

---

ICANN82 | CF – GAC: Operating Matters Discussion  
Saturday, March 08, 2025 – 16:30 to 17:30 PST

JULIA CHARVOLEN

Hello, and welcome to the ICANN82 GAC Operating Matters session on Saturday, 8 March, at 1630 local time.

Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior and the ICANN community antiharassment policy. During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form.

Remember to state your name and the language you will speak in case you will be speaking a language other than English. Speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation, and please make sure to mute all other devices when you are speaking. You may access all available features for this session in the Zoom toolbar.

With that, I will leave the floor over to Nico Caballero, GAC chair. Thank you, and over to you, Nico.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you very much for that, Julia. Please turn up your volume a little bit for the next session, Julia. I would greatly appreciate that so that we can actually hear you.

---

***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.***

---

Welcome back, everyone. I hope you enjoyed your coffee. As a matter of fact, I couldn't find any coffee out there. So I really hope you did enjoy whatever coffee you could get.

Welcome back. We're going to be discussing GAC leadership terms, proposals to align election dates and extend terms of the chair and vice chairs.

But before that, I will give the floor to the NomCom, Josu and [Nitin]. I'm sorry, my pronunciation. I hope I'm pronouncing your name well. They're going to walk us through the steps necessary. I mean, they're basically looking for leaders. So without further ado, let me welcome them again. The floor is all yours. Please, go ahead.

NITIN WALIA

Thank you so much. Good evening, everyone. I think it must be a tiring day, and we are touching you on the end of the day.

As introduced, we are from the NomCom, and we are the delegates who are being appointed this time which is an independent committee to select the members of ICANN.

On behalf of NomCom, we would like to share with certain updates of the open positions which are there this time. In fact, we are looking forward for your support in your regions to take back these open positions. If you have certain people in your mind whom you can recommend to apply, that would be a great thing and a great takeaway from here.

---

What we are looking for is we are looking for leaders. When we talk about leaders, we are looking for critical thinkers. We are looking for cultural diversity. And we are looking for global participation in Internet policy. Next slide, please.

At this time, as far as the ICANN Board is concerned we have three open positions. We are looking for at least three candidates to be filled this time. Next slide, please.

For PTI there is one position which is vacant this time, so we are looking for a candidate for the PTI for one open position. Next slide, please.

For the regional representatives to ALAC there are three open positions, so we are looking for three candidates to be filled for these. Next slide, please.

For ccNSO there is an open position for one person, so this position has to be filled. Next slide.

GNSO we have two open positions, so we are looking for two members at least to be filled for this position. Next slide, please.

So to summarize, altogether we have ten open positions currently, of which three are for ICANN Board, one is for PTI, three for ALAC, two for GNSO, and one for ccNSO. So altogether we are looking for ten leaders to be filled for these positions. And what we are needing is your support to go back to your region and if you find any suitable candidates, please refer them up to apply for these positions. Next slide, please.

---

As far as the deadline is concerned, the window is already open and it's going to close on 28 March. So we still have a handful of days to find suitable candidates and recommend them up so that at least we have good candidates from all the regions, from all geographies, with gender diversity applying for these positions. Next slide.

If you want to learn anything, if you want to know about the open positions, qualifications, any kind of the criteria which have been set down, it's simply on the NomCom page which is [NomCom.ICANN.org](https://NomCom.ICANN.org). This link can be referred to anyone. And I have certain flyers also which I will leave in the back. So any one of you who want to pick it up, you can please pick them up and give it to a suitable candidate. Next slide, please.

I think that's it. We have this much only to tell you about that. If you have any questions, please feel free to raise it to us. We are happy to respond them up. Yeah?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE

Thank you, Nico. As a matter of fact, I do. I wanted to understand a little bit about how do they apply. Do they have to write a form, write something, a letter? And in terms of when they do start to participate, what is their time commitment for this for these positions?

NITIN WALIA

As far as the platform is concerned, when they were to visit this particular link, there's an online application form. There are

---

respective pointers and questions out there on which they can respond up and fill their information and attach their bio in the submittable form which will be uploaded automatically on the website.

As far as the eligibility criteria, time commitment, whether these positions have certain remunerations or not, all that information is already available because every position has a different criteria and qualification parameters. So depending upon if you're looking for ICANN Board members, then, yes, there are certain remunerations which are attached to them which are not then to other positions.

Similarly, the eligibility criteria, the parameters, the time commitment is depending upon the position they are applying. More or less, one candidate can also apply for multiple. So it's not just that you are applying for ICANN Board. You can also apply for the other positions, but you will be selected for one. But still, you have an opportunity window to apply for at least two applications if you are willing forward for that. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you so much for that. Any other questions or comments in this regard? Now, I do have a question. The only part I don't understand is—because you were talking about the ALAC, about the GNSO, about many different—if we can go back in the slides. But we're GAC members, so I don't exactly understand what you need from us. How can we help you achieve your goals?

---

As a matter of fact, I am a Board member. Unpaid volunteer, let me say, and nonvoting by the way. But, yes, I'm the GAC chair is automatically a Board member. And I'm not complaining, I'm just saying for the sake of clarity I'm an unpaid volunteer and I don't vote.

So having said that, how can the GAC actually help you given the fact that you're looking for GNSO volunteers, ALAC volunteers, and PTI directors, and so on and so forth? Sorry for my ignorant question, but I think this would also help my distinguished colleagues to also understand that.

NITIN WALIA

No, it is not an ignorant question. This is a very important question. This is the key point of our presentation here. For us the key is that you as GAC members as representatives of all your countries do the outreach within your own countries. So express from your countries apply for these positions. You are the ones knowing how to reach to all these, let's say, university, technical, whatever, to the leaders of your countries so they can apply for these positions. We can't reach all of them, but you can do.

In that point looking deeper into that, [inaudible] also said something that is paramount to us and it's diversity—regional diversity, gender diversity, and so on. So please, go forward into it, try to reach the people you know in your countries and propose them as perfect candidates to our new leaderships.

Just to add one point into this, GAC is going to play a very particular role for all these positions actually you will see. Reason being you are representing your countries out there. And I think every country needs some participation from somebody from their region in all these open profiles.

So having said that, if you have certain people in your mind who are already retired from government positions and are happy to volunteer for these positions or from the other industries who are there in your mind, I think recommending those people to apply for these positions will be very helpful to them also. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you very much for that. Any other questions or comments in the room or online? Please, go ahead.

ABDELDJALIL BACHAR BONG

Okay, thank you so much. My question is that application is only in English. Is it possible to have other languages? Because last year we sent to share the link to some people in our country, but most of the times they told us it's only in English. The application must be in English. It should be in English. So you talk about diversity, so is there any solution nowadays on that? Thank you.

NITIN WALIA

Yeah, the application must be in English. English is mandatory for an application. English is the language in ICANN, so the applicants must do it in English, yeah.

---

NICO CABALLERO

As the old saying goes, “Fais ce que je dis, pas ce que je fais.” Anyway, yeah, English is a requirement. Any other questions or comments? Go ahead, Josu.

JOSU WALINO

Someone was asking in the chat how the period of the positions, the duration. All information is in the link. When you go there, it's all there. Concrete information about each position.

NICO CABALLERO

Perfect. Thank you so much. Thank you so much. Let's give a big round of applause to our friends from the NomCom. Thank you so much.

NITIN WALIA

Thank you.

JOSU WALINO

Thank you so much, everyone.

NICO CABALLERO

Now we're going to turn to the GAC leadership terms, the session discussing proposals to align election dates on the one hand.

So we have two things here just to be very clear. If you could please get closer. Thank you. One thing is to align the election dates in order to coincide with the Board terms. That's one thing. And the other thing is to extend the terms of the chair and the vice chairs.



---

As you already know, there were many emails and we discussed this before. So at this point, let me adjust this a little bit, as per Operating Principle 31—I'm going to read it for the benefit of the new GAC members. I'll try to be brief here.

According to Principle 31, “Elections for the GAC chair shall take place during the final meeting of every second year unless the chair can no longer perform the functions of the office before the end of a current two-year term of office.” Which is the situation nowadays.

“If the chair can no longer perform the functions during the first year in office, an election shall be organized for the remaining term in office during the next GAC meeting.” And so on. I'm not going to read the whole thing. This is kind of like the background. That's Operating Principle 31.

As per Operating Principle 21 it basically reads, “If the GAC moves to require additional officers other than the chair, then five vice chairs shall be elected from among the members. To the extent possible, the vice chairs should...”, etc. Right at the end, as you can see, it says, “The chair shall hold office for a term of two years, renewable once.” Which is the case, again, nowadays.

“The vice chairs shall hold office for a term of one year and may be re-elected; however, no person may serve as vice chair for more than two consecutive terms.” Which is what we're trying to change today, as a matter of fact, because that's the idea. We've been discussing this for way too long, in my humble opinion, but we're following the operating principles. We are following each and every

---

necessary step in order to make sure that everything is consistent with our operating principles.

Anything to add in that regard, Rob? Can you help me out here? Is there anything I didn't mention, anything that I forgot? Over to you.

ROB HOGGARTH

No. You've done an excellent job, as usual, Mr. Chair. If you'd like, I can review a little bit about the process in terms of what it takes. Because as much as you think you've already discussed this, you'll be discussing it again three months from now. Can we go to the next slide, Julia? Thank you.

Number one, thank you all very much for engaging in these conversations. Nico raised this potential change in the operating principles at ICANN81. You all, or a number of you, engaged in a very productive telephone conversation via Zoom about a month ago. Since then, I shared an update on what happened during that call, and a number of you have then followed up through email messages to the rest of your colleagues.

The way GAC Operating Principle 53 is set up is that a proposal is made to make a change to the operating principles, and a decision is made by you collectively whether to proceed with that. But because of the concerns about notice and people having an opportunity to fully discuss something like this, the decision that you make today is not the final decision.

The operating principle allows for an additional 60-day period in which you can consult, discuss, just contemplate whether you

---

thought it was an actual good idea to change the operating principles in the manner that you will agree or not agree on today. Obviously, if you agree not to proceed, there's no 60-day period. You're not changing the principles.

Consequently, this will be discussed again if you choose to make any changes today in Prague, and at ICANN83 the final decision will be made.

That's good timing. As Nico discussed last public meeting, that would then allow these changes to go into effect for the next election. The annual nominating period typically starts at the end of that period and goes through the final meeting of the year.

So consequently, again I keep saying "if," if you were to make this decision, there would be an impact on those who were elected in their next term. What it would mean is that the terms would be shorter because you would not be going to align your change in Operating Principle 31 for this coming election period, but it would be for the subsequent one. Simply because you couldn't do it this year. You would be completing the election at ICANN83, and that's simply not practically possible.

I hope I haven't overly complicated things. It's a relatively straightforward proposal, but it's just complicated in terms of the actual mechanics of the transition.

I'll stop there, Nico, and allow you to ask any questions. I know that you've already suggested to me and your colleagues on the leadership team that you're going to do this through two different

---

proposals. So they aren't going to be packaged together, but you'll actually have two. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you for that, Rob. Thank you very much. The other thing I wanted to—and this is especially for the benefit of the 60 new GAC members—that the changes will not be applied to me or to the current vice chairs just in case. Whoever is elected as the next GAC chair and the next team of vice chairs, it will have an effect on them not on us. So we're not trying to make any changes to our tenures. I just wanted to make that very clear.

Moving on, Rob, if you would like to give some...if you can walk us through the nuances, the details of the actual procedure given the fact that you're our lawyer. Not officially, but from a legal point of view what are the exact steps?

ROB HOGGARTH

All the lawyers in the room just gasped, including myself. Thank you. Julia, can we go to the next slide?

I essentially walked you through that there's a 60-day waiting period. That was that slide. You've asked me to approach this in two different proposals. And so the first one you noted was the alignment of the election. The idea here being that when the new chair comes on board, that she or he is in a position to be able to onboard with the other Board members and not find themselves

---

behind the wave or behind the curve in terms of coming up to speed and learning things.

In terms of the comments that were offered at ICANN81, more importantly during the meeting that you all had via telephone call and then subsequently, it appears that there is widespread consensus. From a staff perspective we didn't note or record any objections to doing that alignment. That's one of the reasons why we thought bifurcating these two proposals would be useful because you all generally seem to be supportive of this approach.

What I've done in red on this slide for those of you who are following on carefully is just noting where the changes would be made. There's one conditional change here that, if you'll give us that flexibility, it's in the "XXXX" where it says "(RH1)" and "(RH2)." It talks about the elections taking place during the second meeting of every year. This is the alignment accomplishment. And then the only question is, every what year? Is it two years? Is it three years? Is it ten years? If some of you come up with a new proposal. So that's the only difference here.

The other thing that was incorporated into this potentially recognizing and being able to clean this up, and this is the only thing I've looked to clean up in this effort, is just to acknowledge or recognize the possibility or the potential for the GAC chair not completing their full term. Which has already happened. It's also happened with vice chairs, for that matter. But just to basically make a delineation mark of half the term. And again, if you all recommended it, I would make the subsequent change along the

---

lines of the vice chairs as well. But that again really will depend upon how long you want that term to go.

Under the current operating principles the chair serves a two-year term. And it seemed practical to say if the chair steps down in the first half of their term, then there is time to hold another election if you all so choose and name somebody else to step in. We had that instance back in the, I don't even remember now, 2018 timeframe when Thomas Schneider stepped down. There was an election and Manal was elected to fulfill the end of Thomas' term. So that's pretty straightforward.

That hasn't frankly been an issue with vice chairs. If you have a vice chair who is only serving a one-year term, what are we going to do? Go through the whole election process for six months? It doesn't make a lot of practical sense.

Again, the operating principles for the committee are very flexible. There have been instances in the past. Actually, in the two cases that I can recall during my tenure as support staff, both of the changes or someone having to leave took place either before the person was seated or took place just shortly after they were seated. And so there it made some sense to say, okay, there's time to elect somebody else.

In this case, it would be much more important to consider if you were to expand the length of the vice chair terms. And you may or may not decide to do that today. So that would be the only other

---

conditional observation in terms of this particular operating principle in terms of the changes.

The only thing left here is for a motion to be made to effect these changes understanding the conditions that I've suggested. And then if it's seconded, maybe a short discussion period if anyone wants to share any remarks. I don't know if you want to be flexible and offer for anyone to make any remarks now. It's up to you. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO

Not really. I would go ahead with the motions right away unless anybody tells me otherwise. We can do that just now. Do I have a motion to go ahead with aligning the GAC election timing? Is that a hand up or is that a motion, Egypt?

CHRISTINE ARIDA

It's a hand up. I just have one question.

NICO CABALLERO

Oh, go ahead, please.

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Just to clarify that I understand correctly, we did not discuss the terms yet, and accordingly we did not discuss the issue of—I understand—the issue of staggering. So if we go for the second meeting of every XXXX for the vice chairs, if we go for this text that is written here, would we still be able to do different, if we decide

---

to do so, would you still be able to do different elections of vice chairs with that text?

ROB HOGGARTH

I have not employed AI or any other algorithm for me to see the various changes that would be potentially in place. The concept of staggering was brought up not at ICANN81 but during the telephone call that you all had via Zoom. My recommendation there would be to pass these with the understanding that the GOPE working group look into the whole concept of staggering and making a determination as to what the appropriate mechanical alignment like that would be.

Because you don't currently now number the vice chairs or say the vice chair position one and two start in this year and then they get elected, somewhat like the ICANN Board currently does. So my concern there would be it would just get quite mixed up in terms of trying to accomplish that through a general proposal or a motion that you might make at this stage.

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Sorry. Maybe we can use instead of "every XXXX year" of the election year, so something like that. Just suggesting a language that gives us the flexibility to do that later on.

NICO CABALLERO

Sure, but again...thank you for that, Egypt. Sorry. Manal?



MANAL ISMAIL

Can I use Christine's hand? Thank you. One more question. Rob, you mentioned that we didn't need in the past to replace a stepping down vice chair because the term was just one year so we had a few months remaining or so. But if we have now the vice chairs for example for two years, then maybe we will need to consider this also in the operating principles.

Final thing just to make sure I understand correctly, because we also keep saying that this does not apply on the current leadership, if we for example agree to have three terms for the chair or for the vice chairs, then I'll take Egypt again as an example. I hope Christine doesn't mind. She is now on her second year, so she should be term limited. But if we agree to have the vice chairs for three terms, then I think she's eligible to stand for a third term, right?

ROB HOGGARTH

That would be correct, yes, because you're not determining the length of the terms. It's just the numbers. Now based on, and you'll see based on the feedback and the perspectives, the general consensus seems to be moving toward two-year, two terms. But, yes, that could be an impact in that regard, certainly. See how quickly it starts to get complicated there without taking into account the staggering potentials.

---

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you, Egypt. Thank you, Rob. But again, the idea here is try not to boil the ocean. Try to go ahead with aligning the GAC chair election and finding a solution for the vice chair issue. And then we'll take care of the details. You're absolutely right about, not Christine, but any of the other vice chairs being able to be reelected. No problem with that. On the contrary, we will be very happy I guess given the expertise and the knowledge and staying in the house, so to say. So that would be an advantage for the GAC.

Bear in mind 24 hours or maybe two hours after you become the GAC chair, you will have to deal with people who have been at the GNSO for example for 18 years who can read the Bible or the Quran or the Torah from A to Z in five minutes and you're there, "Wow!"

So what I'm saying is we need that expertise. We need to try to keep talent, especially very talented people like Christine and my distinguished vice chairs, in house. The business intelligence in the house, so to say. So that's basically that.

Going back to the procedures, Rob, sorry. Go ahead.

ROB HOGGARTH

Manal always asks the critical, thought-provoking questions. So I did do some other quick calculating here. In terms of vice chairs, if you were to go with Option 6 which would be three terms of one year, it would impact two individuals Christine and Thiago. Because they're the only ones left who are in that position who could offer themselves for reelection.

---

Now one could argue that now would be a great time to make a declaration I wouldn't have this apply to me. Or secondly, you would accept the fact as a committee that anybody who wants to run can run and they take into consideration, well, it would be their third term. Gee, they were involved in voting on this or whatever. So I think that's an individual consideration you could make there.

The other thing though to be alert to, Mr. Chair, is three terms of two years—and this is Manal's point. It could also apply to you if that were determined. So again, whether that's a declaration that you make, I think that's an important consideration. Because Manal's right. That is a possibility that would be created under those two scenarios or options.

NICO CABALLERO

Not in my case.

ROB HOGGARTH

Well, that's why you...

NICO CABALLERO

And I publicly say this, it will not be applied to me in any given circumstance.

ROB HOGGARTH

Well, that's why you apply...

NICO CABALLERO

Not because I don't like it. Not because I am not happy with the GAC. On the contrary, but certainly it will not be applied to me. Take my word on that. This session is being recorded in any case.

ROB HOGGARTH

Well, and your original proposal was two terms of three years in length, and that has shifted now based upon the consensus of the committee and you've acknowledged those changes.

NICO CABALLERO

And I'm fine with that. As a matter of fact, can we go to the next slide, please, Gulten? Let's get to the gist of it. So there, yeah, Rob. Go ahead.

ROB HOGGARTH

So the operating question is you started this saying you'd do two proposals. One would first be the timing. So if you want to resolve that, you can. Manal has raised a couple of issues there. It depends on your degree of comfort or whoever is going to make the motion in terms of whether you wanted to proceed with that at this point before you get into the tenure discussions.

Or having acknowledged the question she's raised, step back and say, okay, yeah, let's look at it as a package and decide what's the best way to proceed. So that's in your hands, Mr. Chair.

---

NICO CABALLERO

My suggestion is to go ahead right now with adjusting and aligning the GAC election timing if you agree. In order to be step-by-step, in order to move forward in an orderly fashion. So let's go ahead with that. Do I have a motion in the room. Colombia, thank you very much. Anybody second? India, thank you so much. Netherlands.

So let's vote now by raising hands according to the operating principles. Correct me if I'm wrong, Rob, but at this point we call for the vote.

ROB HOGGARTH

You need a majority of the members physically present.

NICO CABALLERO

So it will be just by raising hands. So those in favor please raise your hands. And there we go. There's a simple majority.

ROB HOGGARTH

Please keep them up.

NICO CABALLERO

Please keep your hands up. I'll vote. I'm sorry.

ROB HOGGARTH

Sorry, I had to redo. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you so much.

ROB HOGGARTH

Ones who...

NICO CABALLERO

Anybody against please raise your hand.

ROB HOGGARTH

I submit it might have been easier to do that first.

NICO CABALLERO

Seeing none. Thank you so much, the motion passes. Please write it down. So well noted. Thank you so much for that. So let's move on, and now we'll discuss the—I see no abstentions and no objections, so let's move forward if you agree. So all right, let's do just that. Next slide. Okay, sorry. Here we go.

This is the proposal to actually extend the chair and vice term extensions. I see a lot of support for Option 2, longer terms, that is two consecutive terms. Sorry, sorry, sorry. Option 4, more terms, three consecutive terms, two years each, potentially—and this is if everybody agrees—potentially six consecutive years. That obviously will depend on you reelecting the future GAC chair. It is not for granted. What I am saying is six years is not for granted because it will depend on you always. So that's one thing. And I'll give you the floor, Rob, in a second.

And the other point in which we seem to have consensus is on Option 7, longer terms for the vice chairs, two terms, two years

---

each, totaling again potentially four consecutive years. It will depend on you, again, because we will have those elections every two years. Which is exactly what we're trying to achieve in order to avoid having to go through the election cycles every single year with all the problems that that implies.

I have India and then I'll go to you. Or you prefer to go ahead first?  
Rob, go ahead, please.

ROB HOGGARTH

I just want to be able to clarify, maybe clear up any questions. A couple things just to note here to explain for slide purposes. One is the recollection that terms are for consecutive periods of time in the operating principles. It's never happened before but conceivably someone could be elected to the chair position, step down, and come back two years later.

It has happened in the vice chairs perhaps because of just the one-year term, but we've had several instances where someone has served two consecutive years as a vice chair, taken some time off, and then reapplied and been reelected. So again, the key there is consecutive.

Secondly, it's important to flag for you my asterisks. The red asterisk is Nico's original proposal, and those proposals combined were 2 and 7. Based upon the feedback not just on the call but in the emails that you all shared in the last week or so, and the reason why I say "growing consensus" is because a number of you were quite diplomatic and thoughtful in terms of your approach to this.

---

A larger group had basically said 4 and 7 seem to make the most sense in terms of their preferences and their desires. There were, however, a number of GAC members who suggested 4 and 6 as a combination. In a couple of the instances on 4 and 7 and 4 and 6 folks basically said, and you can speak for yourselves, “I’m flexible.”

So I think that just allows you for a fruitful conversation here if folks want to explore some of those changes. That’s why I said “growing consensus.” The bottom line is that essentially based upon the feedback only three of the options have been eliminated. The two that are no change and the one longer single term.

So with that, I’ll see how you want to proceed then with comments or your own motion. Thanks.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you so much for those clarifications, Rob. I already have a queue. I have India, Switzerland, China, Egypt, and the European Commission. For the sake of time, please try to be brief and straight to the point. I’ll go with India first.

INDIA

Thank you, Chair. Although I think Rob has clarified, but then are the options which have been struck off, are they still open? They’re still open, right?

ROB HOGGARTH

Yes, sir. Basically, there was no support demonstrated for them, so that’s why for streamlining I took them out. But they’re open, as is



---

an option potentially for ten consecutive terms, whatever other options one might want to suggest.

INDIA

So in that case I'll express at least the stance of India. For the vice chair we are all for longer tenure two plus two which is Option 7. However, for the chair position I think we would be for the same two plus two because it would be coinciding both the chair and the vice chair tenure at the same time. On one side we are trying to coincide the election along with the GAC larger to be along with ICANN Board election. I think we should strike the same balance here as well.

And also, I think four years time is a pretty decent tenure, not something very short so that you cannot contribute. And it also strikes a balance between giving them [inaudible] enough opportunity to contribute and also allowing emerging GAC leaders to come forward and infuse the new ideas. So I would for the GAC chair that would be with Option 1 and for the vice chair with Option 7. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you so much for that, India. Well noted. I have Switzerland next.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. I see that the combination of possibilities may grow again. So in order to try and to simplify the process I would

---

suggest that we separate the motion on the extension of the chair tenure from the motion for the vice chair tenure so that we focus right now on the chair, try to find a common ground motion if we are able. And then once we have that motion done, we move to the vice chair motion. Because otherwise the possibilities multiply. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Switzerland. I have China next.

CHINA

Thank you, Chair. I just want to echo what Jorge has said. Just a proposal to separate chair tenure and vice chair tenure. We can perhaps discuss one after another.

And another thing is just very quickly to express my position with regard to these options. In terms of chair tenure I think I'm flexible with Option 2 and 4. Perhaps also Option 1 but more in favor of Option 4. And then in terms of vice chair tenure I am in favor of Option 7. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you very much for that, China. So let's follow. I see broad agreement with Switzerland's suggestion. Let's concentrate at this point on the chair tenure, if everybody agrees, of course. Anybody against that idea? No? Trinidad and Tobago?

KAREL DOUGLAS

Yes, thank you, Nico. Very brief. I thought the issue of keeping them together was important because the team of a chair and a vice chair to me operate together. And hence the reason why marrying the terms of the two, the chair and vice chair, keeps together that—what is the word I'm looking for—togetherness.

However, if you do separate them, then you may have a disjointed team. So the chair remains and the vice chairs leave, and then what happens? You may have a term where you have new vice chairs coming in at the end or maybe end of the chair's term and it tends to be more problematic and nothing is going to happen. Whereas, when you have a solid team for a solid period, they're joint. Then to me, you get more out of it. It's more productive.

Hence why I thought in treating with the issue it may be useful to keep the issues together. Just my [inaudible].

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you for that suggestion. Even though I agree with you, that's exactly the situation we have right now. But again, I mean your hands, China, is that an old hand? So I have Egypt next.

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Thank you, Nico. I think in response we do support that we take the chair as a motion and then look at the vice chairs. And I think in response to Karel I think the chair position, it's important that we agree on it. It's very critical and important. And then we can look in

---

the view of what we decide regarding the chair at the vice chair so they will maintain this relationship of the leadership as a team.

But my question was actually to Rob. The two options that we have struck, are they because we had no support or because we had weak support for them?

ROB HOGGARTH I did not see any support or record any for those options.

CHRISTINE ARIDA Because we as Egypt, as I recall...

ROB HOGGARTH Perhaps I missed.

CHRISTINE ARIDA Yeah, we did support Option 1 of no change. So we join others who just expressed to keep that on there.

ROB HOGGARTH Okay, thank you. I'm sorry I missed that.

CHRISTINE ARIDA No worries.

ROB HOGGARTH We now have two of you who have indicated that. Thank you.

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Of course.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you, Egypt. European Commission?

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Thank you very much, Nico. Just to note that I can surely be in favor of having two separate motions. Although if we are looking for the easier solution, I understand that for the vice chair there is more agreement. But which direction to go? So you may want to decide which one you tackle first.

So in that order from our side for the vice chair tenure we are in favor of Option 2 which would favor more stability and at the same time keep the possibility of renewing the vice chair composition quite often.

And for what concerns the chair tenure, we are in favor of Option 4. Again because this would grant the possibility to have if the candidate is willing to go for a third mandate to do so, and if the group is willing to accept it to grant longer term stability.

At the same time you have regular checkpoints where you [inaudible] both sides. So this seems the option that gives the most flexibility to both sides, the chair and those who need to vote. Thank you so much.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you, European Commission. I have Argentina next.

ARGENTINA

Thank you, Chair. I would like to express our preferences as regards the tenures of both chair and vice chair in case that is decided right now. In that sense we are willing to support Option 7 and 4. We think that these are the most convenient since they will allow to measure in a proper way the performances of both chair and vice chair. That's why we make this decision. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Argentina. Any other comment? I don't see any hand online. That's an old hand, Argentina, right? Okay. Any other comment in the room or online? I don't see any. Colombia, go ahead, please.

THIAGO DAL-TOE

Thank you, Nico. I think building upon the suggestion from Jorge on splitting these decisions, my suggestion would be that we follow that but that we would have a motion for at least choosing one of the options that are more favorable and we could see by a show of hands if that would pass. But it seems that differentiation is only for the chair tenure because, as I'm sensing, we kind of have an agreement on the option for the vice chair. So my suggestion is to have a motion for at least one of them because otherwise we're going to have multiple choices here. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you, Colombia. Well noted. Once again, whatever we decide today will not be final. Remember, there's a 60-day period that is until Prague. We're going to be parking whatever decision until June in Prague.

So anyway, well, this is where we are at this point. I suggest moving on with the chair tenure and deciding on that and voting for that at this point. Again, taking into account that no change will be made. You can still vote for no changes when we get to Prague in June.

So following Switzerland's recommendation, I suggest that we discuss the chair tenure at this point. Would you agree with that? Please raise your hands if you agree with that so that we can record it so that we can keep track of...

ROB HOGGARTH

You're just agreeing on two separate motions?

NICO CABALLERO

Two separate, yeah.

ROB HOGGARTH

Okay.

NICO CABALLERO

One for the chair, one for the vice chair. Please keep your hands up so that we can count. Thank you so much. Anybody against please

raise your hand at this point. And the rest are abstentions. So the motion is passed then.

ROB HOGGARTH

Yeah, but that wasn't really a motion. That was just you're now deciding to do two separate motions.

NICO CABALLERO

No, no, no. I know. To decide to move forward with the chair, that is, right? We haven't decided anything yet. We need to decide between Options 1, 2, 3, or 4. As a matter of fact, 3 is also on the table, right? Longer single term, we haven't seen any support for that, but it's still there, right? One term, three years in total, which could be also the case. Switzerland, please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO

If I may, if we are now on the chair tenure question, I would propose a motion that we go for Option 4 if that's convenient to you. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you, Switzerland. Any other? Netherlands?

NETHERLANDS

I second the move, Switzerland.



---

NICO CABALLERO

So we have a motion and a second. Anybody against? India? Okay, would you like to speak to that? Okay, so we have a motion, we have a second, and we have one against.

ROB HOGGARTH

Well, from a process standpoint, you've had the motions. Now it's either you want to permit discussion or you can hold the vote in terms of the majority.

NICO CABALLERO

I really think we have already discussed this enough. Let's go ahead with the vote at this point and see how it goes. So again, the procedure is raising hands. Let's make it simple and straightforward. So please raise your hands if you agree with Option 4. Please keep your hands up while we're counting. We count 33 votes. Thank you. So for the record, we have 33 votes, right? Anybody against apart from India? India has already expressed. So we have one vote against. Okay, and the rest are obviously abstentions.

So again according to the rules of democracy if I'm not mistaken, the motion passes. So it's going to be Option 4, more terms, three consecutive terms, two years each, potentially totaling six years. Again as we said before, this will depend on you choosing or not choosing the future GAC chair for more terms. Thank you so much for that. This is the way democracy works.

---

So we still have five minutes. Let's see if we can do it in five minutes. The vice chair's tenure which really should be a very straightforward process. Sorry, Switzerland, go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO

So sorry to interrupt. Just to clarify if I understood correctly what we just agreed is that the motion passes to let Option 4 sit for 60 days. So we still have, just to address my Indian colleague, we haven't decided yet finally. So we still have to decide finally, but we just decided that the Option 4 now sits for further confirmation later on.

NICO CABALLERO

That's exactly correct. It will sit for 60 days, and we'll make the final decision in Prague in June as we said before. India, go ahead.

INDIA

I completely understand that. Thank you, Jorge, for empathizing but I'm not dead against it. It's not something, but my idea was to make the chair term coterminous with the co chair term so that the same team exists rather than creating the differences. That was the whole idea.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you so much. We totally understood that and we voted. So thank you. Greatly appreciate it, India. I have the U.K. next.

---

NIGEL HICKSON

Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I've got no problem with what we've just done. But given that for the process change we had a piece of paper. I'm not suggesting we create one now because it would just delay proceedings, but I think we ought to have a piece of paper both for the tenure of the chair and the vice chairs that records this vote.

NICO CABALLERO

I don't quite understand your point, U.K. Would you please explain again?

NIGEL HICKSON

Yeah, sorry. I meant when we voted on the process in terms of aligning the Board tenure with the tenure of the chair, we had a piece of paper or we had a motion that was written down which was agreed to. And I think in the normal course of events we should have a motion that was written down for the tenure of the chair and the vice chair. So I'm not suggesting we...

NICO CABALLERO

Sorry to interrupt you, Nigel, but it is. It is there. It's on the screen. That's Option 4. Is that what you're referring to, or I'm not getting this right?

ROB HOGGARTH

Can I offer, Nigel, my interpretation of what you're asking? Thank you. I think what he's referring to is the previous decision to change Operating Principle 31 and to make sure—and, Nigel, we'll take this

---

on as staff too—produce that updated version which reflects the changes that were discussed in the discussion of that motion. With the one understanding that I removed the—if you want to just go back real quickly to Slide 6, Julia or Gulten—I had used the XXXX and the suggestion from Egypt was to just say election year instead of numbers. So that's the change I will make there. Thank you. Thank you, Nigel.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you again, Rob. Thank you, U.K. Well noted. Let's move on. We still have five minutes, so let's move on. Next slide, please, Gulten. There we go.

The vice chair tenure then. Again, the three options are on the table including Option 5, no change. That's also a possibility. Or Option 6, more terms, three consecutive terms. And Option 7, longer terms, two terms, two years each one.

So at this time, let's vote.

ROB HOGGARTH

No, you need a motion.

NICO CABALLERO

Sorry, sorry. I need a motion and a second for that. Sorry, lack of caffeine at this time. Do I have a motion in the room? Is that a motion, Trinidad and Tobago?

---

KAREL DOUGLAS

Sorry, Nico. Sorry to interrupt. I just wanted to propose. If it's wrong, I do apologize. But as I had mentioned before, the rationale or at least my thinking was to marry the terms of the chair and the co chairs or the vice chairs, which would mean that there would be an Option 8. Option 8 would be a repeat or identical to Option 4 so that the term of the chairs and the vice chairs consecutively.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you for the Trinidad and Tobago. Let me kindly disagree with you at this point in time. And given the fact that we could have discussed that if you had raised the point a week ago or a month ago or three months ago or last year or in Istanbul or in Hamburg. You see what I mean? But at this point and at this time I really think that's exactly what I meant by let's try not to boil the ocean because otherwise we would derail and we will not make any decision at this point. That's my humble recommendation, but again I'm in your hands. Switzerland, I see your hand up.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. Just if it's helpful I would suggest that you call for an informal show of hands, first for Option 6 and then for Option 7. And after that, we can have the motion and the second and the vote just to be sure where we stand.

---

NICO CABALLERO

And I agree with that idea. So if everybody agrees, and I see nodding in the room. Anybody against? No? So thank you for the good idea, Switzerland. So let's do just that.

This is an informal temperature check so to say. For Option 6 please raise your hands if you agree with Option 6. I see two hands in the room. Okay, thank you very much. For Option 7, please raise your hands. And there's...okay, we don't need to count, I guess. It's obvious. Thank you so much.

So let's go ahead with the motion. Yeah, Rob?

ROB HOGGARTH

Mr. Chair, do you want to allow Karel's option to be also an informal raising of hands or no? His was an option.

NICO CABALLERO

There's no Option 8. That's what I mean. We won't be able to develop Option 8 at this point. It was not written. It was not circulated. We had ample time before.

ROB HOGGARTH

Okay.

NICO CABALLERO

Two months before, three months before, six months before. A week before, I would say. Yesterday. But two minutes before? I'm sorry, Karel, Trinidad and Tobago.

KAREL DOUGLAS

It's okay.

NICO CABALLERO

Please accept my apologies.

KAREL DOUGLAS

Apologies accepted.

NICO CABALLERO

So do I have a motion? Thank you, U.K. A second? Australia, thank you so much. So let's vote then. What's on the table at this point is Option 7. So please raise your hands if you agree with Option 7 for the vice chair tenure. Please keep...

ROB HOGGARTH

I ask two questions. One is, India, is that hand up?

INDIA

Yes.

ROB HOGGARTH

Okay. And I couldn't tell over there, [inaudible] or [inaudible], whether you were voting or not. Okay.

---

NICO CABALLERO                      So we counted 29 votes which means the motion passes as well.  
And again, it will sit for 60 days.

ROB HOGGARTH                      Do you want to ask for against?

NICO CABALLERO                      Oh, sorry, sorry. Anybody against? I see no hands which means that  
the rest are abstentions. So again, the motion passes. Please bear  
in mind, these will sit for 60 days. You can still change your mind  
and vote against during the Prague session.

So with that, it's time to wrap up the session. Any final comments?  
Yeah, go ahead.

ABDELDJALIL BACHAR BONG                      Yes, I have a question. Difference between consecutive and  
consecutive terms. Because for Option 6 and 7, three consecutive  
terms and Option 7 is two terms. So what is the difference?

ROB HOGGARTH                      Thank you. And if you need to revote, we will. That should be two  
consecutive terms. Thank you very much for pointing out my  
consecutive typo.

NICO CABALLERO                      Good catch. Thank you very much. That was a very good catch. I  
didn't realize. Rob, go ahead.



ROB HOGGARTH

I would just like to observe that this was the most interesting session that I have seen you all have in quite some time. Thank you very much.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you so much. Thank you so much for being flexible. My apologies again, Karel, but we needed to move forward. For such a simple thing. I mean, it's complicated because there are many different things that we need to do in parallel, and that's why I mentioned the boiling the ocean phrase.

Thank you so very much. We'll adjourn the session. Please be here tomorrow at 900 a.m. for the GAC. There's an open microphone session tomorrow at 900 a.m. and right after that we'll have the GAC meeting with the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG).

Any other housekeeping detail, Rob, that you would like to share at this point?

ROB HOGGARTH

Thank you, sir, yes. Just a quick history on that. There was still substantial interest that many of you expressed to have that open mic session which worked out very successfully in some of your minds in Puerto Rico. So it was important to you all to do that. Then there was the interest from the NCSG to interact with you. And the leadership said, okay, that will make a good bit of sense.

---

So they're essentially combined sessions, just 30 minutes each. Right now, Julia, I think we have three sign ups for the open mic. So I think your timing will work out very well in the morning.

Just one final reminder for those of you not familiar with U.S. time changes, remember that there is a change in time tonight. At 200 a.m. it becomes 300 a.m. So please plan accordingly so that you don't inadvertently miss the first session.

NICO CABALLERO

So we're moving ahead, right, in time?

ROB HOGGARTH

Correct.

NICO CABALLERO

So we're losing one hour of sleep, bear in mind. Thank you very much. A big round of applause for everybody. Thank you for your patience. Thank you so much. Well done.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**