

MARRAKECH – GAC: Two Character Country Codes Discussion
Monday, June 24, 2019 – 11:30 to 12:30 WET
ICANN65 | Marrakech, Morocco

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: It's the 2-character country codes and over to you, Thiago.

THIAGO JARDIM: Thank you, Manal. So shall we start the session on 2-Character Country Codes at the second level in new gTLDs. So this session 2-Character Country Codes. -- the concerns many GAC members have been expressing since a while ago. And as you know the matter has been the SUBJECT of GAC advice because on the one hand and here you will see that there are 2 separate issues.

On the one hand GAC members have been expressing concerns regarding the change in the process or the release of country codes and the new gTLDs. This is one issue. And on the other hand some GAC members are also concerned with the use of their country codes under new gTLDs. In the last GAC meeting we had in Kobe the GAC adapted consensus advice and this issue again and basically the GAC advised the ICANN Board to provide a written explanation as to whether the withdrawal process -- the withdrawal of the authorization process was consistent with GAC

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.

advice, so as you can see this is basically addressing the first of those 2 issues, the change in the authorization process.

One aspect of the GAC advice adopted in Kobe reiterated the call to the Board to engage with GAC concerned members also to address specific concerns related to the use of their country codes in the second level in order to avoid confusion. But mostly GAC advice in Kobe asked the Board to explain in writing whether the change in the authorization process was consistent with GAC advice.

I propose we focus on this issue first, that is this session will be focussing -- we will be tasking to assess whether the Board's response to the Kobe advice, whether the explanation to Board provided is satisfactory, and if time allows we could use the session to discuss experiences with the 2-Character Country Code registration search tool which the Board implement today address the second set of concerns.

So basically, we will be focussing on the procedural concerns and if time allows we could discuss the tool provided by the Board to address the substantive concerns.

So in response to our advice in Kobe the Board -- actually the advice was adopted in Barcelona -- I'm sorry. In Kobe we realized

that the explanation that the Board provided was long enough and that required assessing and this is what we are going to be doing today. The Board provided an extensive documentation which documented the change in the authorization process, and I propose that we go through the explanation provided by the Board and judge by ourselves whether that explanation is, in fact, good enough, right?

Any questions so far before we delve into the documentation?
Yes, Kavouss.

IRAN:

Thank you. If I remember correctly in Kobe we said that you have received a very substantial documentation from ICANN Board, and also a letter signed by the president of ICANN and CEO for which we are really grateful. They put together all elements but in one of the last parts that have there is a conclusion.

If you go to that page, conclusion saying that sorry, that is that. You should accept that. That that is not the response that we were looking for. If you bring that page, and read that text, giving all necessary background at the end saying that this is a fete accomplish and in simple term, train is gone. You missed the train. We don't change anything so please kindly put that one on the Board and we see -- and we promise that latest in Canada, in

Montreal if I'm not corrected, we will have a specifically reply to that. If you want to do something at this meeting very good. If not, at least we have to give a reply at our next meeting.

So that reply is not what we expected. I'm not qualifying whether it's constructive or not constructive, but it is not what we expected.

In order to cut the discussions I know in the GAC there are 2 views. One view is about the release of the second of the country code at the second level and the other they have some concern, so we should understand that, what we are saying here we just to address the issue of those country, they were concerned about that, and we need to have some reply. That reply was not something that we expected in that sense, thank you.

THIAGO JARDIM:

Thank you, Iran. I believe we will have an opportunity at this ICANN meeting to provide the GAC response and reaction to the Board's response to our advice. So I don't think it will even be necessary to wait until the next ICANN meeting if you are efficient enough handling this issue. And I agree the Board has provided response and now it's time for the GAC to react to that. So if you allow me I would briefly go through an analysis of the Board's response and then would even propose response that could be

documented in the communique and would serve as the basis for our language that we may adopt at the end of this ICANN meeting.

So basically the ICANN documentation was supposed to help the ICANN Board explain whether the change of the authorization process was consistent with GAC advice. This is what we asked but the documents provided by the Board started by stating that the registry agreement which is the contract between ICANN and registry operator provide for 2 methods for release of country codes. This was the possibility of 2 different ways of releasing country codes. One method will be a process whereby governments are notified and consulted of individual requests for the release of country codes.

As these requests arise. So for example hypothetically if the operator of the army wanted to supply a domain name using the country code of Brazil, .BR it would be BR.army. You would have to notify and discuss with the Brazilian government. This is one method for the release of country codes. The other they method was a process where the registrar committed to provide adopt measures to avoid confusion and ICANN would authorize the release of country codes based on that commitment.

These were the two methods the registry agreement between ICANN and registry operator allegedly permitted. I'm hearing my

voice. And I think everyone else is too, but the point for us was not whether the registry agreement allowed the release of country codes in one way or another, the point is whether the release of country codes in whatever way that it was possible has been implemented consistent with GAC advice. This was what we asked.

That is even if we were convinced that there were, or are two methods for the release of country codes and that a second method, one of those two methods permitted ICANN to issue a blanket authorization for all country codes based on measures to avoid confusion, still it is a different question to ask whether the release of country codes without the prior consultation with relevant government was consistent with GAC advice.

The question was therefore not whether the release process is consistent with the registry agreement but whether the release process was consistent with GAC advice.

What was that the GAC advice and the ICANN Board to do? You might have seen we provided an analysis of the history of the GAC advice and it is available. There is a link in the briefing that was circulated. And I invite anyone interested in seeing it more closely to have a look at it.

But the GAC basically advised that there should and release process where prior consultation existed. The ICANN.org document did not mention any of that advice relating to the release process, unfortunately. It is only mentioned a piece of the Los Angeles advice, that expressed views on the use of country codes.

And the GAC while the GAC expressed in Los Angeles it had no particular view and the use of country codes it did express a clear position on the release process, that is in what ways country codes should or should not be released. And what the GAC asked in that advice and explained further and clarified in the subsequent advices was that and I am quoting from the Los Angeles advice, that relevant governments be alerted by ICANN about these requests for the use of country codes as they arise.

This was the consensus advice accepted by the Board which led the ICANN Board to -- and I'm quoting from the relevant Board resolution to set up and I quota efficient procedure for the release of country codes required to be reserved in the registry agreement, taking into account GAC's advice. In the Los Angeles communique. At that time ICANN decided to accept an advice on the release process.

But then ICANN decided to change the process and when it decided to change the process there had already been had GAC advices about it. Los Angeles, Singapore, Dublin and Helsinki, they asked for a process very clearly where relevant where the release of country codes was subject to prior consultation with the relevant governments.

Therefore advice is complemented each other telling the Board to set up a release process telling the Board what it was doing wrong, as it tried to implement it advices that were already in place and they all played clear what sort of procedure the GAC was asking for.

And if there were any doubts about what the GAC was asking for the reiteration made it clear what it was. In Singapore for example the GAC explained that the release process asks for, should guarantee prior notification of requests.

Dublin clarified should and -- process where the... should be accepted regardless of grounds of objection and we came to the point I believe it was in Singapore to state that the Board wasn't compliant with GAC advice. So the position was well summarized also Dublin in 2015 and I will quote from the chair's words. It was Thomas Schneider and I quote, there has been GAC advice that these country codes, two letter country codes released -- and I'm

still quoting the advice had been accepted and we the GAC members relying on a procedure that would follow their advice. Also in Helsinki immediately before the Board decided to change the release process to do away with release process again the GAC shared in a clarification call about the Helsinki communique reminded the point that GAC advise required prior consultation with the relevant government.

And I quote the consensus is basically every country should have a say. There is a requirement to engage in find a mutually acceptable solution. And unless otherwise indicated and that's why we had lists where governments could opt out from the release process. But we are here analyzing whether the ICANN documentation provides suffix planks as to whether the GAC Board was consistent with GAC advice and the Board did not provide an explanation why the modification ever the authorization process complied with GAC advice it only insists that the registry agreement allowed for two different pass release of country codes and one of these parts did not require prior notification. But the GAC advice asks for a prior notification mechanism.

It is interests, and clarifying -- and it is interesting in some respects the history provided by the Board but it's insists that the also the development of the process which eventually culminated

in the abandonment had already been made clear to everyone and that this -- that the GAC was made aware that the development of the authorization process was meant to move away from these prior notification mechanisms to one blanket authorization.

But still even if that were true the point was in the whether the Board could do or could not do what it did based on the registry agreement. Or based on any policy development process. That it was allegedly consistent with the registry agreement much the point is simple. It was whether what the Board did was consistent with GAC advice whatever it was that the Board could or could not do and the GAC -- I'm sorry to be repeating myself here -- and I'm coming to a closure to the session and hopefully we can move on from this topic to other important topics on this issue as we provide our final reaction to this.

The GAC advised the ICANN barred to maintain and release process with prior notification and approval by relevant governments. So if the Board wished as it could have done to follow a different path let's say because the registry agreement allowed it to do so or because it wished to develop new policy the Board should have rejected GAC advice which it did not. So I would propose that to avoid such misunderstandings from repeating themselves we should be quite clear about what GAC's

views were and what GAC advice was on this issue, and tell the Board that

We thank them for explanation. Unfortunately, we considered that it reflects several misunderstandings about what we were asking, and what it did, and we can hopefully get this item off our agenda with our final response to the ICANN Board.

Before I give the floor to anyone else who may want to react I would ask that the staff to show on the screen what I would suggest could be incorporated into the communique as language on this issue.

And the -- this would be a proposal from Brazil to be placed in the communique as follow up to GAC advice where we could be stating to the Board that the GAC considered that GAC advice was not implemented as we intended and that we would advise the ICANN Board to be aware of that and hopefully to avoid that these happen again in the future.

While GAC staff puts on the screen the language Brazil is proposing, I open the floor for reactions. Thank you. And while you are gathering your thoughts to see how you will react to this I will read what is now on the screen. The GAC remains this would be follow up on previous advice as you know there have been several advices. And I consider it would be appropriate to be a

follow-up to GAC advice. The Board provide an explanation in response to our advice. And our response would be the GAC remains concerned that GAC advice on the procedure for the release of country codes at the second level was not taken into consideration as intended. And advises that meaningful steps are taken to ensure this doesn't happen in the future.

Now over to you. Thank you.

PORTUGAL:

Thank you very much. And I'm going to speak in Portuguese.

(Interpreter) well, I want to be very brief, I believe that Brazil expressed very well the position that is consistent with Portugal's decision, or position is not a matter that government -- that the government's own in our case -- governments they are not the owners, but nobody else owns this .PETI. .PETI represents Portugal according to ISO if it is -- I'm sorry, we are in complete new liberalism in terms of the trade, so everybody can use it.

There are rules, there are policies. Some things have to be followed up. We have principles, and what we are doing here now we are going to say that this should not happen in the future. The same thing for .amazon and this will continue to happen.

Governments are here to help the civil society's private sector the citizens, the government want to allow a favorable environment for all stakeholders. So we lost these proposal -- I'm very sorry that we have to say all the time that this should not happen in the future.

So we don't want this to happen for the new gTLDs because this sentence is very sad. For the work that the governments have made until now. Thank you.

THIAGO JARDIM:

(Interpreter) these are lessons that we learn we hope that the next actions that we do, we started to be involved in the discussions for the policies of the new rounds, and on the other hand, we started to consider the appropriateness of the governance model of ICANN.

Maybe this proposal would be a common ground that we have, and although we could propose something more bold, although we are willing to do that, the response that we will have will be the same we have had before, so the proposal for the texts that shows clearly in my understanding that GAC is still concerned with the situation, what we recommended -- what we advised was not respected we need a forward looking few.

We need this to focus on issues that GAC have common grounds and have to rethink the governance model and each individual member should continue to use the tool that was proposed by ICANN and, well to use this text to find other ways to counteract or to propose what is being said, adopt it and move forward. Not for getting the past. Thank you.

IRAN:

Thank you, Thiago. I cannot speak Portuguese otherwise I would have mentioned. Good that you and ANNA speak in Portuguese. I speak Persian, English and some other but not Portuguese. Chairman -- Thiago, we should be careful of our wording. If we could say it should not be repeated in future is too broad.

What should not be repeated in future? We should say that the release of two-character letters to be used as second level should no longer be used in future in the views of those country that they are concerned because we know that we are divided in GAC by two groups, so we should quite clear.

If we say not to be used in future, you inter into the subsequent ruined of new gTLD that the issue is discussed and currently we are considering the public comments. We have not come to any conclusion that have and when Jeff Neumann and others comes you can raise the question in that aspect, so we should be quite

careful about wording. Most of our difficulties with our communication, with ICANN Board that we are too general in some word. We should be very specific and clear cut what we want and what should not be repeated and where it should not be repeated. Thank you.

THIAGO JARDIM:

Thank you, Kavouss. A brief comment to your points before giving the floor to China and also the U.S. and Indonesia.

My initial reaction to Iran's point would be that sometimes ambiguity and the text that you have in front of you is the best we can have. The alternative would be perhaps nothing. Nothing is worse than something. Also I think there has been at least one case where because ambiguity in it the GAC communique and the Board thought they could do something that was for some GAC members contrary to the GAC communique, because there was ambiguity didn't mean that the Board could simply interpret it the way it did.

And I think the country codes lesson here is teaching everyone here is that the Board should be more careful when it tackles GAC advice. It should talk to the GAC. There has been a mechanism for reinforced GAC board engagement that was put in place as a result of all the developments in this specific area.

So this is my one of my comments and the second one is you rightly said there was a process for developing new gTLDs right. Perhaps there will be the appropriate time for the GAC to adopt advice on this specific next round and Luisa is leading the efforts on this area and the fact we adopt general language doesn't preclude us adopting the specific language when the time comes.

And I don't think we should be anticipating ourselves here. But I take all your points. China.

CHINA:

Thank you Thiago. This is Guo Feng speaking from China. I would like to thank you Thiago for this -- for all your work leading us all the way to this point and also thank you for proposing this language. At this moment when I am looking this paragraph I think I can accept this position. This language.

And I'm not sure if it is a topic when we are as a GAC interaction with the Board. I think we can the topic to interact with the Board and Wednesday morning perhaps to clear convey some of the -- our views and positions on this particular issue because I think that we are now, knowing that ICANN is conducting a topic a discussion on the multi-stakeholder model so I think this is -- this

topic, this issue is highly relevant to the multi-stakeholder model discussion and the ICANN arena.

So I think when we are participating the discussion of the multi-stakeholder model of ICANN within GAC or with other AC or SO this is a particular case we can look at. Thank you very much.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Just to clarify so is the proposal here that we share the communicate language with the Board during our meeting with them? Or -- is there a concrete question or a concrete ask to the Board? I'm sorry I'm asking because we are compiling this right now -- we have already sent a version to the Board and we are trying to update it if there are any updates, so I am a he trying to seek clarification here so that we can compile this accurately and share it with the Board.

CHINA: Thank you, Manal. So at this moment I would suggest we can perhaps send this current draft version to the Board, if no objections from other members of the GAC.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So yeah let's conclude on this at the end of the session. I don't want to keep the queue and the discussion ask still ongoing but thank you Feng for --

THIAGO JARDIM: Thank you. I will give the floor to the U.S. and perhaps if we are efficient enough in the less than 30 minutes we have left we could present to the ICANN Board not as a government but as agreed language. U.S.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you. Ashley with the U.S. and I won't prolong this any longer than necessary, but I wanted to indicate we've had quite a lot of discussion on this subject for some time now. And I think we have for lack of a better word exhausted what we can do here in the GAC. I recognize that there are countries that continue to have concerns. And is certainly within the remit of individual countries to continue to pursue their concerns.

I think at the end of the day what it comes down on is that we clearly had some misunderstandings with the Board with respect to what the GAC was expecting and what was actually done in terms of the resolution by ICANN. And there really isn't an opportunity to turn back the clock as I think some countries would like to do.

What we do have in front of us and I think we should be thankful to ICANN is a tool that is available to governments. I am curious to know what their experiences have been, but I think at this point in time the text sets in front of us is close to something that I think this highway wraps up this issue. I also note that this is a subject that's being considered in the ATRT3 so perhaps that's another vehicle for concerned countries to express their concerns so, in fact, we can find some constructive ways moving forward in the future to avoid these kind of situations where you have the Board thinking they're taking into account GAC advice but there may be some within the GAC who do not feel that is the case. Thank you.

THIAGO JARDIM: Thank you U.S. Indonesia?

INDONESIA: Thank you. I would like to reiterate my friend when Iran mentioned about the language, and I myself is not from an English-speaking country, so things like the word the GAC remains concerned. That GAC -- the word remains concerned it's something difficult for me that understand exactly what it means. It will be different if you use the straightforward wording for example. The GAC complains -- but it may not be nice to put that kind of word in a communique like that.

So my proposal is that we can do the communique like that but perhaps Manal, as the GAC chair, sorry Manal -- can mention to the Board what actually it really means, and in a straightforward language, and hopefully all these things will be in an accordance to what we are heard this morning in a meeting for the newcomers about everybody is requested to follow the expected standard behavior in if the GAC ICANN meetings. Thank you.

THIAGO JARDIM: Thank you Indonesia. We have India, thank you.

INDIA: ... Hussein India for the record. Just a small point, would it not perhaps be appropriate that whether we are laying out advice for the ICANN Board to initiate and to take -- make sure that meaningful steps are taken.

Won't it perhaps be better that what meaningful steps be proposed to take they should advise to the GAC. They should apprise us?

THIAGO JARDIM: Thank you. Are you suggesting that we add language where we indicate that whatever steps or meaningful steps ICANN Board will

take to ensure your that doesn't map in the future that they are communicated to the GAC or that they are devised in a -- or in consultation with the GAC is that what you're suggests?

INDIA:

No, what I'm just suggesting is that in order to assure us that this won't happen in the future, whatever meaningful steps there are intended to take, the very least they could do is they could perhaps advise us what they intend to do just so that we can bounce it around, and make sure whether those meaningful steps are adequate to cover all similar type situations that might come about in the future. Whether those meaningful steps are really meaningful or not.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thiago, if I may, I think this is the normal process Raoul, we provide advice and normally they respond to our advice with whatever has been, whatever measure that is has been taken, yeah, go ahead.

INDIA:

Just to jog everyone's memory in this case several GAC advice were put and still there were misunderstandings so I think this is sufficient cause for us to maybe try a different approach, and seek greater clarity in terms of what the Board's understanding is of the matter, of this this advice which we intend to put ought as well as

what are those meaningful steps they intend to ICTA just double sure we are all on the same page.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Just to clarify again that specifically for what you said, that we need to be on common understanding, and make sure the Board is clear about our advice, this is the main purpose of the post-communique clarification call, which is called clarification call specifically for this reason. We normally have the clarification call before the Board responds to make sure we are on the same page and have the same understanding.

INDIA: Despite all those good measures in place somehow –

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: No, actually, actually those were the measures taken after this misunderstanding. It was a lesson learned and are since we started the post-communique clarification calls which I think is doing the job, but I mean, I'm leaving it to GAC colleagues as well.

THIAGO JARDIM: Thank you, India. Thank you, chair. Perhaps we could take on Indonesia's suggestion, and use the GAC Board interaction to be explicit about the points you raised?

I see and I understand that this is a controversial subject, and I'm glad to feel that there might be consensus, I hope, around this language, which is not a given in this topic, and then in we agree in addition to this to have this language as such in the communique, and present it to the Board, and use it for our interaction with the Board where we could do as Indonesia suggests, that is to be explicit about some of the concerns, particularly in the line of India's suggestion, be explicit that these meaningful steps should be devised in consultation with the GAC using the existing mechanism perhaps improving those mechanisms I this I this would be appropriate. Iran. Thank you.

IRAN:

Thank you, Thiago. You are a legal person, and all legal people, they use this term, ambiguity. No problem. There was a ministry of foreign affairs during 70's that they said -- this is a constructive ambiguity.

You say that, no problem. Right. Let us be very careful. Our additional clarification, all clarification, must be precise, concise, and not contradicting previous advice. The latest one. If that is included I have no problem. So let us not to write a book. One or two sentences maximum, precise, concise, and totally compliance and consistent with the latest advice or follow up

advice that we have given. So if you can produce something and put it on the discussions we have no problem.

One of the difficulties that we have always. The Board looking into the difference of the various communication and put their finger on that rather than resolving the issue. They put their finger on the differences so let's try not to have that problems. And so on. Otherwise I have no problem with Indonesia, or anyone else. The openly issue that address this situation in proper manner. Whether you want to remain ambiguous I have no problem if everybody agree we follow the majority's view. Thank you.

THIAGO JARDIM:

Thank you, Iran. I may have not expressed myself appropriately when he said there was ambiguity there. There was some generality in the sense we advised the ICANN toward take meaningful steps to ensure your -- that this does not happen we could have used more specific word for example that the release of country codes in consistently with GAC advice doesn't happen again.

But still I see it quite precise. Not ambiguous perhaps general because it contains to interpret more generally as meaning that be advised the ICANN Board not to act inconsistently in whatever field that is with GAC advice.

So this is one point about ambiguity and having thought about it once again I think this text would be adequate, and the other point I just forgot. So, I will give the floor to Oman. -- I think it's Oman, right?

OMAN:

Yeah, for the record from... from Oman. We are in agreement with the text you have provided here, but I want to share our experience on the platform ICANN, we have noticed that when we open the platform we have noticed that not only gTLD [inaudible] second level. We found other ccTLD as well and the want to clarify this from ICANN is it only open the platform only for gTLD registration or also other ccTLDs. We have raised objection letter to the ICANN.

This is our experience. Thank you

THIAGO JARDIM:

Thank you very much, Oman, for sharing your experience.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

So just to note that ccTLDs are not -- they don't have a contractual agreement with ICANN, so each ccTLD they put their own policies. They are not under any obligation from ICANN, so what we are

discussing here -- I know, I know it has been provided through the tool. It's for your information.

But regarding ccTLDs if you have any concern, you have to contact the specific ccTLD. Okay?

OMAN: Thank you for this information.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you.

THIAGO JARDIM: Thank you very much, Manal. So the other point that I forgot to mention in reaction to Iran's comments is that I don't see that these -- I don't see these language as being inconsistent with our previous advice. In fact, it would rather complement and the improvement here I think is it provides a consensus reaction to the Board response to our advice.

This would be -- I think quite an improvement. Iran you said it yourself. It is time for the GAC to tell what it thinks about what happened. And we would be saying here that the GAC remains concerned that the advice on this issue has not been complied with as we wanted. So moving on to Switzerland.

SWITZERLAND:

Thank you, Thiago. Jorge Cancio for the record from Switzerland. First of all, thank you very much for the huge work you have been doing, and for coming up with this constructive proposal. I wonder whether we would like to mention somehow that some steps have been taken already, and especially this post-communique conversation between the GAC and the Board because that's already a step that has been taken, another thing I ask myself is whether we should specify, and I think that goes within the direction of what Raul was hinting at that these steps have to be taken in conjunction.

We don't want to enter into a ping-pong game with the Board, so maybe -- I don't know -- put some wording in there that these measures have to be developed together.

And finally, I think that Manal mentioned it as a possibility, that the BGIG could have a task here. So I don't know, perhaps we could leave it as it is, and then add a sentence like specifically following up on the measures taken, we recommend that the BGIG develops something to really avoid that situation happens again in the future. With this topic or with other topics. Thank you, Thiago.

THIAGO JARDIM: Thank you, Switzerland. So if I understand you correctly and also trying to hear and feel the room's view on this, shall we take the highlighted text as adopted. We could share it with the ICANN Board in advance, and then we during the GAC communicate drafting session, think about if an additional sentence that would take on board India's and Switzerland's points?

Hearing no objection I will take that as a yes. And I think it is time to give the floor back to the GAC chair because she knows best what to do now. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I'm going to congratulate you for finishing ten minutes earlier. So any, any comments or questions on this topic before we have a break for lunch? Iran please.

IRAN: Yes, one word. I suggested you maintain the term word of complementary rather than clarifications, or combination. This is complementary. When you say clarifications means that it was not clear. The previous was clear.

Crystal clear. Very clear. But now we complement that, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: We label it clarification just in case there are any clarification questions. If it's crystal clear then, I mean, the purpose of the call is for clarification, and we normally stick to the very language that we propose. We don't complement or add anything. We just make sure that the language is clear, but again, we will not debate the name of the call. We can say Board GAC call.

I'm happy with whatever name but thank you Kavouss for the proposal.

Any other questions or comments? Question, Europe commission.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: I have a question. We said that towards the end of the session we were going to talk about the search tool, so I would like to know whether there are any comments from the countries as to there experience in the use of this tool.

THIAGO JARDIM: Thiago speaking. We have heard the comments by the representative of Oman about this tool. If you have some other experiences, we would love to hear about them. If not, anyway we will have other opportunities to listen to your experiences. Also in the next ICANN meeting but if in the minutes we have left any

representatives of any country would like to share with us the experience with the use of this tool we are all ears.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Other experiences from the floor? Actually we have agreed to have the Montreal meeting as our milestone, but it's good to know as we go -- the experiences and it's very informative if others also can share their experiences like Oman did, so we still have a few minutes if there are any requests for the floor?

Okay, if not, then this concludes the session, and thank you Thiago for making it so effective, so we ended up with communique language, and this also addresses Kavouss's point that the language has been shared very early and agreed.

It's now the lunch break. I'll just do a time check. So please be back at the room at 1:30 so that we can proceed with the working group on Human Rights and International Law. So 1:30 here at the same room. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]