

YESIM NAZLAR:

Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to all. Welcome to the fourth webinar of the Five Number 3 ATLAS 3 webinars and today's will cover Onboarding to the Governmental Advisory Committee GAC. Our presenter today is Yrjo Lansipuro, GAC Liaison. We will not be doing a rollcall for this webinar, however we are taking attendance for the first 10 minutes on this call, after that, your participating will not be a valid entry for the required attendance metrics.

If you are only on the phone bridge, please join the Zoom Room as soon as possible, as this is an attendance requirement. We have French and Spanish interpretation for this webinar, so a kind reminder to please state your name when speaking, to allow for the interpreters to identify you on the other langue channel, as well as for transcription purposes. Please also speak at a reasonable speed, to allow for accurate interpretation. All lines will be muted during the presentation and opened for questions and answers at the end of the presentation.

If you have noticed, we are running this webinar on Zoom, the features are similar to Adobe Connect but in order to view the participants list and chat box, please click on the bottom of the screen. You will only be able to see the chat transcripts for when you join the call, nothing prior to that. To raise your hand, please just click on the raise hand icon. I will now hand the floor over to Joanna Kulesza, Co-Chair of the ATLAS 3 Capacity Subgroup. Over to you, Joanna.

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.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very much Yesim. Thank you to everyone who is joining this morning, evening, afternoon. Thank you to Yrjo for agreeing to run these two webinars on the Governmental Advisory Committee. As Yesim explained, we are looking forward to your questions. Feel free to raise your hand or simply type your questions into the chat box throughout the webinar and I'm certain Yrjo will take them after the presentation is done.

A warm welcome also to some of the GAC members who are joining us today. As practice has it, often questions find their answers directly in the chatroom coming from members of the community, both At-Large and GAC, so I'm looking forward to that exchange as well. Without further ado, the floor is yours Yrjo. Thank you for joining us.

YRJO LANSIPURO:

Thank you, Joanna. Good afternoon, good evening, good morning. As Joanna mention, I'm the Liaison from the ALAC At-Large to the GAC. At some time in my let's say previous life as government employee in Finland, I was also a GAC member but that was a long time ago. I'm happy that I we also have on this call, my counterpart from the GAC, or one of my counterparts from the GAC, better to say GAC Liaison's to ALAC Charlotte Simões.

Charlotte, if you are on the conference, please feel free to comment on whatever I say from the GAC perspective. What I say is simply in my personal role, personal capacity, this is not official presentation by anybody. Let's go ahead.

The objective of this presentation of this webinar is to make a little bit more aware, familiar with the GAC, what the GAC is? What it does? What kind of powers and mission it has? We already have here a slide that shows the composition of ICANN. You certainly have seen this slide many times but anyway, I wanted to make sure that we all agree that GAC is a part of the ICANN Multistakeholder Community. Of course, there's ICANN Organization under its CEO and President, there's a Board and then the Community, which consists of all the stakeholders and GAC is one of them.

Multistakeholder Governance, it's always good to go back to the sources of the Multistakeholder approach and in this case we go back to the Information Society 2003/2005 and one of their achievements was to define the Internet Governance, which is the development and application by governments, the private sector and civil society. Their respective roles of shared principles, norms, rules, the system making procedures and programs, the shape of evolution and use of the internet. This is the basis of the Multistakeholder Organizations that deal with the internet on and of course now, talking about ICANN and its Community.

The GAC, Government Advisory Committee, is an advisory committee to ICANN, under the ICANN Bylaws and its mission, its task to provide advice to ICANN on public policy aspects, especially with regards to the internet domain name system. As issues that the governments feel that they are public issues or public policy on such issues, Governmental Advisory Committee will advise the ICANN Board. This all is framed in the Operating Principles of the GAC and on the screen you see the link to that document. Of course, as you all know, the supporting

organizations, they make policy, the advisory committees give advice about those policies to the Board and the Governmental Advisory Committee has a special place among these advisory committees because we can say it's more powerful in which way we can see in the next slide. But first, let's talk about the membership of the GAC.

The membership of the GAC is open to all national governments as well as to what is called, Distinct Economies, as they organized in international support. It also can have and has multinational governmental organizations and treaty organizations as observers on the invitation of the GAC through its chair. You see here on the left-hand side a sample of the logos of those international organizations and treaty organizations that are among the observers to the GAC.

The number of members and observers of the GAC has increases constantly. There was a handful, 20 or 25 people in the beginning who came to meetings and were members of the GAC and that has grown I would say tremendously during the existence of ICANN since 1998. This has of course -- the more members you have, the more prestigious, the more powerful you are. It's almost like network ethics and when that now has 178 members, there are a little bit more than 200 national governments in the world. It means that it's very hard actually for anybody to say that GAC is not representative of them. That includes big countries.

The GAC appoints a non-voting liaison which has always meant that they appoint their chair to the Board. That is to say the GAC liaison doesn't vote.

Once again, this is the role of GAC. ICANN receives input from governments, Governmental Advisory Committee and the key role of the GAC to provide advice to ICANN on issue on public policy, especially where they may be an interaction, ICANN's activities or policy and national laws or international agreements. In the worst case of course, they are in conflict and that's of course something that the GAC is there to try to avoid, situations like that.

Now, we have a few slides that give you the exact text of the ICANN Bylaws, about the relationship of the GAC's and Board when it comes to the advice of the GAC. First of it says that the advice of GAC on public policy matters shall be fully taken into account by the Board. In the event that the ICANN Board determines to take an action that is not consistent with the GAC advice, it doesn't follow the advice, it so inform the committee and state the reasons why it decided not to follow that advice. They have to give the rationale why the Board thinks that it's not possible to follow the advice from the GAC.

Now here, we've already come to the differences between the GAC and other advisory committees, for instance like ALAC. ALAC also gives advice to the Board and many times the Board actually answers, acknowledges that advice has been received but they are under no obligation to do so. This one of the differences between the GAC and other advisory committees, the GAC, they have to acknowledge the advice and they have to tell the GAC whether they follow the advice or not.

If GAC advice is approved by a full GAC consensus, that is to say this decision has been adopted in the GAC by general agreement, with no

formal objection, at such advice can only be rejected by a vote of the Board of no less than 60 percent. If that happens, then the GAC and the Board will try, as it says in good faith and in a timely and official manner, to find a mutually acceptable solution. From the GAC, obviously it's very important what advice it gives, everybody's on board and no one disagrees.

The GAC consensus advice, it's adopted by general agreement, in the absence of any formal objections. Now, that doesn't mean that everybody in the GAC is happy, that everybody actively supports this advice, it just means that nobody feels so bad about that advice that they would formally object. This is the same rule for At-Large in the United Nations and the organizations are part of the UN, UN family, that's full consensus. GAC advice enjoys vote agreement but received one or more formal objection and the threshold is actually under discussion, that means that the range of views is conveyed to the Board. The Board knows that while this is a view that is strongly held in the GAC but at the same time, it's not without objections. This kind of advice they don't need the super majority of 60 percent to overrule it.

If the GAC consensus advice is rejected by the Board, if they have 60 percent super majority to do it and if there's no mutually acceptable solution, then the Board will state in its final decision the reasons why the Governmental Advisory Committee advice was not followed and this will be [inaudible] rights or obligations of the GAC members with regards to public policy issues.

This is for those who might like flowcharts. This is the process I just described in this legal language. This is just a flowchart how the whole thing happens. It doesn't seem to be visible very well.

GAC advice must be given in a written form and the specific advice must be clearly marked as such, so that the Board can identify it clearly as an advice. This happens usually after each ICANN meeting in a communicate that was prepared by the GAC and this sort of drafting the communicate, sometimes it takes a big chunk of the time, of the GAC at an ICANN meeting. What is remarkable, what has changed from the time when I was on the GAC, at that time, 13 years ago, the GAC use to do this in a closed session but since then, things have developed in the direction of transparency and now everything happens in the open. If anybody at an ICANN meeting from the outside wants to see how the communicate is put together, how it is actually drafter, everybody is welcome to be there, it's an open meeting and that's like all GAC meetings nowadays.

I see that there are questions but if you don't mind, I'll deal with the questions after the presentation.

Of course, there are also other means of interaction between the Board and the GAC. Usually after some time after an ICANN meeting, there is a call with the Board and the GAC or the GAC Leadership to clarify the advice. The Board can actually ask, "What do you mean by this?" And there is an answer and a lot of back and forth to make sure that the Board understand what the advice is. There's a correspondence and also the correspondence between the Board and the GAC, the Chair of

the Board and between the Chair of the GAC, it's also in the open on the website.

There is a Board GAC Interaction Group that plans and brings things forward on improving the means of interaction. At least there are joint sessions, Board and GAC meeting at ICANN meetings and of course a lot of people come to those meetings to listen.

The way GAC interacts with the Board and with the community as a whole, it has also changed over the years. The watershed really, the watershed years were 2008/2012 when new gTLD process intensified this GAC interaction with the Board and the entire community. At that time, those who were acting in ICANN and ALAC, the GAC was very active in early warnings about certain applications. If there were applications for names that one or two countries in the GAC didn't like, there was this early warning. They were more detailed advice by the GAC about certain categories of names and that meant that GAC became more of rationally involved than ever before.

This is the structure of the GAC. The Chair is elected for two years, renewable once. The Vice-Chairs are elected for one year each and they are renewable once. As you see, the names of the countries, there are five Vice-Chairs and five ICANN regions. In principle, each region should represent and all Vice-Chairs by one person. Then there are seven working groups. As usually in ICANN, they all have abbreviations, most of them but we don't need to guess what they are, we can go to the next slide.

Here you can see the full names of the working groups. There's a GEO Names Working Group, Geographic names obviously, very active now when Work Track Five of the Subsequent Procedures PDP is still debating. There's a working group for Underserved Regions. There's a working group that deliberates on whether the GAC should participate in the Nominating Committee. There's working group on what is called The Corporation of Principles Evolution, which is related to the fact that the GAC is now a member of the Empowered Community of ICANN. There's a Human Rights and International Law working group. Public Safety working group and Board GAC Interaction working group that I already mentioned. Let's take them one by one so we see what they do.

Geographic Names, obviously, examines how geographic names can be protected in any future expansion of the gTLD space. The GAC, the members of the GAC have different opinions of that and this is of course makes it difficult for the GAC to present -- there are countries and governments that don't really care whether names associated with their cities or rivers or mountains, whatever, how they are used and there are countries that really care about not only capital cities and other cities and so on and so forth but also, significant geographic features.

The next working group is the Underserved Regions and here obviously we talk about regions that are underserved by the DNS industry, you will know what they are. Also, least developed economies and small island developing states, especially in Africa, Caribbean. Here it's a question capacity building and there's also now, there's a very promising avenue for corporation within ALAC and GAC on this area.

Participation on NomCom. This is a long story because from the beginning, as long as NomCom, Nominating Committee has existed, there has been a Chair for the GAC but -- there was actually a few years when it was occupied by as I remember, by a gentleman from Sri Lanka but most of the time and since then, they Chair has been emptied and the rationale has been that there's been no agreement within the GAC whether it's proper for the government to get involved and influence the selection of directors and other important people in private company. Now, the working group is deliberating on this question and let's see what will happen.

Operational Principles Evaluation, this working group will make recommendations for changes to the current operation of the principles in order to enable to the GAC to operate more effectively and efficiently as a member of the ICANN Empowered Community.

Human Rights and International Law working group it's [inaudible] on the aspects of ICANN policies and procedures, which relate to human rights and international law. How to ensure that the management of the DNS, which is the core, the mission of ICANN, how it can happen in a manner that respects human rights and international law. It's not an easy subject and here there is -- actually yesterday's webinar that some GAC members are participating on an individual basis, GNSO working group on this, same topic.

Public Safety working groups, of course public safety is one of the key areas, the core areas of what governments are responsible for. When it comes to DNS, it's a question of DNS abuse, cyber crime and so on and so forth. Again, there has been actually an initiative from the Public

Safety working group towards that ALAC to see, to find out, whether we could have some cooperation also with the GAC and the ALAC on this area.

The Board GAC Interaction working group, it's improving, it focuses on improving the processes in the GAC, Board interaction. For instance, how to define the GAC advice and how to improve the process of how it is considered. They have to keep in mind over its existence, since 2000, GAC has given a lot of advice on different levels of granularity and it's of course not an easy task for the Board to keep in mind what specifically the GAC has advised at any given point.

The GAC also participates in the CCWG, the Cross Community Working Group on Auction Proceeds. Yes, of course [inaudible] the proceeds that were generated from the new gTLD auctions, and this working group is trying to find a mechanism that will take care of the use of those funds

The GAC also participates in a couple of PDP's and of course already mentioned the subsequent procedures, especially Work Track Five. Also, in the PDP on International Non-Governmental Organization, International Government Organizations and Security Rights.

Finally, here we have the liaisons, from the GAC we have And Neves and Charlotte Simões, both from Portugal. I'm the liaison to the GAC. Next please.

Questions? Now we can go to the questions. Can I ask, Joanna?

JOANNA KULESZA: Yes, I have a list of questions, we've just had four questions. I'm happy to read them out unless you would like scroll through the chat box, it might be easier if I read them, is that correct?

YRJO LANSIPURO: Yes, please do, yes.

JOANNA KULESZA: It seems we have four questions. I don't see those posing the questions having their hands up, so I'm just going to read them out. Two come from Dave, one consists of two elements. The first question Dave asked reads as follow, "Should not all the AC's and SO's and the GAC be on the same footing, in the sense that they should have ICANN Board inform other AC's and SO's about the reasons of not following their advice as it does with the GAC?" That will be the first question from Dave, if you would like to take that one by one, I'm happy to give you back the floor Yrjo.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you, Joanna. Thank you, Dave, for this question. Unfortunately, I can only give my personal opinion, which is basically, of course, on the ALAC side, At-Large side, it would be nice if this would be the case, at the same time, I also understand the reasons why the GAC is in a special position here. I think that we have discussed this within At-Large at many occasions. That at least when we give advice or any advisory committee gives advice, of course it should be at least, even better if some more explanations could follow. This is not really -- I mean this

webinar is about the GAC and I would not in large this into this sort of discussion about what should happen with other communities. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you, Yrjo. What I particularly like about your presentation is that you managed to steer from those sensitive political issues that naturally come when we discuss the GAC and I think it's one of those political issues that Dave is referring to here. I see Javier's hand up, I'm happy to give him the floor. Also, Charlotte wants to chip in, respond, comment or give her insights, please free to just let me, either by raising your hand or putting a message in the chat box. Javier, your hand is up, you have the floor, then we'll go back to the questions, I have a list with me.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET:

Great presentation Yrjo, thanks Joanna, thanks everybody. The question is, are there examples or cases of full consensus GAC advice that has been rejected by the Board and can you give us a discussion on that? Thank you.

YRJO LANSIPURO:

From the top of my head, I would say that we should go back to some elements of the -- some cases of the new gTLD [inaudible] 2008/2012 because there were some elements of GAC advice that were rejected. I can't give you the specific, which applications so on and so forth, they were concerned. There have been such cases.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you, Yrjo. I'm convinced our GAC liaison's and our colleagues have agreed to work with us also on capacity building would be happy to answer those questions in more detail. If you're willing to peruse that Javier, I'm happy to convey the questions to the GAC liaisons that we are in touch with. I also don't have a specific answer but I'm certain that that answer can be found.

I see Haroun's hand up. I'm going to start with the hands up, so Haroun you have the floor for your question and then we'll go back.

HAROUN MAHAMAT: Thank you for your presentation. My question is, the GAC advice rejections, if the ICANN Board rejects advice from the GAC, later on as you mentioned in your presentation, you find acceptable solution, could please explain what that mean, acceptable solution? Thank you so much.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you for the question. An acceptable solution is something that is acceptable to both sides. Obviously in such a situation, not only with the GAC and the Board but in any similar for the constellation in politics or whatever, there should be negotiations where each side is trying to save something, salvage something. Not really getting everything, they wanted but at least something, which is called a compromise. To my mind, this is what was meant by an acceptable solution. Thanks.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very much Yrjo. Again, I believe that to be a political question, so thank you managing to cover as much ground as possible. Charlotte noted in the chatroom that she's not aware of any GAC advice that has been rejected by the Board thus far, where Roberto noted that there might have been an issue with the Triple X. Again, if that is something out participants want to peruse, please kindly drop me or staff an email and we will be certain to follow through to give you specific answers even though we do not have them at this particular time.

I see Joan's hand up. I had your question on the list Joan but I'm happy to give you the floor to ask the question. Please, go ahead Joan, the floor is yours.

JOAN KATAMBI:

Hello everyone. My question to the presenter and I want to thank so much for this presentation. My question is, from the list I saw that currently they have 178 members to the GAC, I'm wondering, are all countries, Africa, Asia, America commissioned by the cue, how do they get their views represented at the ICANN? The number seems to be few, as regards to the total countries that we have. Thank you.

YRJO LANSIPURO:

Thank you. This is also a good question. We have to understand that there is a discrepancy in the full number of members, which 178 countries, governments or distinct economies and the number of GAC members who actually come to the ICANN meetings and can participate in the physical meetings, which is typically not near to 178. Of course,

the ICANN meetings, the physical meetings are not the full story, there are intersessional means of communicating and participating and so and so forth.

For instance, let's say elections of the GAC Chair, it's a procedure like usually in ICANN to enable electronic participation. There are like in At-Large, the title can be facilitated and the same goals for such GAC members that meet several supports. From my point of view, how I see it, I think that of course, it's a problem that actually so many GAC members are not able to come to the meetings. Maybe the travel costs but also some governments have small personal resources, human resources and I can understand that it's not possible to go to three ICANN meetings a year.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you much, Yrjo, hope that answers Joan's question. I also understand that the participation within the GAC is growing, has been growing throughout the recent years. I remember times when it was roughly 40 or 50 countries that actually participated and it seems that there is more interested coming from the governments to join the GAC and affectively participate in the meetings. Let's keep in mind that there are other forums, where states are better represented, they find the environment more suitable to their needs, like the ITU for example. It is always the need to split the interests of the speaker with the participation between different venues.

We have questions on my list. I don't see any hands up. From Aisyah, I hope I'm pronouncing that correctly. The question is quite general,

Aisyah wants to know why the GAC participates in the NomCom working group but is not represented in the NomCom? If you would like to take that one Yrjo, I'll be happy to hear your answer?

YRJO LANSIPURO:

Thank you. I'm happy I can clarify what I said. The working group of the GAC, within the GAC, that deliberates, that discusses whether the GAC should participate in the NomCom, it is precisely for that purpose, that is to say there's an empty chair in the NomCom and the GAC has to decide whether they want to take it up. Within the GAC there are different opinions and at least in the previous years, the prevalent opinion was that governments had no business in being part of selection of the leaders and directors for a private company, which ICANN is after all.

I think that the -- if that establishment is setting up of this working group, it itself a few years it chose that maybe the wind is changing, at least this question is now discussed within this working group. So far, the Nominating Committee, the empty chair is still there. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very Yrjo. I see Joan's hand up. I'm wondering if it's a new hand or an old, Joan? Is that a new hand? I'm going to move on with the questions. If Joan feels there's a new question, please feel free to just let me know.

I see had another question and she was wondering why GAC does not get to vote? I'm not particularly clear of what kind of vote you had in mind, unless that question is clear to Yrjo and he's wanted to take it on?

YRJO LANSIPURO: Why doesn't happen, my understanding is that it would not reflect the opinion of all countries in the world and that's why it's not done. I also think that for the GAC to give advice that counts, that is taken into account, the most important thing is to try to achieve a consensus. Even if GAC would vote and there would be 40 against 21 or whatever, that would not be an active advice to the Board because consensus is really what matters. I don't if Charlotte could actually have an answer to this point?

JOANNA KULESZA: Charlotte, I'm wondering if you can hear us?

CHARLOTTE SIMOES: Yes, hello.

JOANNA KULESZA: Yes, the floor is yours.

CHARLOTTE SIMOES: Thank you, Joanna. I do not have all the details behind the rational why GAC is voting member in the Board. This is a difference also with other AC and SO's because ALAC has a voting member. Probably because

there's different ranges of views in GAC and as you said Yrjo, it would be difficult to have an orientation for one vote. I hope this can enlighten you about this. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you, Charlotte. It's already said, Yrjo has been kind enough to initiate a collaboration with your colleague, with yourselves and your colleagues regarding capacity building. If this webinar proves fruitful ground for further discussion between the constituencies, I'm certain At-Large will be happy to facilitate that.

I managed to get a confirmation from Joan, that that is indeed a new hand. Joan, feel free to ask your question. Your mic has been unmuted, please go ahead.

JOAN KATAMBI:

I have another question to the presenter. Governments has different in terms of the policy and the model, I want to ask, does ICANN under the GAC, I'm still conflicted because the expectations of the governments in regard to the internet are different and what ICANN also wants to put in place is different. How do they handle such issues between the different states or even governments?

YRJO LANSIPURO:

I'm not sure. Thank you very much. I'm not sure if I got the question, there was some disturbance on the line. I don't know if you could repeat of if somebody heard it better?

JOANNA KULESZA: Maybe if you could rephrase that Joan, would that work?

JOAN KATAMBI: Okay. I'm wondering, do the GAC, under the ICANN sometimes feel conflicted because government policies are different and the models? Sometimes as they come up with model with regards to internet, do they feel conflicted that maybe governments might not approve or feel okay with what they are coming up, maybe better or to their internet? Have you got such instances where [inaudible] with what you're coming up with regards to the [inaudible]? Is this okay now?

JOANNA KULESZA: Yrjo, I heard that better, I think I can repeat for the sake of clarity. My understanding is that Joan wants to know whether they GAC internally conflicted? Whether it is easy or difficult for them to present that statement that you had mentioned? Again, a political question but I am pretty certain that you have a lot of insight to share with us. The GAC is conflicted internally, whether it's easy for the GAC to produce that outcome or whether the different interests from different countries impact the way GAC?

YRJO LANSIPURO: It's a very good question, thank you very much. I'm really sorry, I couldn't make it out. Yes, you have to realize that even so, outside the governments, in other constituencies, we think of the GAC as monolist, saying the governments don't like, don't want to do this and that,

actually, of course the GAC, especially when it is so big as it is now, it has always internal conflicts and different opinions as any international organization. We could not expect them to agree on controversial things.

Of course, this is understood within the GAC. It means that people are realistic as with the representative of the governments, you don't even try to get agreement and consensus on somethings, on things that you know that are impossible. In many other fields, political is the art of the possible and that applies to the GAC very much. In things that are possible, there is a possibility of achieving consensus then they are things that go ahead. In my presentation I used the example of geographic names, it's one of the areas where the opinions of the GAC different from each other and where consequently it's not possible to produce a clear-cut opinions and things. I hope I answered the question.

JOANNA KULESZA:

I think that is a perfectly comprehensive answer. Going back to my list of questions. There was a question from Satish, what are the differences between GAC members and observers? An easy one I presume. Looking forward to your answer, Yrjo.

YRJO LANSIPURO:

Members are there to decide, that is to say, observers are observing the procedures, they can advise, they can certainly give advice from the area and from the organization they represent but, in the end, of

course, when it comes influencing the actual decision of the GAC, then it's a matter of members.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you, Yrjo. There's more information if I understand correctly, on the GAC website that gives us a list of the members and introduces us to the ins and outs of becoming a members and observer. I'm happy to share the link in the chat. Again, as a moderator, I feel obliged to go through the questions. We have another question from [inaudible]; why is there only liaison on one side and two on the other side, when it comes to the GAC and ALAC?

YRJO LANSIPURO:

I think Charlotte could answer that, but I understand that [inaudible] of GAC, Ana, especially today, she is now actually at CSTD [inaudible] in Geneva, and to my mind, it's wonderful that they are actually two liaisons from the GAC side, so if one has to travel to all sorts of international conferences, still the other is there.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you. Regarding the previous question we have a comment from Charlotte who rightfully indicates that observers represent international and regional organizations, as opposed to the members just come from the state. Thank you for the clarification, Charlotte.

Next, we have two questions from Michael, how does the GAC behave when one of its proposals is rejected by the Board or what credibility for the GAC in case of non-consensus? I think we partially covered that

issue. Also, if I may, I'm happy to hear Yrjo's comments on the process of consultation. It seems that when it came to GDPR related advice, just around the same time last year was a consultation between the Board and the GAC, my understanding is something to avoid a rejection from the Board of GAC advice. The question from Michael focuses on the process should advice from the GAC be rejected and I'm happy to hear your thoughts and comments on this Yrjo.

YRJO LANSIPURO:

I think these are situations that everybody wants to avoid first of all. I think a lot of work will be done in such a case from both sides to avoid clear but flat rejection. Anyway, as the Bylaws say, in case of rejection, then both sides should try to achieve in good faith and in a timely manner something that is seen as mutually acceptable solution, that is a compromise. Neither part gets everything they want but at least some.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you, Yrjo. I understand that this would to a large extent be a theoretical situation that we do not have to deal with, at least not very often. Charlotte comments in the chat box, again if you want to grab the mic, just raise your hand and let me know. I'm going to read out your comments from the chat box at this point. Anna Neves is the official liaison from GAC and Charlotte herself is representing her as Anna could not be here as she had overlapping commitments, which is something Yrjo emphasized as well. The GAC representatives wear many hats so to speak, they represent the government and different

venues and with that in mind, it is safer to have two individuals sharing the workload I understand.

We also have another question from Michael, I'm going to read it out, how does the GAC secretariat work, since it wants to be neutral about everything, is it like at the ALAC? That's the question that I'm reading out and I'm looking forward to your answer Yrjo.

YRJO LANSIPURO:

The GAC secretariat, it's a long story with many shades. That is to say -- maintaining an independent secretariat for the GAC is a question of money. Throughout the history of the GAC, there have been many attempts to solve this problem. In the beginning, if I remember correctly, the European Union or the European Commission was actually taking care of the secretariat duties, at some point the government of India did that and so on and so forth. Then there was this organization in the Netherlands and now the last phase has been as you know is Australian based. Understand that there is a division of labor, division of work between the ICANN support staff of the GAC and the independent secretariat.

My understanding is that the independent secretariat takes care of substance and the ICANN support staff takes care of anything else. Now, as I understand, there is a new situation, I don't know if Charlotte could inform us what the actual situation is in the independent secretariat? Whether the Australians are still continuing or whether some new solution is being sourced?

CHARLOTTE SIMOES: As you mentioned the independent secretariat that was supported by GAC members has been working for seven years for GAC, along with the secretariat provided by ICANN. This independent secretariat has ended its contract at the end of 2018, so now currently we only have the ICANN support secretariat. GAC is working on a solution to have this independent secretariat once again, supporting all the deflections and all the issues, regarding all the PDP's and the work of the GAC. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you very much, Charlotte. I think your answer links to the last question I have left on my list; it comes from Joan. I don't think she reflected this question that she posted in the chat box, so I'm going to read it out and I would like to hear an answer from Yrjo, but your thoughts [inaudible] anything you'd like to add; does GAC participate in public comments like other AC's and SO's?

YRJO LANSIPURO: No, the GAC has other -- that is to say, the communicate is the many vehicle for the GAC reactions. I tried to think whether GAC members as representatives for their countries, probably have been doing that but to my recollection, the GAC comments to the public comment procedures have been rare if not there at all. It was as I said, the main vehicle is advice in the communicate.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you, Yrjo. I think that clearly draws the line between the GAC Advisory to such and other communities or other groups within the ICANN environment. We have a comment from Michael in the chat box, indicating that the GAC secretariat has not been neutral since the beginning of this year. Thank you for sharing that comment, Michael. I don't have any more questions on my list. I'm wondering if we have any more questions from our participants?

I'm not seeing any hands raised. I think we've managed to attend to all the issues that have been provoked by the presentation Yrjo, thank you for that. If you or Charlotte have anything to add, I'm happy to hear your comments or thoughts on this discussion we've been having. Anything from yourself Yrjo, that you would like to add or Charlotte?

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you, nothing really from my part. I'm really happy that I could give this presentation. I hope that this increases the awareness of one important part of the ICANN Community, the GAC. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you, Yrjo. We have a hand up from Charlotte. Charlotte, the floor is yours, go right ahead.

CHARLOTTE SIMOES: I would like to thank you for extensive work preparing this webinar for At-Large members. It's an expression in French and Spanish, it's we available to have this kind of resources to enlighten the audience on the role of GAC and to enhance cooperation between GAC and ALAC also.

We know that cooperation is running on capacity building also and the other issues. I would like to thank you for this. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very much, Charlotte. I must admit, those were my thoughts exactly. I believe that Yrjo's wonderful presentation contributed to the interaction between advisory committees, to groups within ICANN. I am convinced that that is also my emotion, that there is a deep interest among the users to find out more, find out more specifically about the impact that the governments have on the policy making or the decision-making processes within ICANN.

I am convinced that this collaboration that Yrjo and yourself have initiated will help build capacity within the At-Large environment as well possibly along GAC members. I'm looking forward to further steps here and trying to find out how we can enhance this model that has just been initiated. If we do not have any more questions, I will be happy thank you again for participating and invite you to the last webinar on Cyber Security, which will take place next week. Again, two times for the webinars; the first addition will be on Tuesday, May 21st at 2100 UTC, David Huberman will give us an insight into cyber security, cyber security basics.

Those of you who do not find that timing appropriate, have other commitments, are more than welcome to join us on Wednesday, May 22nd at noon UTC, again the same topic but with a different speaker, that will Patrick Jones. I'm going to link to the wiki page that gives you the agenda for our webinars, the one's that we have already concluded,

those will be uploaded onto the wiki page, you can listen to them offline. The last one will also be held live next week on cyber security.

With that, I want to thank Yrjo and Charlotte for joining us. Yrjo for the wonderful presentation. Everyone who participated, thank you for taking the time to join us. Thank you to Yesim and the entire staff who have been wonderfully helpful, we could not have done this without you. And last but not least, fundamental and critical thank you to our interpreters who make these webinar truly international, global and cross cutting when it comes to ICANN Community. Thank you everyone and see you next week. Thanks everyone, bye.

YESIM NAZLAR:

Thank you all for joining today's webinar. Our webinar is now over and we wish you a lovely rest of the day. Bye, bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]