MARRAKECH – GAC: Joint Community Meetings (GNSO, ccNSO, and BGIG)
Tuesday, June 25, 2019 – 10:30 to 12:15 WET
ICANN65 | Marrakech, Morocco

GENERIC NAMES SUPPORTING ORGANISATION (GNSO) MEETING

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. I got the Green light to start if you can take your seats and we only have like 20 minutes for this session and that's why we have decided to focus on just 2 topics. The EPDP phase 2 and legislative tracker so I would like to first to welcome Keith and other GNSO colleagues in the room and shall I hand over to you Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Manal. Good morning everyone. I'm Keith Drazek. I am the chair of the GNSO and joined by Pam Little one of the vice chairs and Yulf, our counsel liaison to the GAC as I'm sure you know thank you for the opportunity to be here with GAC colleagues to be able to discuss topics of common interest. So on our agenda we proposed a discussion of 2 topic the first being a brief update and conversation on the ongoing policy process the keep up with Phase 2 which is the portion of the EPDP designed to focus on the development of a system for access and disclosure to nonpublic registration data also described as uniform access

model and we will speak to that in a moment and the second topic we listed it as a legislative tracker topic but I will expand on that a little bit.

I think as you all are probably aware we've heard from ICANN Org that they are work and establishing a process for better understanding and prediction and tracking of developing regulation and legislation around the world particularly as it relates to ICANN policies. And so we'd like to talk to you all about sort of looking ahead and how that might be coordinated within the ICANN community and I suggest Manal we take one at a time and open up for questions and I would love to have a dialogue today.

The first topic the EPDP Phase 2 I think we've heard recently from Goran, and around the work of Phase 2 there are open questions about how ICANN might play a centralized role in the development of a uniform access model. And it is one of the open questions in my mind that is a decision point at the fork in the road. In other words, I think we have sort of binary choice ahead of us as we develop the policies around a standardized system for access or a uniform access model and that really is whether ICANN can play a centralized role as a controller of data, and where registries and registrars would effectively become the processors of that data and as you will hear Goran say there's question as to whether ICANN and we all can sufficiently reduce

the amount of liability face by contracted parties the registrars and register stress to the point where we can actually have what's determined a uniform access model. And if ICANN is able to take on that role as controller. And to take on some of that liability.

Then I think there is the opportunity to build a standardized uniform access model and, in the way, that many of us have thought about it if it turns out ICANN is unable to do, take on that centralized role it essentially distributes the risk and the decision making around disclosure of data down to the contracted parties themselves and the register stars. So I think what we are faced with here is while the EPDP Phase 2 work is ongoing, and there's a good work that's taking place this week here in Marrakech during the face to face meetings, there is this decision point I think that we need to acknowledge and recognize as to which path we're going to take. What policies are we going to develop in support of which model.

And so I think that's it's important just to keep that in the back of our mind as we are working through the EPDP Phase 2. There are some important policy questions that need to be developed and asked to inform the answer to that question, about whether ICANN place a centralized role or not but at the same time we have a bit of a chicken and the egg scenario is how do you develop public policy if you don't know which model you're trying to support and at which point does identifying the model make

sense in terms of the timing and the front end. So there's a lot of good work going on in the EPDP I think we recognize that it has been a bit slow to start up in terms of getting to some of the substantive work, but that that work is really I this think taking place in Ernest this week. So I'd like to just pause there and see if there are any questions or comments from GAC colleagues related to the work of the EPDP. Any questions about what I might have said. Happy to hear any questions or comments. Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Keith. So and thanks for this brief. Any comments or questions from GAC colleagues? Iran, please.

IRAN: Thank you, Manal. Thank you, Keith. I think before reply to your questions could you very briefly give advantage and draw backs of each of those 2 paths? Number 1, number 2, I was attending the EPDP now, I don't know whether we are at the end of the beginning or we are at the beginning of the end.

There are discussing many things but still they are square one. So perhaps that would be a good question, you say draw back, and advantages, and whether we have other choice, whether there is

any light at the end of this long tunnel, or the EPDP rather than giving the whole things to ICANN. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:	Thank you, Kavouss. It's very good question, and I think that the question of timing is that there is clearly a recognized urgency to the resolution of what we're going to design and develop and implement, and I think in terms of the beginning the end of the beginning or the beginning of the end I think it's a bit of both. The end of Phase 1 delivered us essentially a replacement policy for the temporary specification which as you all know, had a defined expiration date so that was accomplished. We are now beginning the process to replace the previous WHOIS protocol, and the system that we have known for many years.

And I think at the end of the day this question of whether ICANN can play a centralized role or whether it has to be distributed is a key question. I think there is work that can take place in the EPDP to help inform that work and to help frame the question appropriately that will hopefully bring an answer in the near term, I know that Goran mentioned yesterday during our GNSO working council with the Board that during the EPDP session his team with ICANN Org is going to be engaging with the EPDP Phase 2 people to talk specifically about the engagement with the European Commission and to try to plan for asking the right questions to make sure that the questions that are posed are the right questions as it relates to the work of the EPDP.

And so I don't think at this time we can predict an end date for the work of Phase 2. I think there are some gate and questions that need to be answered in order for us to be able to understand the path forward. I think to answer your question about advantages or disadvantages, I think if ICANN were able to take on a centralized role as controller I think that would give registries and registrars some confidence in the ability to say, we are acting on behalf of the policies established by the controller, and therefore it would enable a centralized process or a centralized system that could be inter operable and have standards of predictability. The down side to a distributed system is it would effectively have registrars making the decisions individual by and that could potentially upped mine the ability to have a unified system.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Keith. Iran is this in your request for

IRAN: I apologize. Just the idea injected here. Important issue in the whole thing is the accountability, so whether they give the whole things to ICANN, to play a centralized role as the controller, and the others as processors, the issue of accountability perhaps is another issue we should look at that who could respond to that accountability that we have discussed for 4 years. Thank you.

ICANN POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you again. Thank you again. So I think that's a very good point and I agree that accountability would need to be considered and factored into any model. And I do want to just note I think as we talk about ICANN taking on a centralized role as a controller in this particular case, we are really speaking specifically to a reaction to one regulation from GDPR. I think as a community and ICANN have to recognize we are talking about gTLDs. You know generic names. Global names and that there going to be on already are other regulations and laws come into effect that we have to be able to provide enough variability in the model. We have to have the right knobs and dials to be able to turn to make sure that we are able to implement a system that can meet the needs of a range of different regulations. And I think with ICANN playing a centralized role it becomes more manageable rather than having a distributed system where you know you end up with the variability being much more complex. So I agree accountability is very important. Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you Keith. Any other questions on EPDP Phase 2? Keith, any final remarks before we move to the second topic?

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Manal. Again, Keith Drazek. I think from the   so council perspective as you know we are the managers of the policy process and we are the manager of the EPDP under our auspices. We have participation from multiple different parts of the community including excellent representation from the GAC and so you have, and the community has our commitments as the GNSO council to make sure that the Phase 2 EPDP work is done in a timely and efficient manner as possible. And that we are committed to seeing this process conclude successfully in a timely manner and with the   you know the utmost level of consensus and support possible. We recognize this is a very important effort, and that the success of this I think is really important for the GNSO ICANN as a whole, and to make sure that legitimate users of registration data have access to the maximum extent allowable under the law. Thank you, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Keith, and thank you for the update and the discussion. This remains to be a topic of interest to the GAC. We are committing to participating to the process, and we hope we can arrive at the desired outcome in a reasonable time frame. Thank you.

So if there is nothing else on this maybe we can move to the legislative tracker.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you again. So as I mentioned at the outset, this topic is I think one that has been introduced by a reaction or an acknowledgment that ICANN's reaction to GDPR is something that we want to I guess in terms of timing is something that we would like to avoid moving forward. We want to try to help ICANN, and ICANN has recognized the into need to have a better act to predict and to understand and to analyze what's being developed internationally around regulation and legislation, and how that might impact what we do here in ICANN, and specifically from a GNSO council perspective gTLD policy.

And so I think encouragingly the ICANN Board and ICANN CEO identify this had as an important component of the work of ICANN, and that ICANN needs to do a better job of being able to predict what's coming so we're not in such a reactive mode that we can plan ahead and that we can understand where these issues might arise. So we can avoid another GDPR like situation. So the question that the GNSO council has been having an is how best can we as part of the community, engage with ICANN organization and the ICANN Board to basically work together to try to make this as effective and efficient as possible? And so one of the questions also that has come up at the GNSO level and the GNSO council is if we are looking to try to track evolving regulation and legislation what is the role of the GAC? Or members of the GAC in informing that discussion? And ha debate

and the ability to have a tracking mechanism that identifies the potential issues, helps with analysis or helps inform analysis, and you know how best can we as a community entirely work together?

And we've heard I think just this week that there is a suggestion that perhaps the cross-community engagement group on Internet governance might be a vehicle, or a structure, for ICANN Board, ICANN Org and ICANN community which includes the GAC of course, this might be a focus al point or as place where we can come together and have conversations about this particular topic. So that's essentially the beginning of a conversation related to this question of how better can ICANN prepare for evolving Internet related regulation that impacts our policy and so I guess the question for GAC colleagues is whether there is a topic that you've discussed? Is this something you've thought about and if not something for substantive discussion today I think a topic we would like to continue to evolve. So thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. Keith. And thank you for putting this on our agenda today. I think buy the definition a legislative tracker would be of interest to GAC members, and I invite GAC colleagues to follow up the reports that's being posted occasionally. In terms of discussions frankly we haven't discussed this among the GAC but

it's good at least as a starting point to brainstorm the topic here at this meeting, also in terms of the cross community engagement group on Internet governance, in fact, we were asked if the GAC could be one of the chartering organization of the group, and despite the fact that we didn't feel in a position to be a chartering organization because of the nature of the topics and the diverse views we have here that we may not be able to, we may be delaying decisions if we wait for consensus on topics as broad as Internet governance but we were very supportive of the group per se, and we asked them if we could be of any help and frankly ever since they have been receiving I think individual requests from GAC members to join their mailing list, so I think we already have good presence over there.

Whether it's the place to discuss the   or the platform for GAC and other parts of the community to meet there for the legislative tracker, I open this for discussion. Kavouss please Iran. Go ahead.

IRAN: Thank you, Keith and Manal. As a personal note I have worked with you during the ICG and with others during the accountability. Cross community process has proven to be a useful process. You involve everybody, and it is room everybody to contribute. However you have to it be quite careful that we should not limit it to the cross-community Internet governance.

Internet governance is very complex. Very sensitive and complex topic, however, under the framework of that we could address this issue, under the framework. But on the specifically attach this together because one may kill the others, and vice versa. So perhaps within that framework accepting cross community for discussions and so and so forth we further contribute to this issue, if we could also at the same time address part   not totally the Internet governance which is quite complex subject. This is a personal note. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you again, Kavouss. And, yes, I have a long history of working together going back several years, 5, 6 years even. It's hard to believe the time has gone by so quickly. So I take your point absolutely, that the cross-community efforts and working groups and engagement has been very helpful, I think in the ICANN space as ICANN evolved and I also agree with your point that Internet governance very complex. Also very broad in terms of a definition, and this would be one you know perhaps one component of the work of the group but certainly not the entire work of the group. Manal, I might also just to update there was a meeting of the cross-community engagement group on Internet governance yet, and there was I think a strong participation from the ICANN Board members from the ICANN organization in that group and it was discussed about the possibility of having this

discussion, this legislative and regulatory tracking discussion as perhaps a component of that group.

Like the GAC the GNSO actually chose not to become a chartering member of the Internet   the CCEG the evolution. There's some history there but we also chose not to become a chartering member and our view at this time is that the group probably has a function that can be a bit more ad hoc or informal rather than needing to have a formal charter with formal decision points, and I think that to have an opportunity to engage on these topics, and to contribute and exchange views is something that would be worthwhile. So I think as we look ahead. This is still in the very early stages that this could be an opportunity without having to become a chartering member or sign up to a particular term you know of behavior I think we have the ability to use this as a further discussion point on questions of evolving regulation. Evolving legislation and how that might impact ICANN. I expect that ICANN organization would take the responsibility for continuing to manage the tracking, the mechanism. The reports and all that have as it should, but I think it's very important for the community to engage through that process to make sure that ICANN is as informed as possible. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Keith. And thank you for briefing us as well on what happened yesterday during their meeting. Russian please go ahead.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much for presentation, and thank you for call to participate in discussion about legislation, about rules and norms, can we expect from GNSO more formal approach, and prepare some structured framework for such work? I mean, we define it procedural, define it deadlines because best effort is a good approach, but it's a quite critical question especially in terms of be compliant with national regulation, and in terms of we framework. We structure approach states each state will provide information with national legislation to make your task easy because only states are known better what are regulation and enormous applicable for each concrete case, and in which case, I think we will be more efficient, and escape some complexity in GNSO, and in big discussion. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Russia, and I agree completely. I think that's exactly the reason why we as a GNSO council are interested in this, and have discussed the role of members of the GAC or the GAC in these discussions. We as the GNSO council would be focused only on how regulation and legislation would impact gTLD policy. So

policies around generic top-level domain names so our focus and our remit are narrow as it relates to policies for gTLDs and the work we either have under way or work that we would potentially need to initiate. So I think your question about structure and process is a good one. And I think that's something that the GNSO council is continuing to discuss as this issue evolves or this opportunity evolves. And I think we would see ourselves as reviewing the regulations and the legislation that ICANN has identified and done some preliminary analysis on, and then providing our input to the process on how we think it might impact gTLD policy. So I think that's an and going discussion at the GNSO council.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you Keith. I have Iran then Trinidad and Tobago and then we need to conclude for the sake of time so Iran, please.

IRAN: Thank you, Manal, and thank you, Keith. May I share my experience with you. 45 years of experience. Many terminologies are very very important issue. When you talk about regulations, and legislations you go to the very very vast area that may involve some complexity, we have face with this issue because we are GAC also ITU more or less, we have difficulty when we talk about legislation and regulations. Perhaps one should think of some

synonym for this, not all them regulations no it is legislation which may end up having a convention and so on and so forth and that would be very very difficult to arrive at consensus.

Otherwise that will not be   have any results. Perhaps we should look some other terminology. Terms which Maya chief the same purpose, but not fall within the trap of   (foreign language)

IRAN: Avoid to have legislation and regulations. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Kavouss, and certainly as government representatives you would have better ability to help us with the right terminology. So we could certainly welcome your input on that.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Trinidad and Tobago, please.

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO: Karal Douglas for the record from Trinidad and Tobago. I wanted to support the initiative. I recognized a lot of countries around the world are taking some example from Europe, changing the data protection laws. So it is very timely even in the region much the Caribbean region we are now examining the GDPR to make

some sort of headway as to maybe a Caribbean GDPR type of legislation, so of course as rightly said you don't necessarily want to be reactive all the time. So taking in front is definitely the way. And I think now in particular given the fact that the GDPR is in effect, and other countries are recognizing there is a need to update their laws. Not just data protection, but other areas, so I'm fully in support of this initiative.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much for the comments and I think that is absolutely ties our current discussion about this tracking and awareness effort back to our topic number 1. And as I mentioned, as we understand GDPR is just one regulation or law. We now have the evolution or the   of others, and we as we develop a uniform access model in the EPDP Phase 2 or a standardized system for access and disclosure if there are going to be different changes or different pressures from different laws and regulations, as we build the system as we design a system that has the variability capability we talked about this is a very timely I think you know opportunity for us to make sure that as we design a system we do it with enough you know, ability to an adjusted thank you very much, Manal. I appreciate the time today.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Keith, and thank you ever and thanks to JULT. I this I it concludes our meeting with the GNSO and starts our meeting with the ccNSO. I have to step out of the room unfortunately, but Par GAC advice chair on our focal point with the ccNSO will be leading this meeting and I will be back in like ten minutes so if you please excuse me. Thank you.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

COUNTRY CODE NAMES SUPPORTING ORGANISATION (ccNSO) METTING

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I have to step out of the room but Pär will be leading the meeting. I will be back in like 10 minute, so if you please excuse me, thank you.

PAR BRUMARK: So we welcome our dear colleagues and friends from the ccNSO. Last time I said something else. I don't know where you want to start and who wants to start. We start with a PDP update.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Good morning. I want to give you an update on the PDP for the retirement of the ccTLD. For those who are new, I will briefly run through the first slides on the history. This one gives you the RFC that has spawned all this. And you can see from a slide that it covers both the legacy com, net, organize, mil and the definition of the CC out of the ISO 366 table. It is critical to note, IANA is not in the business of determining what is or isn't a country and rely on the ISO table for that. Next slide please. Again, every stemmed from 1591 but there was a lot unsaid about it. Lack of detail for transferring control, the terminology up until a few years back was redelegation, the current terminology is revocation and transfer. You will see both in use. We are trying to stamp out re delegation, but it will probably take another decade or so. As noted, the ccNSO a few years back had what they call the framework of interpretation Working Group which took a long

lack at RFC 1591 and tried to provide guidance for the ambiguity present and I will note the Working Group had active GAC participation which proved to be helpful. Historically, there was confusion. The IANA was making up policy as it went along depending on the circumstance of what was going on with the specific ccTLD and were doing that with other issues as well. Next slide please. Thus the ccNSO decided we had to embark on a long-term process to review the IANA policy and try to get rationalization and consistency. Next slide please. Along the way, we have had several Working Groups related to 1591. The first was the delegation redelegation and retirement Working Group which is a mouthful. That was trying to put together the history of the IANA's activities with respect to delegation and redelegation. That was followed by the interpretation Working Group which ran for a couple years. The current Working Group is working on a retirement policy for when a country code is removed from the ISO table. This would happen if a country changed its name. We actually have a couple that are doing so at the moment. It is basically if they change name and the corresponding code they were using gets removed because at that point we feel it needs to come out of the root. This will be followed by on a second part of the same Working Group working on the appeals process for this activity. RFC 1591 states there should be an appeal process but there is nothing in 1591 as to how it should run so the last bit is ccNSO developing an appeal mechanisms. Next slide please. So,

it is our contention that if the CC two letter code is removed from the ISO table, then it needs to be removed from the root as well and the FOI is noted to determine there was no policy with respect to the ccTLD. Next slide, please. You can see in April 2017, we had our second birthday just after Kobe. I would like to think that it is hopefully middle aged at this point. We have been meeting regularly. We have called every other week between face to face meetings. We rotate the calls on a six-hour interval so we all suffer time zone issues. We have identified and are working through a number of issues. Next slide please. Since Kobe, we have closed a few things. We have sorted out the applicability of the policy. We have worked through and agreed on a consensus basis to definitions of some important terms including trigger date and end date for the retirement process. We also have an overview of the retirement process and we via consensus after considerable work have come up with a duration for the removal process. It is not like you can suddenly take its ccTLD out of the root the day after a country changes its name. And in Kobe, we did a preliminary   got preliminary support from the ccTLD that was present in Kobe. So we got validation from our community that the work to date is on the right track as far as they are concerned. Next slide please. This gives an overview of the removal, the retirement process. It all stems from the trigger event which is the removal of the country code from the ISO 3166 table. After considerable discussion, as a Working Group via

consensus, we decided the process of removal of the country code to the removal of the two letter ccTLD should take a minimum of five years. The retiring ccTLD can come back to ICANN with a retirement plan and get an additional five years, so the time lag between the removal from the table and the removal from the root can be as much as 10 years. We recognize that not all ccTLDs may be able to negotiate with the IANA on a retirement plan. Next slide please. Here is where we are. We have the following topics currently under discussion. Continuing the oversight of the retirement process discussion. We are embarked just recently on discussing the status of exceptionally reserved country codes. These are country codes that are not formally in the ISO table as a two-letter code. They are in a different category within the same document. An example would be UK. The ISO country code would be .GB but that is not used. We have decided after several debates on this topic that for the moment we really don't want at a get bogged down in trying to sort out the retirement of IDN retirement of ccTLD. Next slide please. What we are working on next steps is change of manager during retirement process given that a retirement of a ccTLD may take up to 10 years it is entirely possible, although not likely, that a change of manager for the TLD might happen so we need to sort that out. They may have a different philosophical approach than the prior manager as far as the function with the IANA functions operator might be. We have to sort that out. We are just getting into

developing scenario for stress testing the policy and will be doing that between now and Montreal. That is the update. Previously in the FIO Working Group we had GAC participation. My group and I as chair would real appreciate if we could get GAC input. It was helpful with the FIO and It would be helpful to have GAC perspective on the work we are doing. That's it for me. Any questions?

INDONESIA: This is the Indonesia chair. You asked the wrong people. You must ask the government. No, really. The trigger event is a remover from the ISO code. The one country I know that is contemplating this, they may or may not decide to change the name of the islands into an Indigenous language name. Then the government may or may not approach the ISO organization and say we want a different code. They can say we have a new name and want to keep the same code. If they approach and say they want a new code, the old ccTLD must be retired. If it changes, it is a one to one transfer. We don't really know what's happening because at the moment there is no change in the ISO code that we are aware of that has triggered a retirement. It is basically for the governments of the world to decide, for each government or country, to decide whether it wants the ISO code change. If the ISO code changes and we hope nothing changes before we are finished because then we have a policy to do this. Yeah. If not, we will, of course,

the IANA function operator will have to do something but they will probably go with what has developed so far, and at least say a minimum of five years, and say OK, if you need more, talk to us about the retirement plan because they are involved in our Working Group, so they know what our current thinking is. But there is no formal policy. It is not for me to tell any government what to do.

EBERHARD LISSE: One of the very important, I think, noted remarks from Stephen and again that was very important for the work of this group, and that is in principle the IANA is not in the business to determine what is or is not a country. That is one of the reasons for the ccTLD rely on the 3166 list. Everything from what is the country code of a country is determined through the mechanisms of the ISO 3166. IANA has nothing to do whatsoever in assigning the two-letter code to the country and whether it is included in the 3166 list. I think that is a fundamental premise of the work of this group and also of the work of the ccNSO in general. Thank you.

PAR BRUMARK: Any further questions?

EBERHARD LISSE: It is very interesting what you just mentioned because the name of the ccTLD is using ISO 166. Now, while in the 3166, there are

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

many areas where this is not a country, but it has an alpha two code name in ISO. IO, for example, and others. IO for the territory in Indian Ocean, for example. If it is in the ISO 3166 but I am not sure if it was country. Apologies for my understanding of the geographic. It means ccTLD is not only looking after country code. It look after anything in the 3166 plus country code. Apologize if I am mistaken of my understanding.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you. This is a very interesting question. The real point is in short, it is not our problem. It is for the last 40 years, we have lived by the ISO code because it was said it was easier to use the ISO list than make up rules ourselves. There is a list of countries and territories. It is basically more for statistical purposes like distinct economies. Like if there is an island like the islands part of Denmark or the Netherlands country of Saint Martin and the smaller islands, they are distinct economies and form parts of the economy, but they have their own. Generally speaking, if there is an ISO code, there can be a ccTLD. There is two for which it has not happened because of the governments and the people. UM, the American outlying minor islands, there is only radioactive pings living there and the U.S. government said it is not necessarily, we don't need it, don't do it. Then there is the smaller Caribbean island of the Netherlands that are distinct municipalities of the Netherlands and they said there is so few

people we don't need it. Then there is the western Sahara and a conflict between the government of this country and so it has not been delegated. Basically, any country, any entity, that is on that list can even be a regional subdivision of a country like Teran. TW is its own distinct economy. Therefore that is the reason for it.

PAR BRUMARK: Thank you, everyone. If we talk about country codes, the best advice we can give, and I think I can give to you, is to look at the standard itself and look at the definition used in there. We are using the definition of the ISO 3166 and I think everybody talking about country codes in our context should live by the definitions. There is an overlap in definitions that make it very difficult sometimes in the conversations.

PAR BRUMARK: Thank you very much. Next topic is…

AJAY DATA: Thank you for inviting us here. Next slide. Here we are talking about the status on ccTLDs and how audience is going to impact the future of the internet. What you notice here is almost 42 countries who have ID and string located cannot become part of ccNSO. That's is the status as of today. Next slide please. These countries have been delegated with a string and name and have

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

a delegated name to the country and cannot become part of the ccNSO. These are options and issues. Some require attention and have been discussed within the ccNSO. The policy of the variant is being discussed and pending. Some Communique work has happened but the policies around them have not been ccNSO is around the request I believe received in Kobe and now the activity is notice this. The PDP2 have been discussed. Another option issue is to take the fast track process to a policy development. Now the policies acquired around that which is being discussed. The more difficult part looks like as ccNSO is discussing the same thing and these are going to be discussed with these recommendations. I think ccNSO is discussing about ccTLDs and about operator names. The country code ID in a string and ID in a string. These things will be required. Retirement of IDN we discussed so we will skip this discussion here. What is the roadmap? This is the roadmap which I believe we talked on the previous slide is from fast track process to the policy for selection of IDN in a string. This is basically the order. This will require a bylaw change. Article 10 in bylaws. This is where the discussion is going through. Next slide please. And, of course, next slide please. The roadmap is very clear that how do we do the start the evolution of fast track and PDP 2 and gap analysis overall between IDN ccTLD policy. And the third step is spread the PDP where there is a bylaw change and a policy for IDN and a string. These are the two important aspects of representation today

where this requires a bylaw change to have inclusion of IDN ccTLD as a member and how strings are going to be selected and what are the policies going to be. Next slide please. To address this, council defined this group preliminary review team was formed and this team has already met many times and discussed over conference calls and trying to see what kind of changes should be recommended into the policy which is available in front of us which came in Kobe, I believe. This has been discussed. The reporting is going to be back to the council and then go to the board. This is a lightweight gap analysis being performed where the council thinks that there are some changes which are required in the policy. This discussion has been going on and we are almost at a final stage to discuss it out. Next slide please. These are the findings. As you can see, no major updates acquired in the proposal bylaws. Need to develop policy around the IDN ccTLD management and variance management is an open topic, again. It has been discussed at several levels and requires more discussion. Update relevant parts of IDN ccTLD selection process, criteria, and procedures and reconfirm the principles of underpinning the policy. This is a different part globally because the communities have framed their own things which now has [indiscernible] but the policy is not in place whether to locate, how much to locate, whether to locate. All those things will be discussed.

BART BOSWINKEL: We will keep this at the time as Ajay said there are no updates to include the 61. They cannot become members of the ccNSO due to the bylaw restrictions. Next one. Policy that's, I think, that's clear as well. You can read it at your leisure. Next slide please. Selection and this goes back to the fast track process and the overall policy. You saw it on the slide. Confusing similarity you have been informed now regularly on the   what it was called? The extended process review similarity panel and the risk management panel, Etc. What you see is a divergence between what is happening between IDN ccTLD and gTLDs. At one stage, it needs to be looked at whether there is room for harmonization in that area and there is a proposal right now for IDN ccTLDs, but a fast track has evolved over time and that is why the evolution needs to stop to amend and get everything in place. I think the other one is very clearly, you can read it at your leisure, but these are two major substantial parts and maybe the last two ones are relevant for the GAC as well. Permanent IDN ccTLD advisory panel. In the proposal it was suggested that such an advisory panel would include members of the GAC as well. That is changing and the review of the policy after five years, I think there is a bit overview fatigue so that needs to be reconsidered whether you want to have a review of policy every five years. Next slide please. The principles, and I think this is very important as well, in future, the fast track and the overall policy were designed with the idea that IDN ccTLD and ACCII ccTLDs are effectively the same and

managed and governed in the same fashion. That principle was the result of the preliminary evaluation and we should not change it. It means the delegation transfer revocation and future retirement process applied to the IDN ccTLD and ASCII ccTLDs. The other principles speak for themselves. These principles drive the policies and drive the work of the respect of the ccTLDs. Back to you, Ajay.

AJAY DATA: We are going to discuss how to include IDN ccTLDs in ccNSO and what are the changes required in bylaws. This is what we will discuss during the Marrakech meeting and issues which I talked about in the previous slide. Next slide. This obviously our goal to report back to council in August. We are, as I told, we are already at the final stages. We are going to probably finalize during the Marrakech meeting and Kate for the council discussion on how to move forward. Next slide please. Just for the record, this is the membership PRT we have. Next slide. Any questions?

BART BOSWINKEL: The reason for presenting this is to pre-warn you of a potentially upcoming new policy development process around IDN ccTLDs. The expectations, if all goes according to plan, that will be at or around the Montreal meeting. The report of this group will more or less be transformed into an issues report and based on that

one, the council will decide whether or not to launch a future PDP and closing the current draft IDN overall policy because as you could see, say waiting another two years for IDN ccTLDs to become members of the ccTLD just to resolve the more procedural and substantive issues around variant management, et cetera, is probably not a very wise path to move forward. Thank you.

PAR BRUMARK: Manal, please?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Between now and Montreal, if there are things that can bring the GAC up to speed so by the time the PDP is there we can join affectively. We have been away from the topic for some time, so it is good to revise.

BART BOSWINKEL: As soon as the draft is decided, I think that will be valuable for you. This is based on the high-level analysis of whether there are gaps in the current proposal and that will inform your discussions. You will see a focused effort, so you don't need to go through a lot of documentation.

PAR BRUMARK: Indonesia please?

Indonesia: This morning we discussed the GNSO and the ccTLD problem with security. So many crimes are using ccTLD for their place and because we didn't find one, G it is used by many people and so easy to use for crime because there is no check of the user. I want to know in your policy and process, and the roadmap for the ccNSO ccTLD, how do you measure the security? How do you measure the security of the ccTLD? Is there any policy that you developed for example, the ccTLD is not allowed to be sold anywhere outside of your country, or if it is sold you have to check who is the user and you can identify that one? You see, I personally will not want the ccTLD for a particular country or territory. It is used for crime and we will have more and more cybercrime. Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I understand your concern very much, but it is outside it scope to develop these policies. That is a national sovereign matter. All the policies for the ccTLDs about registration, et cetera, are done locally together with the government. If you have an issue with a particular ccTLD, you should go to the ccTLD. That is outside the scope of the ccNSO policy development.

PAR BRUMARK: That concludes. We don't have any time left. It concludes another great thorough Meeting with the ccNSO. Have a nice day all of you.

[Applause]

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, everyone. If you can just hold on one more discussion and Maarten, sorry to keep you waiting. We have

BOARD GAC IMPLEMENTATION GROUP (BGIG) MEETING

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much everyone, and if you can just hold on one more discussion, and Maarten please sorry to keep you waiting. We now have 30 minutes quick discussion with the Board GAC interaction group, so please remain seated.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So thank you everyone and apologies to Board members for the delay started but without any further ado I will hand over to Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you, Manal. It's a great pleasure to chair this Board interaction group together with you and to have it name which we think of Kavouss as a proposal it's really to focus on the process on how do we further improve the Board GAC interactions, and with that we follow up on good practice to be very clear on how the process of receiving advice and dealing with advice works. So with that can I go to the next slide?

Who is in control of the slides? Super. So what we want to present very shortly, and this is why we think 15 minutes will do here   is to follow up on the Kobe score card, what have we responded to that. The process again. We going to share with you the schedule for responding to the advice that we expect to come out of Marrakech, and we have discussed beforehand that it may be

good to find a better way forward than how we deal with deferred or pending advice, and we want to talk about that a little bit too. Any other business would be the point where any suggestions from any of you on how to further improve this are very very welcome, so hence the heads up at this point in time.

Next slide, please. So the Kobe scorecard. We've been responding to as promised in Kobe in our previous Board GAC interaction group meeting. There were 8 items on WHOIS and on CCT review, there was also previous item related to the subsequent round of new gTLDs and we also responded on that, and there were a couple of deferred advise items the value of having that in both   in a scorecard is very much that it shows very clearly, we are not for getting it. We are considering whether it should be no longer deferred or answers to which we've been acting upon. Any questions about that?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: No, just to thank you for keeping track of deferred GAC advice and it's good to see some approvals in the way and glad to have one been approved after the Kobe meeting, and thanks for the platform as well because this is keeping us on track, and making us know what is pending and what's been responded to, so thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Super. Then the next slide, and here I would love to turn to Christine who has been facilitating this process for quite a while.

CHRISTINE WILLET: Thank you, Maarten. This slide depicts the anticipated time line for the Board consideration of the GAC's Marrakech communique. We anticipate scheduling a Board GAC clarification call approximately 4 weeks off this ICANN65 meeting, the week of the end of July. In preparation for the Board's consideration and adoption of a scorecard in September and that would be well in advance of the ICANN66 meeting.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you very much. Obviously, the pace between this meeting on ICANN66 is much larger than between the spring meeting on this meeting, so we've always been able to keep up to at least the 4 weeks but now if there's 8 weeks let's give those 8 weeks. So this should work right, Manal? Then on the next slide this is the topic we talked on as well. It is really how to deal with GAC advice and deferred items. They give an overview Christine where we stand on that.

CHRISTINE WILLET: Thank you, Maarten. Christine Willett. Yes, so since ICANN 60 the Board has provided updates to the GAC on the status of its advice.

In summary the Board went back and looked at advice issued by the GAC since ICANN 46 in April 2013 at the Beijing meeting, in total those GAC communiques comprised 192 items and 8 follow up items have been issued via those communiques. All of these items have been gone before the Board for consideration. However, some of these items still require additional Board action as Maarten mentioned. 14 items have been identified and we are tracking within our systems as pending items, they have been considered by the Board, they've been reflected in the scorecard, but the Board decided further community action was required before the Board would take action or take resolution of those items.

Some examples of those are items related to IGO's. The Red Cross Red Crescent issue and the... and there are 4 items identified with the status of deferred. The Board reflected the status they are deferring consideration of these items. As Martin mentioned previously 3 of these were for the GDPR WHOIS on one is for IGO's and the hope is by brings these to the group's attention is the Board could begin a dialogue between now and the Montreal meeting and thousand move forward with these items pending Board action and deferred.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: So on that we would love to hear your thinking on that input is very welcome.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Any immediate reactions, or feedback on this? Okay, looks satisfactory.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes, I think we think it makes sense. That's why we discussed this beforehand, and the satisfy sense is approval right? At least I get some reaction now. Thank you very much. And thank you, thank you for this overview Christine. Kavouss, please.

IRAN: Thank you very much, Maarten. I found this Board GAC interactive group is very useful. Essential, and has resolved several important issues up to now. Something from the last call for that, we had advised GAC and Board to do something and you raise add very pertinent question that perhaps we should be quite careful when we propose something, give some way forward how to do that because the question you raised at the last meeting was that yes we understand the GAC advice, but we would like to know how to do it, so it seems to us that perhaps we should consider in future when we ask the Board the standard term Board shall   or should or requested to take necessary actions we

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

should say such as what? Because this is a necessary action is very very we should perhaps say including but not limited, are and give some examples to the Board to know how to do it. Otherwise the same question you will raise in future that if you say the Board take necessary actions to address the issue, we should give some example. This is for us to be in future to have a better understanding of this, and that is something I wanted just to share with our distinguished colleagues from our last call thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Very thank you for that, Kavouss. It can always be clearer. I think what we've been trying to do also in responses to the scorecard to those that we deferred to very clearly indicate why we deferred it. And where appropriate, to propose an opinion, and in particular for those processes for which we are not the ones who are to act according to our bylaws, that's every the… happen even at times we did find it appropriate to have an opinion about it so thank you for your remark. Manal, please.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yeah, I agree with Kavouss and its learning experience I would say to both the GAC and the Board, so we get to know how we can make our advice more clear in terms of implementation and so on, and you also get to know the thinking of the GAC, and how the

advice has been formulated. So I thank you for your keenness on again having those meetings regularly at each ICANN meeting, are and I also see the post communique calls very useful, as I said to both sides, so and the platform of course. So thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Good. Then the remaining issue is any other business? And while we wait for hands to go up for sure what I would like to express myself is as you may know or may not know I'm also the Board's designated ATT3 group and that's review also looks at GAC interactions, and an initial discussion there were a lot of questions so how transparent is things? And I'm very happy that if you   as your representative we've been able to point at a lot of points where transparency in the whole GAC process has been increased tremendously starting with that all meetings are open but also with the web sites where it's very clear check in between your communique and what we've done with that and things like that. That helped us realize that indeed a lot progress has been made over time for which I can thank you and supporting staff as well because we shouldn't waste time and misunderstanding in process if that's not necessary. And focus on the real issues together.

So when there's no questions, then the final word is to you, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. Thank you, Maarten, and it's good to know that you're part of the sub group on the GAC with ATRT because with your deep involvement with the GAC it's good to know you're part of the working group. Switzerland, please. I'm sorry, go ahead.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Manal. Jorge Cancio with Switzerland for the record, and thank you for this presentation and this exchange and as nobody was taking the floor so I take the opportunity to make some comments.

I think it's very valuable that you make the link to the ATRT3 and I'm looking forward to engaging in that process too although it's really very difficult to follow up with all the processes. For instance, we have the parallel process now on the evolution of the... multistakeholder model and there as the GAC we have made an input to the consultation where   and there are also some mentions of what   of what, or what Board role we would like to see, or where we would like to see evolution, and how you deal especially with conflicts when there are different positions within the community or between supporting organizations, and advisory committees and that.

I'm not naming any one specifically, so I don't know how we can avoid having to make the same inputs in ATRT3 here in the BGIG in the multistakeholder evolution discussion I just wanted to

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

point that to you. And also point out to you that yesterday we had a discussion on this protracted, very long issue of the 2 character country codes second level domains and there, there was also an interesting exchange and we saw that this post communique conversation with the Board was a good step, a step in the right direction, but I think the feeling was also that we need more steps, and there were some ideas floated perhaps by myself, that it could be good to attach this working group into looking for further improvements, and I personally have the feeling that sometimes those calls, although they are very useful, veteran very form list particular, so we very much stick to the written word, and sometimes I think that we need really a substantive conversation on what we meant, or what a bit in the line of what Kavouss was saying, but given the time pressure we have when we issue a communique and the different positions we have in the GAC we cannot always describe all the things we meant with one line or one sentence or one advice to the Board, but this substantive conversation or especially when you feel as the Board that you will perhaps formally comply with the advice but materially perhaps you don't fully comply with the advice, I think it would be good to have some mechanism that prevents misunderstandings and that helps us to have a substantive discussion so that we know what the other side or the other sides really intended with the advice or you with your resolutions. So I leave it by that. And thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: So, I'm not sure whether I should start at the beginning or with the end, and please ask me when I forgot anything. If you start with the end I just want to point out that these calls are planned to really clarify and help us to give a response to the real question, and sometimes it's clear what you're ask, and then we don't need to spend or waste time on that, and other times it's really like okay tell a little bit more. We really would like to make sure we respond to the right question. Admittedly, we count all talk about questions. The communique is the prime communication measure and the focus is on clarifying the communique. So that is first.

Now, if you feel that at some point our response is not sufficient, and this has happened in the past   we've seen it back in an ex communique and that the discussion continues so it's a dialogue continuing, it's not a... track on every topic. Sometimes that happens and not always. Thank you for your appreciation for our briefing on the two-character codes. I think this was pretty clear and because also at that time it didn't come back in the Kobe communique, we haven't reacted on things that weren't in there, but if the GAC feels there's more to be discussed about that, of course we will be open to answer any questions that may arise. Now to it the very first part of avoiding double work, the whole process   about   community,   multistakeholder   process

improvement is now currently in the hand of Bryan Kute to facilitate the community in the bottom up way with the community whatever may come out of that. The Board has stepped back from even guiding that. We are participants and followers as well and as interested. The fact that it happens was an outcome really from bottom up feelings expressions etcetera.

So that is ongoing, and it is also communicated with the ATRT, ATRT leadership has been talking about Bryan cute as well to make sure that our focus is not on the same as what Bryan is focusing on. And that the outcomes of the process are also taken into account they are relevant RTA3 so she is don't have to come back you to that's my other hat. ATRT will be here with you to ask you some questions and please consider that also an opportunity to raise those issues that are relevant for ATRT even when they're not asked in that room. And that is a mechanism that is built in the bylaws, and very important in that I think I touched upon the issues. Anything my colleagues want to add? Okay? Manal, before we go to Kavouss.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, thank you very much Maarten and we have one last intervention from Kavouss, but before this I'm just I'm thinking out loud here back to Jorge's question, an and whether we might

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

once in a while need BGIG call which might be less formal and more in depth, so this might be an option but Kavouss go ahead.

IRAN: Yes, I take this opportunity to first of all thank you man teen very much. You are among those Board members are a man of talent very good. And I want to reiterate what thigh distinguished friend Jorge mentioned in some of the conversation rather than pointing or making recourse to the procedure, we should engage in dialogue. That is something that could have a positive result.

Recourse to the procedure may not have any result. Anyone could do that, but dialogue may have a good result. So we have to take that into account. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kavouss, for those words of wisdom at the end. Any other interventions or requests for the floor? Maarten, any other final words from your side.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: No, just is to say this is why even in those calls we do have a little bit of space for dialogue but indeed the focus is on what is, and I very much agree that it's about a dialogue. It's fought only about the formalities. Formalities are important, and we need to tackle

those but next to that it's about achieving our common goal together and I think that has been the focus, and that should be the state of focus of our activity together so thank you very much for your remarks. Thank you all for listening. It may not seem very substantive meeting, but please note that we've come a long way and that we are now at the stage where we do have this dialogue and this focus on continuously working together better to be able to focus on the sensitive issues so thank you for that opportunity. Thank you, Manal, for working with us on this together.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much Maarten and thanks to Beckie and Chris and Christine and David as well, and also to other Board members who I have seen following GAC discussions since the morning. So and thank you all for your patience. I do apologize if I hinted that this was the last session before lunch because looking again at the schedule, we just have a GAC communique review quick review before lunch.

[Applause]

GAC COMMUNIQUE REVIEW MEETING

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you for your patience as we put the Communique draft minus one on the screen. And now it disappeared. As you may all expect, support stuff usually fills in the normal stuff regarding attendance and number of GAC members and observers. Simple summaries of our bilateral and other meetings or exchanges that took place but the main focus, of course, would be on sections consensus GAC advise or follow up on GAC consensus advise or sometimes other issues if it is important. So please make sure that by Wednesday noon time any final, final, drafts have been sent to the whole GAC mailing list. Meanwhile, as we conclude each session, we already hinted where we need a Communique language, so please, make sure to coordinate or to reach out to the topic leads if you have any reflections or want to be included in the drafting of the Communique language. Excellent. Thank you, Fabian for the reminder. This is accessible for all GAC members to put their text directly in the Google Docs if they wish so. With this, Fabian, can we have   yeah. Currently, it is an empty template and placeholders for the regular sections we have. We are scrolling down to the   just to let you know, we started getting text from the Working Groups. We had the human rights Working Group yesterday. This as a brief summary on our discussion on the Working Group discussion.   This was held in plenary. Also appreciate if other Working Groups could send their summaries

ICANN POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

in. Yeah, so from the first topic we identified to be reflected in the GAC Communique was the two-character country code. This was the text where we agreed yesterday, it reads the GAC remains concerned that GAC advice on the procedure for the release of country codes at the second level under new gTLDs was not taken into consideration as intended and advises meaningful steps were taken to ensure this doesn't happen in the future. I will pause here for any comments or... yes?

IRAN: I have no comment on that, but I will raise the question I had before. Do we have any topic on which I would like to have GAC advice before making or proposal any text, we have to agree on the topic? What topic we want. As I suggested, it may not be useful to continue to have follow up action on previous GAC advice. This is something just like you just read that GAC has concern about that the advice has not been taken. This is one point we need to agree on the topic on which we need to have advice before suggesting any text. And second, it will be useful when we refer that GAC met with an entity, and what is the result of that. This one, two, three lines of that saying GAC met with ccNSO. So what? Then we have to say what was discussed. Anything arising from that discussion? It would be useful to mention that otherwise people say they have always in the Communique GAC met with this and this and without reference of what was discussed and

what was issued to be follow up in further. These are the two things that we suggest for the conservation of colleagues.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much Kavouss. We usually say we listed with what group and list the topics discussed from the agenda that was shared with the GAC, so we keep thing factual because the time is tight. We keep things factual for support staff to take care of, but again, it follows what you kindly suggested. On the topics that would be reflected in the Communique, again, I am sharing my thinking here and it is open for comments from GAC colleagues. I think topics on our agenda are all potential to Communique language, but we get to conclude this after the discussion whether we need to reflect it in the Communique or not, whether it is going to be a concern or a compliment, I mean it is very difficult to identify what type of advice or whether It would certainly go into the Communique or not. I would list the two character .AMAZON and the normal lists that we already have in our agenda as potential but, again, it is not certainly unless we go through the discussion. I am not sure whether this is satisfactory and answers your question, but I also invite comments from other colleagues if they wish. Do we have other text, Fabian?

FABIAN: That's all we have.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: That's all for now. It is just the two-character code. Are we expecting something on .AMAZON? I see nothing, so please, this is a heads up that something on .AMAZON will be coming. If you are interested, please, coordinate with Thiago. Indonesia?

INDONESIA: Should we say we will remove this from the list or keep it on the list still, you know? I don't know how we pass it to you. We give the group gives it to you in writing? What is the operation for that? Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I am sorry. You are asking how to get involved in the drafting of the Communique?

INDONESIA: In the drafting of the Communique. We pass it directly to the staff to write it down.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: If you want to put it   you want to put it in the Google Docs. The Google Docs is accessible to everyone but also there is a pen holder Thiago is doing this. If you would like to coordinate first this would be my preferred option. I am sorry, Kavouss did you have your hand up?

KAVOUSS: What I had in mind was after that you said what the result was and if you could summarize in one or two lines that would be useful. On one hand, you follow the agenda, on the other hand, at least you give a consequence of result of that meeting. That is number one. Number two, I have no problem about .AMAZON or two characters but on PDP I have doubt this is staged that we would have any advice because you have given all advice before on EPDP itself at this stage, they are at the beginning of discussion even after four months and today we heard from Kate and another issue. So I have doubt that we would have any topic or any issue with this as EPDP and GAC advice. It is not clear what they do. Today they discussed something that how we could use the information that is made available disclosed and how we could be sure it will be used correctly. It is a very, very preliminary idea at the very beginning of the whole process. If you come back at the beginning of everything so I don't think that, this is my understanding, you have any advice on the EPDP at this stage? Two characters, no problem. You have said whatever you could say. If you want to add something, but just   as you mentioned, and always in the operating principles, not every message to board would be in the form of GAC advice. You have all possibility to communique, to convey any message in a letter or any way that you want to the board on behalf of the GAC but not in the language and terminology of GAC advice which has a different challenge. Informing, reminding, or reiterating that could be

done but not necessarily as GAC advice. This is just again food for thought.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much. And on EPDP, I understand we have having the discussion at 9:00 A.M. in the morning. We will be able to conclude for sure whether or not we agreed to put a Communique language. Any other comments at this stage? One last point, if you can, please, look at meetings that are taking place on Thursday. We normally get out our Communique after we finish its drafting on Wednesday night. This makes it difficult to reflect anything that is taking place on Thursday. We usually make sure that from a GAC perspective, nothing controversial is discussed on Thursday but this meeting, there is the cross community Working Group on who is data protection and EPDP and, again, I am not sure whether we need to reflect something from our listening and participation in the Communique drafting and whether this should mean postponing the posting of the Communique until Thursday, or posting it as we normally do on Wednesday. Again, it's a question for us to think about and I see a request for the floor from India.

INDIA: Yeah. The government of India for the record. This point which I am going to make stems from what was discussed in the previous

meeting with the board GAC interaction group in which a point and I hate to keep people away from lunch and to make a lengthy discussion, but I thought this may be useful and it also feeds into the operating principles and evolution work also. So there was this point which was being made that GAC advice should not perhaps be back and forth in the sense we are making repeated advice and in the next Communique we are making another advice on the same topic. If I may suggest a way out of this could possibly be, in which the GAC should look at, if we are faced with [indiscernible] when we are finding ourselves repeatedly giving advice on the same topic to the board, it might be useful to consider maybe constituting some kind of Working Group within the GAC to address all the issues and probably the subject needs more extensive discussion and deliberation and a formal, sort of exercise through which we are able to qualify our thoughts and document them properly and then perhaps come out with a consolidated document which we may wish to share with the board with the approval of the GAC. I share this for ideas to get comments from my esteemed colleagues. Whenever we find ourselves in a situation where we are repeatedly offering advice about the same subject, it should serve as some kind of an introspect whether it calls from a greater discussion among the GAC colleagues in terms of formalizing the process as a formal Working Group.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, India. I take your point and Iran's point as well on this. Obviously, whatever thing that is pending it is already flagged pending in the platform, so there has to be a good reason to keep repeating this in our Communique and also avoid inconsistent language. I take your point. Anything else on the Communique before we share a few logistics? OK. If not, then I have a request for the floor from Australia.

AUSTRALIA: Thank you, chair. I just wanted to advise Commonwealth GAC members that they are welcome to join us for a meeting at 12:30 today. There has been a change to the room that I wanted to note. We are now meeting in the rose ray room which is on level one over at the main conference center. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Australia. Now, regarding our schedule for the rest of the day, as you may have seen, Rob has sent an email indicating based on discussions after the two character code session yesterday, and since we have this one hour free time, replacing the IGO protections facilitated dialogue, we will utilize this hour in two character code discussion basically a quick overview and then the platform and how it can be used and this may be of specific interest also to new GAC members because we have agreed to have Montreal as a milestone for feedback from

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

everyone. So we need to make sure that everyone is comfortable and aware of the platform and is able to use it. I will not be able to be at this session because I am meeting Keith at the time on the topic of IGOs. A GAC advise chair has kindly volunteered to chair this session. I will be back for our preparations   just checking the schedule. I will be back for the preparation for the board meeting, of course, but I will be coming from the conference center, so I may be delayed a couple of minutes. I would appreciate if I have any volunteers from vice chairs to kick start the session on time, so that we don't lose time preparing for the board meeting. I will leave it at this. Australia?

AUSTRALIA: I have been corrected on the location of the Commonwealth meeting room. It is not level one. It is level minus one. Sorry about that.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: OK. Thank you for the correction and for GAC leadership colleagues, we are meeting at the opal room. Have a lovely, well deserved lunch. Apologies for locking you so long in the.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]