaws, and then there is a classification of fundamental bylaws, and the bylaws actually define what a fundamental bylaw is. The ECA processes specify that if there is a change to a fundamental bylaw, you don't just have an opportunity to reject what the Board did, but there's actually a requirement that the community approve of that action, so there's actually an expectation that there is a yes, do this, as opposed to nobody objected so it's fine. In this case -- and

let me step back. The fundamental bylaws are what you might expect. They're the missions and core principles. They are the accountability and review bylaws. There are aspects of the make-up of the Board of Directors. There are things related to financial aspects of the organization, and there's a long line of bylaws that are impacting the IANA function, and the fundamental core technical work that ICANN does much the IANA naming function review is one of those fundamental bylaws that governs essentially the review that the community takes of what IANA is doing. The ccNSO came forward earlier this year to basically share with the community that they were having difficulties filling the seats as specified in the bylaws that were their responsibility. At the beginning of September, after several months of back and forth and deliberations, the Board accepted their explanation and said, yes, you're right. Let's find a way to continue to populate the group but understand and recognize some of the issues you have. Now, this is not the session where I'm going to go into the details of that. I had some of that in the e-mail that I sent to you. There's going to be some follow up from the leadership so there may be opportunities to talk about that if you have specific questions about the specific changes that are being made. But from an ECA perspective, what is expected is that the GAC, as a decisional participant in the ECA has an opportunity to say yes, we approve. No, we object. Or by action or inaction abstain from making any comment about this. The bylaws the way they're set up through

the ECA process is that there are -- there's requirement that at least 3 of the decisional participants say yes. Approve, or if it's to be rejected that no more than 1 -- I'm sorry, I don't want to confuse you. More than one member or decisional participant says no then the amendment is rejected. So far as of today, there have been expressions of interest, and approval reflected by both the ccNSO and the at large advisory committee. So there's still a third decisional participant that has to act. I'm not familiar with where the GNSO is on this but clearly Manal has been approached by the ccNSO chair to ask what the GAC is thinking about this are we going to get your approval and if the GAC said yes, you would have your three. So the way the process works is that 21 days after there's been a community forum held about the issue. There's expectation and requirement that something comes in from the various decisional participants. The community action forum on this topic was held yesterday morning. So I look around the room. There were a couple of people there. So thank you very much. Manal participated as the representative of the GAC in that meeting. Now within the next 3 weeks there's expectation that the GAC will be able to approve object or abstain. You will see shortly after this meeting, a note coming out from the GAC leadership with a recommendation to you. One of the reasons why the leadership asked me to send out the e-mail to you all ahead of time, was to see if there would be any expressions with respect to whether the GAC should proceed with approving this.

And if we move to the next slide, we did receive a number of comments on the GAC e-mail list, thank you for Denmark, Somalia and Switzerland for sharing your points of view. Again the leadership will come out with an e-mail likely from staff, that asks any one to share any additional feedback, that e-mail will be a recommendation from the leadership as to what the GAC will do here. I would just ask that you all please look for that. And take the opportunity either to provide feedback or otherwise to remain silent. The GAC ECA guidelines address this issue quite well, so I'm very happy to see that this part of the process is actually working. That's all I have on this Manal. I don't know if you'd like to share any more details. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Rob. I think you covered all the details. So we're good. Anything else on the agenda? So, actually my laptop crashed and I'm re-starting it again.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: I will happily continue.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: On the agenda.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Yes, we will move on. Next slide, please, Gulden. The next thing that I wanted to report to you is also something that's going to be coming up later this week. I keep saying later this week and realizing later this week for this topic is tomorrow. Since the Abu Dhabi meeting ICANN 60, the ICANN.org has moved forward with tracking GAC advice and how the Board assesses it, responds to it, and further implements that were they have committed to doing. That's been proving to be a very effective way for all of you to potentially track and identify what's been going on with the various issues. Recently, and Manal I believe you or I shared this with the GAC -- the GAC received notice that the Board was evolving, changing, updating the process in terms of when certain aspects of the process were to take place. Typically what would happen is the GAC, when it responds to your advice in the communicate it issues what they call affectionately a scorecard. That scorecard is approved by the Board, comes out as a formal Board resolution. Gets published. We share it with you. And saying here's the link.

Please take a look. But what's missing in that process is an actual decision from all of you to say, yeah, we accept that, or that looks good, or, oh my goodness the Board didn't get that right. We saw a good example of that yesterday when Paul pointed out you know I'm reading this Board response now. You know sometime later, and I don't know that they really did respond to our advice.

Certainly the way we as the GAC expected. And so the leadership asked us as staff to look into that and say, can we create -- can we create a process taking advantage of this change in timing, where the Board comes out with its scorecard, they circulate the tracking advice in which the ICANN.org staff consider whether something is closed, resolved. Still in process and gives you the opportunity to then evaluate it and as a committee say, thumbs up, thumbs down. Wait a second we need more clarification here. So it's really a recognition there's another part of the process that would be of value that would allow you to confirm almost not in real-time but certainly consistent with what's going on so that you find yourself in a position where you are responding for more directly to the Board and more quickly. It doesn't even have to be something official Manal although I think that's what we would contemplate. Where ultimately there would be some acknowledgment from the committee that it has received the scorecard, and you know advising the Board that you know the GAC is comfortable with it or not. Now of course the challenge there is what's the right timing for that from the perspective of all of your work loads, and expectations for preparing for the next meeting? Is it if you assume that the scorecard from the Board comes about 6, 7 weeks before the ICANN meeting, what's realistic in terms of your expectations for being able to evaluate that? What sort of mechanisms would you like to see? We would certainly appreciate volunteers or individuals who would like to

help us out in terms of preparing those recommendations. Again the leadership has asked us to present an array of options. I've been approached by at least one or two of you. Or maybe I approached you and asked if you would help me out -- to give us some advice as to what might work in that regard. So if that's something of interest to you. Please reach out to me. In terms of our timing, again, I would be looking for the ICANN67 meeting in Cancun to have had the opportunity to present some options to the leadership for them to react, and maybe offer you all a proposal for how that might work. That would mean we'd still go through a maybe another cycle where you don't have something formal in place, but I think that there are a number of potential option that is could be considered either a task force or a permanent group that would be tasked with you know reading through the scorecard and making recommendations to the GAC. But we will look at a number of those options and present them to the leadership. I'm not going to promise that within a few weeks of the meeting Manal, but this is something we have been thinking about, so I'm hopeful we will make progress on it by the end of the year. Thank you. That's it for this issue.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Rob. And thank you to the support staff for all the efforts, and this is also an important topic, and we need to

make sure we close the loop in this cycle with the Board before the GAC advice is marked as closed so that with we are all on the same page. So, I think we're done with this session.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: No, we have one more.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: No, I'm sorry.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: And I have all the way until 4:15 so I am hey more than happy. I'm sure since this is openly other first session today, you're willing to go longer too. Just a quick sort of wrap up on this item. If I could. You will have this as a generalized topic in your meeting with the Board GAC, interaction group tomorrow. One of the agenda items for the BGIG meet something to talk about the tracking of the vice and the tool that the ICANN work staff provides to you all. For those of you who are actively engaged with the GAC website you know we have an activity page that allows you all the way back to ICANN 60 now to look at where the communicate is, what the clarification call recording sounds like in terms of the interaction with the Board. And the GAC. You can read the scorecard. You can see a link to the latest update of the inventory that ICANN org

provides. So you have got that in one place. It will be very helpful to engage in some conversations potentially tomorrow during the session just to get some concepts and ideas that you may have individually to share with Board members. So this is something will come up tomorrow, so you now have some good background for that conversation. The next and last item is GAC record keeping. And this is an area where there are a couple of bullets, I want to share with you. Something I don't have on the slide but some interesting statistics I want to share. Those of you who have now been on the GAC in the 2 years that I've been with you know that I like numbers. Sometimes they're interesting. Sometimes they're actually very telling in terms of strategy and the rest. In the last 12 months we have 99 new participants in the GAC. As you all know we distinguish between members and participants. Your country is a member. Your delegation is a group of participants. Whether you're a single individual, or whether there is a delegation of 5 or 6 but we've had the 99 new people in the past 12 months. That's balanced by the fact that 62 participants have left. We recognize of those 400 some odd people they don't all come to every meeting. Not all of them even have an assignment to come to ICANN meetings. We appreciate sometimes being able to go to some country members that have an additional member to the delegation participate which is great. And so it's not as if 62 people have disappeared from this room. But the important aspect of that is that there is a constant renewal of participants

involved in this committee. And one of the things that is fundamental to our core support work is to be able to maintain those records. When you look at statistics more -- you know in more details. There could be reasons for these numbers because as many of you know, over the last several months we have been very focused as a staff, on making sure that we're double checking with you as GAC representatives, about the records of your delegations. I'm sure you can imagine this, with 178 members and 38 observing organizations there are on occasions people leave and forget to tell us. Or somebody moves on. We take very seriously the spirit and tradition of GAC confidentiality. We are now subject to new privacy laws and guidelines, as ICANN org, and so we need to, and take great attention to making sure that people who join the GAC e-mail list, who ultimately have access to website. Are accredited, and formal delegates. You would be somewhat surprised how many requests we get from just people elsewhere in the committee. I want to be on the GAC mailing list. Can you know -- and we say thank you very much. Can we see you know your representative telling us that and then we don't hear from them again. But then there are also just very simple considerations that we have that if someone does retire or they move onto another responsibility in the government that we maintain a channel of communication and that we have records that demonstrate that we have permission from you, from your government to add that new person or take them off. And I

apologize to several people many of whom are not here that we are sticklers for that.

But we see that as our job to manage that and protect that so that when you receive an e-mail from someone on the GAC list, that you have comfort level that they are approved by their government, that you are hearing from someone who is a formal recognized representative, or advisor. And so I'm sorry if we create extra paperwork or issues. I think it's very fair to say that as a staff we work hard to minimize the process for you, but please understand that that's why we do that. With the leadership's blessing, I'll go so far as to take that -- we have embarked on another initiative within our record keeping functions to align and make sure that if you're on a working group, you're also -- your information is also linked to the delegation itself. So you may, as a representative say you know. This issue is really not my area of expertise. There's somebody else who can do a better job on this. I would like persons to do it. Great. We would love to have that person. The co-chairs of that working group would be delighted to have them but now with the leadership's blessing we want to make sure if we got somebody on a working group. They're also identified on the delegation. There was a period of growth, great growth within working groups 3 or 4 years ago where that principle wasn't as focused, and the certainly the privacy principles didn't exist as much. And what we want to make sure

is that working group members also have the benefits of being able to contribute to GAC discussions, but we can't do that if we don't have them identified as a delegate. So we are working hard to try to true up those records. Make sure that if you are a delegate you can join working groups and if you're on a working group that your listed on the delegation. Apologies for the extra paperwork, but we will be done that. In terms of in person meet ago tendency. For those of you for whom this is the first meeting, this is something that has bothered me from time to time. Someone hands you a piece of paper and says, write it down.

Believe it or not that continues to be the most reliable way that we can identify that you have participated in the meeting. But we are constantly looking for better ways and more efficient ways to collect that in information. And it's critical when I say that's information because now this thing again about the privacy laws and regulations that we are all becoming more conscious of, so we are again with at least the recognition of the leadership moving forward and trying to do different things. The last couple of meetings Gulden has handed you sometimes a nice pink iPad. We appreciate that's of you who are helping us experiment with that. Manal mentioned earlier this week we are exploring the QR code scanning capability. We are not ultimately doing that experiment at this meeting but tell you about that. When you look at your badge, you have QR codes on your badge. The concept is,

and our goal is that when we produce the communique. When we produce the minutes we have an accurate reflection of who attended the meeting and the reason why we take attendance every day is not to ensure that you're not going shopping or checking to see if you're sick or something like that -- the bottom line is we want to make sure that we have it reflected. And sometimes even on occasion someone will say well, I was there, and we will remember, or we will note that there is an error in the minutes, and we change that. The goal is 100% effectiveness. We want you to be credited with the amount of work that you're putting into this organization when it comes time for the HLG we want you to be comfortable when your boss comes to talk to you and to a company you. And so we want you to make sure that our records are accurate and reflect that. So again, we appreciate your willingness to experiment with us, we will continue to do that, if by any chance at this stage in the week, at one time or another you haven't done the iPad, or haven't done the pen and paper, please do so. Essentially, we compare our notes from every day just to make sure again we've got everyone recorded. And as you know. We aren't doing it as individuals. So we're doing it as -- by delegation. We don't say Manal Ismail was here. We say Egypt was here. I know you're in a different situation. You're right here next to me so I thought of it. Be aware of that and thank you for the co-operative efforts that you have shared with us to make that work. With that, that is the last item Manal.

I look over at Feng just to say, when we talk about attendance and things like that. This is potentially something for the operating principles working group. Ultimately to look at but that's not something for today. That's far down the road. Thank you very much.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Rob, and thank you for keeping us informed, and posted on those administrative efforts. They are all small but very important things that we need to put in place right. So that we can work effectively as you rightly mentioned. So my laptop re-started slowly by surely so I got my memory back, and I will stop here to say if there are any questions or comments on what Rob presented, and if not we will move to the following session on study on ICANN legitimacy and I can see -- yeah please, if you can join us on the panel. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]