
MARRAKECH - GAC: Second Level Country Code Registration Search – Overview and Demonstration and
preparation for Meeting with the ICANN Board
Tuesday, June 25, 2019 - 13:30 to 15:00 WET
ICANN65 | Marrakech, Morocco

SECOND LEVEL COUNTRY CODE REGISTRATION SEARCH

CHERIF DIALLO: (Interpreter speaking) Good afternoon we will start with the next session. Please go back to your seats. We will start with our session. We are running behind schedule now. We are starting 20 minutes late so without further ado I'm going to give the floor to Laurent Ferrali, who is going to introduce the subject topic of the session.

LAURENT FERRALI: During the session I will give you a brief overview of the framework of 2-character code issue and ICANN has developed this tool, and... in this context. So what are we talking about? The descriptions start with in the context of the registry agreement and especially the one provision the register document we I'm to avoid any confusion with corresponding country codes. The idea is that by confusion we are -- I mean the idea the definition of confusion is... affiliation with our government or... existence.

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.

It's not the name itself but its more the content associated to the name and the idea again is to avoid any confusion with common websites or ccTLD website. So it's very important to understand that at the beginning it was about avoiding any confusion with the country code. It was -- the idea was not to gave the right to the government to authorize the... of a 2-character code. The idea was avoid any confusion of the word of government at the beginning was to -- I mean authorize in this context. And again it was the sole objective of this decision, and this registry agreement is a contract between ICANN and the registry. And it's not the end of this contract, and off this provision is not to give any rights to government of a 2-character code. It's to avoid any confusion. So what ICANN did in order to help government to avoid any confusion we have develop a search tool for government, the idea is to give you the opportunity to monitor the research of your 2-character code at the second level so you will be able to report any potential confusion. You can see on this table, and I will show you the table in a few minutes.

So contrary to what some governments are thinking, governments here play a very active role and this is why we decide that we decide because it was a discussion with the GAC leadership back in -- this is why with the GAC leadership to create this search tool to give the ability to governments to report about any potential confusion. That's the

measure that the Board adopt. There were -- and there are still 3 kind of measures much the first one is involuntary measures so I will not spent a lot of time and this, and but the second one is related to registration policy and the aim of this measure is to -- the registry is responsible of -- has to avoid any confusion in the use of the 2-character code, and it has to address any complaints from government or ccTLD operators so it's part of the -- and these are, mean we have this registry agreement and we have some provision in this registry agreement, and ICANN is -- ICANN worries to make sure that the registry follow the provision, and ICANN responsible of the enforcement of this project. It means that if you have any issue, misuse to report to the registry the registry has to investigate, and respond, and if the registry is not doing that you can go to the complaints department of ICANN, and flag that this is an issue was not resolved by the registered operator and ICANN will investigate and take any necessary measures.

Very briefly, there are a lot of interaction between the GAC and the Board on this issue, and I mean the -- it start with the... GAC advice and this GAC advice was clear. Explain there is no... from the GAC on this issue, and, yeah so this is the GAC advice because I heard several times today that yesterday that this was very, was mentioned but you have the text just on the screen. The full text of the GAC advice. The GAC ask the Board in Barcelona to answer

to several questions, and so -- and the Board's sense is answers to the GAC so please, wait carefully the different answers provide by the Board to the GAC of this important issue, and before taking any advice on this

So thank you. Now I will show you how the, how the work tool works a few second thank you. So basically you -- I mean every GAC primary contact receive a log in and password to connect to this search tool. It's not a search tool per se. I mean this tool, the aim of this tool is to provide you information about the registration of your 2-character code in the TLDs so as mentioned by Oman yesterday you have ccTLD and TLD because its every restriction of your 2-characterter to code at the second level in the world so basically you have all of this information. If you are not to the primary GAC contact and if you need to access this tool you can send a request to the GAC secretariat, and we will proceed with this request and we will give you the credentials to access this tool. Thank you very much.

So this is -- can you -- so this is the -- so on the right -- sorry can you move -- can you scroll up? So yes this is, this is Stephane Bonndallaz' account thank you and you go to the work page activities and then second level country code restriction search and then you will come to this page so please scroll down and sorry that's basic information you need about how it works and restrictions and then at the -- yeah, and then you have -- so you

can see I mean on the left side of the column you have the country code or authority code associated with your country because you know that some countries have one country code and several 2-Character Codes associated to their territories so in this case for Switzerland we have only CH and so on the left side of the column you have CH. The country codes. In the middle you have the TLD, and on the right side of the column you have the date of the registration. The information and, of course, you can -- you have access to -- you can decide to show only gTLDs or ccTLDs and if you have -- I mean if someone has report to you an issue with a specific website you can use the search engine on the left-hand side just above the table with all the registration. So yeah, so with this tool you are able to monitor all the 2-character code at second level and if you have in any issue with one of those country codes, you have to contact the registry in charge of this TLD, so -- and you have the list of TLD in the middle again, and it's part of its obligation to investigate any potential confusion case, so -- and again, its part of his obligations of its obligations so if he's not doing that you are able to reach out to ICANN complaints department in order to, to report that the registry didn't act accordingly to the registry agreement

So yes, it's -- I think it's all I have to say about the search tool and the context, and if you have any question please let me know/

CHERIF DIALLO: [Interpreter Speaking] thank you Laurent for this overview of the search tool. Now I'm going to give the floor to the GAC members in the room to see whether there are any comments or questions. Argentina, please.

ARGENTINA: For the tool have been sent by e-mail? Because I tried to access and it says access defied but maybe I'm doing something wrong.

LAURENT FERRALI: Yes, all the -- I mean all the credentials -- I mean at the beginning ICANN created a credential for all primary GAC contacts so if you have any issue with that I mean with the connection to this please send a message to GAC secretariat, and CC me, and we will answer to you in -- I mean very quickly, we have already provide I think around 36 or 37, 36 or 37 additional access for secondary GAC Web -- I mean not the primary GAC contact but secondary GAC contact so it works I mean you can experience some difficulties, I mean is the case with this kind of tool. There is some security layer etcetera etcetera so if you have, if you have in any issue please contact GAC secretariat, and just CC me, thank you.

CHERIF DIALLO: [Interpreter Speaking] Indonesia. No? The gentlemen from there?

INDIA:

Government of India for the transcript. So notwithstanding the policy of the government of India which is of the opinion that country and territory names including country codes and ISO3166 country codes should not be released at any level without prior approval and consent from the respective national governments and that if legitimate concerns of the governments are not addressed governments may be compelled to take safeguard measures as appropriate including but not limited to blocking of such domains. While I appreciate the fact that you have elucidated the functionalities being offered by the tool, the 2-Character at the second level released notification tool which has been prepared but I would request you do kindly explain as to what is the utility which this provides to the viewer per se. For instance .CH .state bank. I don't know how many domains are registered under .CA .state bank. There may be a Julia and there may be a Laurent .CS .state bank and a Maria so there may be several domains operating under this, so how do I get a picture of -- because how can I track all of those domains. This probably would serve of utility only in the limited extent when a complaint is brought to my notice about the specific domain, about some specific confusion related report by comes to me and then I can check about that domain's existence and then probably report to the registry, concerned registry and if they fail to take action I can report to ICANN compliance but probably this doesn't give me a picture kind of a snapshot how many domains under this level are

operate -- are actually operational so that I can proactively possibly seek out and search those domains and see if there is some confusion potential or some, some calls for raising the matter to the registry or the compliance department. Thank you I was able to explain get across my point properly.

LAURENT FERRALI:

Thank you very much, India. We are getting the legal background and I mean the -- the thing you mentioned that there is this ISO list and as you know the ISO list has been -- I mean -- first you have a lists of 2-Character provide by bureau of statistic of the U.N., so I mean I'm not, I'm not very familiar with the international law but I don't think that's... and then you have ISO. ISO is providing -- is not providing -- ISO is these codes are assigned by ISO and it's for -- it's what ISO website thinking. If the 2-character code are assigned to country, so, and again for particular reason. So it's difficult to -- I mean at the first level we don't have any issue. We have the... etcetera but a combination of 2 letter, I mean the rights the sovereignty over a combination of 2 letters it's an open discussion. I mean at the international level and obviously at -- I mean it's not within the ICANN that we will solve, we will discuss this issue because its far beyond ICANN mandate to discuss this, and to decide that okay, to decide about the sovereignty of countries over something.

So again, the framework of discussion is to avoid any confusion, and this is the role of the registry and this is the role of ICANN and the active role of government is to say look there is a confusion so please correct this. We are getting the sec point I'm not sure but I need to check with the people from are IT that we can investigate more than the second level. I'm quite sure that we can have the information on the third level because as you know, I mean... register CH.legal I would have on the left-hand side of the address, and I don't think that ICANN will be able to investigate there. I mean we will -- we will -- we can -- yeah we can provide in -- at the left side of the TLD. I mean the first at the second level. I'm not sure but let me check. I don't want to give you a final answered to but I'm quite sure we can investigate at the third level for example and I the fact that you want to fight against confusion. Think about the fact that it's not about just the domain. If you have -- I don't know -- we need to find a good example but CH.rugby for example and you are planning -- you are asking for the ought saying of a government to use this in the context of the non-confidence fusion, and you say to the government okay it's just a website I will use to give information about I mean the rugby competition in the world blah-blah-blah and then you will use it as a website and then you will use it as a website we will give more information about the Swiss federation information, Swiss rugby federation and then there will be a risk of confusion but the risk of confusion you cannot be sure about the risk of confusion at the

time of the registration. It's the use of this -- of the web sites which is important. Not just the -- I mean the domain name. It's what you are doing with your domain name which can cause some confusion right? So yeah, but I will try to try more information from my IT team. We are getting an request to have nor information about a global snapshot of the use of the 2-character code at the first and second level. Thank you.

CHERIF DIALLO: [Interpreter Speaking] Swiss, you have the floor.

SWITZERLAND: In Portuguese. [Interpreter Speaking] Fabian thank you for your explanation, and I believe that you gave us all the possible information but meanwhile you mentioned a key point which is the use of the ISO norm for instance for.PT in the case of Portugal, or point RT in the second level. This is beyond ICANN's mandate. If it it is beyond ICANN's mandate why is ICANN in the middle of this so to say why the members of the ICANN Board they are not all -- these are not all the alphabet letters. Are they letters? Are they for instance in our case, let's imagine the name of Jim Nazem. I want a list of personal trainers. The people go to the..PT and find the name so PT for personal trainer, whereas PT is also Portugal and the fact that being that list PT is in many lists, this is not my issue. It's an issue of principles. I'm not defending

anything for Portugal. I think it's a principle within GAC for ICANN.
PT is a personal trainer, or for Portugal. ?

LAURENT FERRALI:

Thank you very much [inaudible]. Yeah I'm not sure about this translation. You are not happy with the translation? [Inaudible]. Okay, sorry, so just for the clarification I was just saying that the country code the ISO lists there is no it's not a legal norm. It's something that the world is using and this is why -- I mean if we want to give you a process based on this ISO list it's like we are... about sovereignty of government over something. This list not a legal Norman this one it's the -- it's the U.N. statistical norm it's the same. They are using this code for administrative issue. I mean it's to help to -- I mean, yeah, it's not like you are granting some sovereignty on 2-Character. It's like we are using these 2-Character Code for particular means. I mean it's to help you to do -- yeah. It's and I mean, and, and they -- yes, and they -- I was not sure about the translation because sometimes it's not PT. I mean .PT is not an issue. You have full sovereignty other the .PT. There is no interference with .PT and if there is [inaudible].

And if there was any confusion with the work of ccTLD of your registry, I mean if someone is trying to pretend that they are the -- the registry using PT in a name that's a for sure confusion and the registry will have to investigate and take measures. It if

it's not it was a breach of the registry agreement and ICANN will investigate so this is what ICANN can do. Could do. And again, your ... governments is to flag any potential misuse of your 2-character code. Thanks. And if -- if you want to add something in English.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I just would like to say that my point is not about .PT because .PT is a brand new so we are doing the most we can to, to have dignity, to give .PT. My point is that if I'm going to use .PT it could be for Portuguese products, so it could be .PT... (foreign language).

SPEAKER: Something like that if it means something of course it's okay, as I think that .IT, it's okay because it's an Italian brand so there is no problem there. But my point is if there is a problem so and if you have check all the time on the list it's very good that you have a list. My point is we are obliged to go there because nobody takes the lead to say to the country that .PT,.IT, whatever is going to be used for another purpose that is for a gTLD but is not going to be used as a country. It's going to be used for something else. So... as gTLDs well it's a market that should not exist but okay it exists, and we have to deal with it the best we can but my point is we have to check the list. It's good you have the list but we have always to check the list.

LAURENT FERRALI:

Yes, thank you. Yes indeed you have to check the list and it's -- I mean, yeah it's what many agencies are doing and many legal... many governments are doing because they cannot decide that they will -- I mean block everything since the beginning and they will grant some access to -- I mean, yeah it's the model -- I'm from France so I can tell you that is the model of the... we were asking people to provide an a lot of documents to have the service but now we are talking about the Internet and you know that's is not... as this is why it's a very successful network so yes, I mean the -- I understand your point [inaudible].

No, I'm not saying that but for example, I mean some government we are complaining about the fact that we switched from one path to avoid confusion authorization process to the other one. I mean if people are asking you the authorization to do something, you would have a lot of demands, of requests right? So it will give you the same amount of work. Maybe worse because you have -- you need to check everything. If you are able -- I mean as a government up in your citizens are able to I mean in many countries in if Europe. I don't know -- I mean every country in the world but in Europe many countries they have this opportunity for citizens to report if there is any problem with some websites. I mean for different things. I mean criminal activities blah-blah-blah so this is the way I mean some people are monitoring the Internet. You cannot monitoring everything but if

there is something wrong, and if there is a risk of confusion a major risk of confusion you will be aware of this because many people will complain about that and then we will be able to intervene. You will be able to first with the registry and if the registry is not doing anything ICANN will do something but yeah. Thank you.

CHERIF DIALLO: [Interpreter Speaking] thank you very much.

INDIA: -- for the transcript just to add to what my colleague from Portugal just pointed out that you know while the list is helpful to the extent it allows us to (-Egypt) (to understand it which registries has the said 2 letter string been authorized for release at the second level? However as you also yourself admitted that the list doesn't provide us with a view of what is -- how many domains exist beyond the second level, so, so that is a part of the limitations both of the tool but it also points to the fact that you know sometimes when you take such long standing -- such wide sweeping decisions which may be set in stone in the past, however they have implications for the future. Now it makes it -- it places the government in a very difficult predicament in terms of how to assess what is the extent of the problem, how to did about trying to influence the problem.

How many websites are to be seen, and how to go about developing reason a framework. What you're saying is essentially in the sense of once the horse has bolted. Once the complaints from the people start piling up then you go into a reactive mode but by that time somebody will lose his scalp so in the government you have to be proactive and you have to think about protection measures which you can put in place before such a problem is allowed to occur. So that is I think the primary point of this notification tool which I think so this is the first point I want to make.

The second point in terms of limitations of the tool as I can see it although of course we are decided amongst our testifies that we would be discussing it during Montreal meeting however one of the obvious limitations which I can see is there is no one button in which you can straight away click and report to the registry. You have to essentially click the registry then you have to go inside website of the registry. Search for the contact tab. Press the contact tab. Then search and see if there is a valid e-mail I and then only then can you report. Rather helpful alongside the domain.CH.state bank there should be either a button which you can press and immediately wrong wrongdoing directly or, in fact, extending that logic further what I would want to suggest is that simultaneously by pressing that button you can register the complaint both with ICANN complains as well as with the register

industrial to generate which is a more patient process because once you night --your concerns both ICANN some ... both can undertake on the problem before them and come to their own conclusions. And if required they can take action in the matter. That's one solution which I have. Thank you

LAURENT FERRALI:

Thank you very much for your suggestion. Again, I will check with IT department what we can do. But I don't think that we can start the investigation from the registry side and ICANN at the same time. Because registry have some responsibilities, and the role of ICANN is to make sure that the provision of the registry agreement are respected by the registry. So ICANN can't intervene comprehensive department people from the... department are able to intervene when they think that there is a breach of the registry agreement. I mean we cannot ask the ICANN complaints department do proactively think that maybe there will and breach of the registry agreement. That's there is a chain of responsibilities and we need to respect this chain of responsibilities. It's -- there is a legal framework for that. There this contract but thanks for your suggestion. Related to the -- a kind of button to reach out more directly the registry and to report about confusion to the registry directly. We will talk to the IT team and well let you know before of course Montreal. We will try to give you an answer before Montreal. And thank you. Yes.

OTHER SPEAKER: Just a small point.

EGYPT: Just making a small point in the I was probably not able to convey my idea accurately. So at the very least what we could do is alongside the respective domain name and the 2 letter country code we could provide 2 buttons each one more reporting the matter to the registry directly and the other to reporting the matter to ICANN complains if and when that stage comes so at least at a glance alongside each domain name that functionality is enabled for us that is available for use by the governments should be required at a time when they require it and it should be a one click kind of option which should create -- which should open a web form which should allow inputting of the details of the complainant who obviously is a person who is authorized and who is logged into that 22-character tool because this is the inside of the log in so obviously he was authorized to view that information so once the web form is opened he can just input the details of the complaint the specific complaint and he can just click a button to submit and he can transmit that first to the registry and then depending upon as when he receives some kind of response from the registry which may or may not be satisfy should he require he can logging in the tool and at a click of a button escalate the matter from the ICANN from within the tool

itself. I think that functionality probably could be provided, thank you.

LAURENT FERRALI:

Thank you very much, and sorry for my bad. I did not understand that you were talking about 2 different button. So yes of course I will -- yes, I will I will convey this request to the IT department that -- and we will let you no at the before Montreal I guess. I mean that -- if it's feasible or in the but I cannot answer to you right now because -- yeah, sorry about that but I will let you know. Thank you.

CHERIF DIALLO:

[Interpreter Speaking] we have a little time Oman.

OMAN:

On the registration of the 2-Character -- of the gTLDs in our 2-character code but Oman is in support with the Indian comment. This tool has not removed the confusion, and, and having it will create other consequences that may cause more complexity as mentioned piano Mr. Raul. It doesn't give us any indication that remove any confusion. Just a registration that this gTLD has register and your ccTLD of the second level.

LAURENT FERRALI: Thank you.

CHERIF DIALLO: [Interpreter Speaking] the Congo democratic republic.

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO: Comprehensive perspective I ICANN and based on your presentation I understand that the registry agreement is binding ICANN and the registry and as such I think it shouldn't really be a space for confusion because on top of that there's this registry policy that the registry is based on -- I mean is also responsible of respects but they have a concern of misuse and about this confusion issue. Like in our case our ccTLD which is that city and we have already some expression of interest like CD that music or that CD that CD. As such there shouldn't be confusion but the main issue is how to control the intention beyond the request. Beyond the registrant who is requesting something so I think it would be a little bit difficult based on the search tool that we have here to clearly understand or identify that there's a confusion. I didn't know if there might be other strings or other entries which can help governments to I mean to clearly sort out this issue and make sure that there's no based on the intention of work -- or what the requestor will do there won't be in highway confusion with the ccTLD with the country code top level domain use. Thank you.

LAURENT FERRALI:

Thank you very much Congo. I can -- yeah, I can understand that some people are using CDS compact disc. I mean yes -- yeah, and I mean, the 2-Character Codes I mean -- yeah, we had a lot of discussion today -- not a lot but some discussion today, and I think that we will be very happy if we can share with me -- I mean if you can share with me in I potential measures you are using to avoid any confusion, not in two character code but on many different things because obviously we don't using only 2-character code and the Internet. We are using a lot of different names. Numbers and I'm quite sure that at the risk of confusion it is not only related to the users 2-Character Codes it can be related to the users many names. Even numbers on the Internet. And I will be very grateful if you can on provide me examples of measures implemented to avoid confusion. Not on 2-character code but on other names on members that code -- that could be used to confuse people. I mean it's like I mean we have a discussion for like 2 or 3 years about this 2-character code and at the risk of confusion it seemed the only risk of confusion on the Internet is 2-character code so if you have any example because in the... it's difficult to monitor the confusion. The risk of confusion reeled to the 2-character code. If you can share with us what you're doing to avoid on fusion with other terms on the Internet it will help us a lot to see what we can do I mean because again don't think that the -- the only risk of confusion on Internet is related to the use of 2-Character Codes but maybe I'm wrong. No. No.

CHERIF DIALLO: [Interpreter Speaking] there is one last request for the floor by Iran. But unfortunately, we run out of time. Perhaps quickly we can give you the floor Iran.

IRAN: Within the purview of this topic. We are just many issue which is outside the mandate and purview of that. I don't think we should discuss toss the owner of the country code. You suggest it is outside this. Nothing at this meeting will prevent or dominate the applicant guide we have on for discussing future much the issue is release of the 2-Character at the second level. Thank you very much for the tool. I think the number of the government they have used that play not be sufficient representative that you could make any conclusion. We should continue to have this one further review by countries and perhaps it's out of the question now or something at your website that -- have you use this had tools? What is your views? What do you propose for improvement. What is the difficulties and problem and so on and so forth and maintain that until sufficient reply then you go from the BETA to alpha from the experimental to the application. On but do not discuss the ownership of the ccTLD it is outside this meeting totally. I think we should avoid that thank you.

LAURENT FERRALI: Thank you. That's a very good suggestion we will create a survey, and if you -- if there is any is there any volunteers from if the GAC to discuss the survey. I mean what kind of survey the question we should have, we should ask to GAC members, I mean -- we will be very happy to work with you on the questions, and then to -- we will be very happy to secure the link to the survey. Thank you very much for your suggestion.

CHERIF DIALLO: [Interpreter Speaking] the last question from the floor from Indonesia before closing the session.

INDONESIA: I just after Kavouss notes that I think last year Kavouss you mention about the 2-Character country codes is actually country close as the identity of the country and it becomes important because when you see that ID that is Indonesia. U.K. is United Kingdom document it becomes an identity of the country. Now it becomes an important when it comes to the social aspect of the use of this identity. We -- in GAC we have already identified, and discussed several wording with -- which become socially sensitive just like Islam. It was then refused to be used, and in some countries there are many many wording which is socially sensitive much not only that Islam. LGBTQ2S for example. In one country it's society. You use a country code, it may cause a social problem

for that country. Now whether it is within your activities or not it doesn't. It doesn't really matter but it has to be realized that it is important to a country, and as we say connected to the unity of the country and the soaks movement of a country don't forget we have so many radical group in many countries and this to be utilized by them to make problems in if a country. Thank you.

LAURENT FERRALI:

Thank you very much and we are not -- I mean ICANN is not trying to avoid any responsibilities, and I mean, we know that sometimes there are some sensitivity -- I mean local sensitivity. You have mentioned that Islam -- I was part of the team work and that and I was part of the team provide information to the sensitivity of this issue, and the same thing for that. So we are very well aware of this but I mean we will not be able to -- I mean tomorrow you will have to work on the GAC advice right? Potential GAC advice 2-character code you start to draft this. I think it's good to bear in mind it's global position T doesn't mean we will not be able to address I mean specific cases. I mean we are own to discussion. I mean they are technical team is there. And we are -- I mean we are collaborating for many law enforcement agencies to help them. It's not like we. I mean everything... with an agreement but at this level we -- I mean I think that the GAC should be a global position and then does it mean that ICANN will no the help you to address, I mean local

sensitivity that it's -- I mean we have -- I mean ICANN is a technical organization. We are here to help governments if never any issue with regulation legislation that something that... expressed several times that ICANN can help governments and regulators legislators whether they are trained to develop new regulation and legislation. So please, keep in mind that you will have to work and the global -- yes please let me -- it's a --

[Simultaneous voices speaking].

LAURENT FERRALI: Keep in mind that you will have to work on the GAC advice, and give a global GAC advice to the Board. It doesn't mean we will not address specific issue you will have in the future. Okay? That's not only the registry agreement. We can discuss. We have a lot of very skillful people here that are able to help government to find solutions to some problems so it yeah, but tomorrow, it's a GAC advice. It's a... GAC advice. We need to have the global position of the GAC but again it doesn't mean we don't care about your specific case. Thank you very much.

CHERIF DIALLO: [Interpreter Speaking] thank you Laurent. India insists on taking the floor but unfortunately, we have run out of time, we will have to close this session. Thank you Laurent. Thank you all for your participation.

[Applause]

PREPARATION FOR MEETING WITH THE ICANN BOARD

OLGA CAVALLI:

The idea is give background at a new GAC members, for those who are not so informed about the interaction between the GAC members and the board. We have a list of topics that have been submitted by different members of the GAC and questions and statements that will be part of the session. Maybe we can follow on. This would be the agenda. It is not a lot of time so the focus on the dialogue on the topics and questions is always important. Get to know those of you who are new to the meeting that it is a very well attended meeting. Many people come to the meeting not only from the GAC and the Board but several other supporting organizations and advisory organizations come to the meeting because there are several issues related to public policy that are important and a part of the agenda. So this is the agenda that we will have in that session. This has the topics. Five current topics. The idea is we review them, we agree on the topics and see if we have any suggestion of changes or additions. Five topic areas. Additional topics on the 24th of June. Evolving ICANN's multistakeholder model, this is one of the topics. IGO protections. And domain registration and protection model GDPR. GAC capacity building sustainability efforts. DotAmazon and two-character country code domains is something we have just been reviewing. Any comments to the topics? Additions? Reactions? Indonesia?

INDONESIA: A few weeks ago, president Putin made the statement that Russia will make some sort of net that will be different from internet and can be offered also to be used by other countries. Can I ask the Board's opinion, what their opinion about Mr. Putin's statement like that? I just want to know. And I also want to know what's the Board's opinion about the problem of IT security mentioned by president Trump. What is their opinion? Is that still OK? Or ICANN do something else? Or whatever. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: You are proposing two items. One is the opinion of the Board about what has been informed by Russia about being isolated from the internet and the other is comments from the United States President about IT security. That would be the two issues? Any reactions from colleagues? United States?

UNITED STATES: Yes, I am not necessarily opposed to the content, I'm just not sure it is appropriate to be talking about individual countries represented on the GAC in that manner.

OLGA CAVALLI: Apologies. Can you clarify if you agree or not agree of including the topic?

UNITED STATES: I propose not including it.

OLGA CAVALLI: OK. Any other comments? Reactions? I will give the floor to our chair now. Iran?

IRAN: If you raise the point of weeks, minutes, and half of the first topic remains nothing for the remaining part. Either you have to prioritize the issues or you have to see how much time you have available. I don't know what. Some of these issues we have addressed many, many times. What do we want to say about two-characters? We have told many, many times. We have to see what we really have to say in a concise and precise and what we expect from the board to say apart. Once again, no problem, but we have to have a limited number of topics which comply with the time available. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: I give the floor to you. We are just reviewing the list.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Olga. I apologize for being late. Have we gone through the -- OK. OK. So I will take Switzerland and

Portugal and Russia and then I will comment on the list.
Switzerland, please.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Manal. I think that we as said we have many issues on the agenda and I think we should be mindful of the specific agreement and mandate of ICANN and correspondingly of the GAC. We should just stick to the issues which are on the purvey of the board.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Jorge. Portugal, please.

PORTUGAL: I know what I am going to say is not going to be accepted but I think it has to be in the transcripts. In my opinion, we should be brave and discuss the protections that dotAmazon and the two-character country codes and second-level domains and the first topic involving ICANN's model. I know that nobody is going to agree with me but I think that could be very interesting to have this discussion. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Anna. Russia?

RUSSIA: Thank you. About proposal to include a new topic in agenda for discussion. As a board, I don't really understand which speeches or which documents mentioned our Indonesia colleagues and I think it is better if we not include it in agenda list.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Just for the sake of time, we limiting ourselves to a maximum of the list on the screen. Cook Islands, please.

COOK ISLANDS: May I propose that given the proposed topic from the underserved region be the first one because is non-controversial and seeking assurance of capacity building efforts.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. Noted. If we can change the order -- also, a quick comment on the evolving ICANN's multistakeholder model and this is a comment from my side because frankly speaking I suggested this topic on the list but if there is no consensus we can remove it. I thought it was an important topic that needs to be there despite the fact we don't have a complete question but, again, my intention was that we tell the board it is important to the GAC. We are following it closely. We have submitted comments. And maybe even bring to their attention certain parts of the topics of our input like what Jorge mentioned this morning

regarding the board's role. If we want to bring to the Board's attention specific parts of our comments, we can do this as well. I will stop here and Iran, please.

IRAN:.

Yes, Manal. I have no problem with what you put but perhaps it is better just to draw the attention to the no discussion pause it -- because it is a very, very deep discussion. The remaining part, maybe some of them, just to throw the attention, the topics that require further discussions and further actions. We leave it to you to select. We have no problem with any of them but not to add any more. Even if possible, reduce them but not to add anything. I am not opposed to any idea. Everybody is right but time is limited.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: India, please.

INDIA:

Thank you, sir. When weaving together the comments made earlier by Portugal, my worthy colleague from Portugal, and Jorge from Switzerland, I think It would be important that these issues be discussed with the Board. Maybe the issue of idea protection, two-character country codes or maybe the dotAmazon issue and what larger umbrella we want to use to

serve as a vehicle for discussion of these issues, we can choose that. We can choose if we want to discuss it in the multistakeholder model or whether we want to discuss it in light of ongoing interaction in the Board GAC interaction group or whether we want to discuss these topics as part of the ATRT 3 recommendations. The way and manner in which we want to discuss these issues with the board we can choose that. The discussion cannot be chosen by us, however, it is important these issues be discussed with the Board. Also, this kind of connects with the draft GAC advice which has been agreed to as consensus in terms of taking suitable steps by the Board to avoid such things in the future. I think there is a strong and compelling need for open and frank and detailed discussions with the board how we evolve the process, so that these kind of things don't happen again. For instance, there was talk about, you know, measurable steps but it is not as if those measurable steps were not spelled out. They were not available earlier. However, it is important that, you know, there is open discussion with the board as to what framework is required to evolve a mechanism, so that this kind of a situation in which GAC advice has been not considered, is not repeated in the future. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, India. So, we have six minutes. Here is what I propose.
Just to quickly bring to the attention of the Board the GAC

submission on the multistakeholder model, then, again, quickly go through the capacity building thing because it's non-controversial as mentioned. I think the IGOs as well has developed and we have already received a board response to the question that we thought of previously, so it might not be that controversial but we can, again, bring it to the attention of the Board and update them on today's discussions with the chair of the GNSO council. Then we can leave more time to the substantial discussions on dotAmazon and GDPR. I am wondering on the two-character code if it is for the information or it's a question because currently we just have the Communique language. Are we posing a certain question to the Board? Or just bringing it to the attention of the Board? Yes, Iran please.

IRAN:

Thank you. Perhaps you concentrate and focus more on the domain registration, data protection matters, GDPR and EPDP. This is an important issue. We would like to hear more from the board. We heard from the board in the EPDP that they want some sort of assumption procedures for some other issues but with the EPDP it is something that is urgent and important and we have to be very clear with respect to let us say centralized controller, ICANN to act as a centralized controller, and also the processor who will make concentrate and focus on that, maybe if everybody

agree, to have more idea or better idea of what is going on. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. Let me repeat my question on two-character codes. Are we posing a certain question to the board or just bringing this to their attention? Just to know the order of the topic we will present.

BRAZIL: Thank you. If I can recall correctly what was agreed in our two-character session, we agreed on text that would be presented in our Communique as follow-up to the GAC advice on this issue. Since this text is already agreed, pending only the addition of a second paragraph that will illustrate examples of meaningful steps that would be taken to improve and avoid what happened in the past will produce again in the future, since it has been agreed, that text, we would just be sharing with the ICANN Board the GAC conclusion on the issue, nothing else. This is what I recall was agreed in our session. I would say that this is satisfactory to us. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil. So, again, here is my proposal and, please, let me know whether it makes sense or you would like to change this.

Then it is the multistakeholder, two-character codes, capacity building, IGO protections and let me know whether GDPR comes first or dotAmazon. As usual, I will read whatever we have agreed as a question or statement and then we will invite one or maybe two comments at most from the floor. I hope you keep it brief. OK. You don't agree?

IRAN: I fully agree. I think it is best to not discuss GDPR or dotAmazon and who is first. The only thing is you propose or guide the board that you have to have assignment of the time for issue of that but not spending the whole time on one subject and remaining subject there is no time. It is up to you and your competence.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Noted. I will do it to my best and try to go quickly through the non-controversial topics we identified and allow more times to topic that need a discussion. So, yeah, Olga, please.

OLGA CAVALLI: Perhaps we can distinguish between the topics that go first and are more informative and letting others know there are others that require perhaps more interaction. Any final comments? We are right at the hour? There is a cross-community session here in

this room on DOH but there is now a 15-minute coffee break. So, India?

INDIA: Government of India for the transcript. I think it may be useful while we discuss with the board on the issue of two-character country codes and we communicate the agreed test and the doubts that have been raised and the inadequacy which has been pointed out in the tool. Possibly, if you could add a line just sounding of the board that during discussions with ICANN, certainly inconsistency and inadequacies by the tool have been pointed out. It is just for their information so they can direct the authorities who look into the specific making of the tool, and improving of the tool, to act accordingly and take into account all those things which have been brought to the attention. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, India. Canada, please. Sorry. Go ahead.

CANADA: Thank you. It is Luisa with the government of Canada. The GAC focal move will be meeting at 3:15 in the diamond room for those who expressed interest in joining this GAC focal group. It will meet for about one hour. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Luisa. I hope this covers it all. I would invite you either to take your stuff with you. I am just reminding you that the coming session is community-wide session. If you are using more than one chair, maybe you can consider freeing some chairs for other community members. With this, we are reconvening here tomorrow for GAC meetings at 8:30 for the geographic names.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]