

---

MARRAKECH - GAC: Communique Drafting (3 of 3)  
Wednesday, June 26, 2019 - 17:00 to 20:00 WET  
ICANN65 | Marrakech, Morocco

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I have Iran requesting the floor and also Germany was supporting this suggestion. Iran, please.

IRAN: It is not supporting or opposing. It is what is agreed by everybody. I have no problem saying that the GAC considered the actions being taken in regard with the EPDP. I don't want to say with satisfaction and the progress -- that I don't want to say. I could not join that group. I have no problem consider the actions being taken and continue to be taken in regard with the development of Phase 2 or EPDP. I leave it to the European Commission. Not saying that happy with the progress. It is better to be at this stage and we may be happy or not happy.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Iran, for sharing your views early before we start the drafting exercise, so they are taken into consideration. Any other comments? We are expecting three Communique draft languages, two-character code .AMAZON and the reporting on

---

*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.*

---

EPDP. We will be back if anything is accomplished before that.  
Please just let us know. Thank you. .AMAZON .AMAZON

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: If you can start taking your seats. OK. We are ready to start. Thanks for everyone who participated in those discussions. I think it's ready now on the screen. Can we -- can we move down to the text on .AMAZON? OK. So, we have proposed text on .AMAZON. Adjusted by Colombia, Brazil and U.S. The GAC asks the Board to explain in writing whether and why it considers its decision to consider with the .AMAZON based on the proposal of the eight Amazon countries. I am reading this badly. The GAC asks the Board to explain in writing whether and why it considers that its decision to proceed with the .AMAZON application based on the proposal the eight Amazon countries addressed it did not address their concerns. The rationale during the meeting with the ICANN Board, several GAC members expressed their concerns about the recent Board decision to find the Amazon Corporation proposal of 17th, April, 2019 acceptable and directing the ICANN Org to continue processing of the .AMAZON application according to the policies and procedures of the new gTLD program including the possibility of the outcome in the .AMAZON case becoming a precedent for similar cases for delegation of contentious strings, future, in the next round of the new gTLD program. Several members references the ICANN 60 Abu Dhabi Communique where

A, section 5 follow-up on previous GAC advice with regard to the application for .AMAZON and related strings, the GAC expressed the need to find a mutually acceptable solution in the case of the .AMAZON gTLD applications for the countries affected and for the Amazon Corporation and B; in section 7, GAC consensus advice to the Board with regard to applications for .AMAZON and related strings. The GAC recognizes the need to find a mutually acceptable solution for the countries affected and the Amazon corporation for the use of .AMAZON as a top-level domain name. Several members referenced the letter the GAC sent to the Board on 15th, March 2018 in response to the Board's request for new or additional information to provide to the Board regarding the GAC's advice that the Amazon applications should not proceed. Where it was stated that the GAC does not have any additional information to provide to the Board on this matter, beyond referring to the GAC Abu Dhabi Communique. Some members did not necessarily agree with the basis of these concerns as articulated above nor would the interpretation of past GAC advice. This request for a written response from the Board should be considered a follow-up to the GAC Board discussion during ICANN 65 and should not be construed as GAC advice on this matter. So, Brazil?

---

BRAZIL: I am looking at the U.S. I am wondering whether It would be possible to add new GAC advice at the very end when there is this caveat stating that this shouldn't be considered GAC advice whether we could add now.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Any objections to adding the word new at the very last sentence? New GAC advice on this matter.

UNITED STATES: As long as we maintain that there are members who do not agree with the past GAC advice which still there but for the record.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: OK. Thank you, the U.S. With all of the above givens, no problem with adding the word new. Any other comments? European Commission?

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Can you go up a bit please? Yes, I think we have lost some of the changes we made in the previous version when it was still in the report of the Board meeting. For example, the contentious back was we change it to strings that have a public policy dimension. I don't remember the formula. I think the first sentence of the

---

paragraph is very difficult to read. Again, we [indiscernible] in our revisions.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: You mean the first sentence in the rationale?

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Yes. The last part of the sentence would be a different sentence including the possibility of the outcome -- it should be split.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I am sorry. Last part of which sentence?

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: The first sentence of the rationale. Including the possibility of the outcome in the Amazon case becoming a precedent et cetera, can we make it another sentence? So full stop after gTLD program. This includes the possibility.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So are we good to go with the text as amended on the screen? India?

---

INDIA: India the record. I think it may perhaps be appropriate without specifically framing the next round of the new gTLD program, if we made it just say as in public policy concerns in the future and close it. It perhaps may be more appropriate. Or in future. Yeah, and just put a full stop after that.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Full stop after in the future? In future? OK. So do I have other requests for the floor? Switzerland?

SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Manal. I know this is a very sensitive issue today, but I cannot resist to propose as this is now on the follow-up to GAC advice and that is the last sentence we had the same studies now, above on page 3. So that we move that sentence of some GAC members urge all parties including the ICANN Board to exhaust all means to facilitate a mutually acceptable solution to this part at the very end.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Where do you see that sentence? I have the sentence but where do you see?

SWITZERLAND: At the very end of the last sentence of the rationale.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So, can we go up again? Iran?

IRAN:

Thank you, Manal. If everybody, yes, if everybody agrees with the text at the beginning, I could say that it is a very awkward English on the GAC and Board discussions we will have on 26th of July. I am sure that they will ask you please clarify the meaning of this sentence. Those who have drafted are kindly requested to attend that meeting and to explain because it is very, very difficult sentence in English whether and why and so on and so forth. So the mixture of many things and does not follow any structure but if everybody agrees, I have no problem.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, I can see a hand at the back. Jamaica, please.

JAMAICA:

For the record, Jamaica. With respect to the edit that was made this would now be the second sentence in that first paragraph on the rationale. So that sentence that begins "this includes", it is recommended that we add -- we start the sentence by saying "concerns were also expressed with the possibility of" and the rest the sentence would remain.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Jamaica. I have the U.S. next.

UNITED STATES: Thank you, yes. I would just like to go respond to Switzerland's proposed text. I apologize for jumping around. I appreciate the sentiment that is being applied here but this goes back to my original concern about process. What I am concerned by facilitating, exhausting all means, this would need to be consistent with the process that is currently underway. I feel like we are running the risk of being counter to existing process and procedure as is currently articulated and I think that is setting a bad precedent. Again, I agree with the sentiment, but I think -- well, I know we would have concerns because we need to let the process play out as it is already and continues to be underway. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thanks, U.S. Switzerland?

SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Manal. Reacting to Ashley's point, we would of course, not suggest all means include anything that is against procedure, so bylaws or whatever is applicable within the ICANN framework, so I don't know if it would help to say "to exhaust all means consistent with available procedures or consistent with existing



---

procedures or with applicable procedures" or with something like that so that we put the sentiment within the framework of the available procedures.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Switzerland. I think this is helpful. Let's go up and take the text so that we can see all the edits. So first of all, Kavouss, you expressed concern about the first three lines. The actual question. I think there are no other objections and you offered flexibility that if there are no other objections you are OK with it, so let's keep it as-is since it took some time for everyone to agree on it. If there are no other objections, I would appreciate your understanding and flexibility. Moving on to the -- I am sorry. India.

INDIA: Thank you, Manal. Probably just a linguistic point and probably It would perhaps improve the reading of the first sentence if we could consider instead of "based on a proposal Amazon but did not address their concern" notwithstanding the concern the Amazon countries were not addressed comma complies with GAC advice. It is just linguistic and perhaps It would improve the readability of the sentence, but I leave it open to you yourself and my Brazil counterparts to see if it adds value to the readability without distorting the meaning. Thank you.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Any reactions? Sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is it possible to see how India's suggestion would look on the screen?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Fabien, have you grasped this, or would you like it to be repeated by India? We will give it a try but if it is not agreed by everyone then I would rather we keep the agreed text as-is and proceed.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Brazil agrees it is better to proceed with the agreed text.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Better to proceed without the text? With the original text? OK. I see the U.S.

UNITED STATES: Thank you. I am sorry. I am going back to Switzerland's proposal again. Reading it again, it also strikes me that this isn't appropriate for this particular section. It makes sense in the context of where it was before, but it is not clear to me how this reflects a follow on. It is more of a think about this as you move forward thing. It just doesn't seem appropriate here.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: OK. We are getting to it again. It was not finalized yet. Just to -- so we will leave the original language of the follow-up to GAC advice. Can we get it back, yeah, on the screen? So this is the final text as has been originally proposed. Now, on the rationale, Iran, please.

IRAN: Thank you, Manal. Keep the sentence as it was but allow me 2-3 minutes to propose a slight modification to that. If it is not agreed, delete my modification. I want to make the text quite simpler. If Fabien could kindly type for a moment what I am suggesting that may help. Can I proceed?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes please but just a second --

IRAN: The GAC requests the Board to clarify in writing whether --

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: May I suggest something? Sorry Kavouss. Can we do it in a separate paragraph?

IRAN: Copy the first one and put the amendment. Medical marijuana

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Just not to lose the original text.

IRAN: The GAC requests the Board to clarify in writing whether its decision to proceed with the .AMAZON applications complies with the GAC advice or consistent with the GAC advice and whether the concerns of eight countries, you mentioned eight South American countries, have been considered. A very simple and straightforward. We don't change anything of that. The first thing whether it comply with the GAC advice and whether the concerns of eight South American countries have been taken into account. Look at that one carefully, Chairman, and distinguished colleagues, if you agree take it, if you don't agree, throw it in the basket. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So I am looking to the authors of the original text, but I am also not sure it could be out of my ignorance is there -- I mean a known list of concerns of the eight Amazon countries or we can get pushback from the Board asking which concerns are you asking about? Food for thought. I have Brazil and then Iran.

BRAZIL: Thank you, madam chair. Brazil would prefer to stick to the original text, so we can move on to discuss other topics.

---

IRAN: No problem. Keep my sentence when we have boards and GAC clarification on the 26th of July. Thank you. OK.

BRAZIL: I agree with that.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Noted, let's keep the text. We will need clarification with the Board. Thank you, Kavouss. So, on the rationale, there was helpful proposal to break the long sentence into two sentences for readability issues. A full stop after new gTLD program and then a new sentence and Jamaica proposed concerns were also expressed with the possibility of the outcome in the .AMAZON case becoming a precedent for similar cases for delegation of and then contentious strings was replaced as originally agreed by sensitive strings that the GAC has stressed as raising public policy concerns in future and then there was a suggestion by India to stop here after future. So those are the proposed amendments on the screen. Any comments? I take this as acceptance. OK. There were no edits or any proposed new text in the following bullets. Can we scroll down? I think the word accepted and provided the above text is there which still exists and then we have -- I am sorry, Brazil.

---

BRAZIL: I am coming to be coming back at a this which was the agreed text between the three countries but there is some inaccuracy in the paragraph that starts with some members do not necessarily agree. At the very end of that paragraph, there is the suggestion that all GAC advice on .AMAZON applications are past advice which is not something that the GAC has agreed on. Looking at the U.S. and hoping the U.S. may accept the deletion of the word past, so we would leave it open for interpretation. As you can see, the very third last word in that paragraph, yes, should be deleted in our view. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil. U.S.?

UNITED STATES: If I could provide or offer up an alternative to that recommendation. If it could stay instead of past GAC advice change it to GAC advice on this subject.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Is this acceptable by everyone? OK. Thank you. Then this leaves us I believe with the very last sentence proposed by Switzerland. Some GAC members urged all parties including the ICANN Board to exhaust all means consistent with applicable procedures to

---

facilitate a mutually acceptable solution. We may need a few commas here. Iran please.

IRAN: This is a part of the question, right? This rationale?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: It is part of the rationale, yeah.

IRAN: It is not GAC advice?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: No, this is the rationale follow-up on previous GAC advice.

IRAN: My concern is with the word "some". Could we say it was indicated? Instead of some people? As soon as you put the word some you involve the divisions/polarizations.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I think the intent here is not to include everyone since not everyone has -- I mean it's just to indicate that some people highlighted this, but if it is OK with everyone to put it in a passive voice as suggested by Iran? Kavouss your suggestion is --

---

IRAN: My suggestion is get rid of the some.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: But it will then read GAC members urged all parties? OK. Any comments on deleting the word some? UK?

UK: I think we are not sure still why we need this sentence in this part of the text. It does not seem to us to be relevant to the requests that it is rationale for. This is rationale for asking the Board to explain in writing. I don't think that this sentence is directly relevant to that. It is relevant to the discussion that we had with the Board where some members did do this. I think it will be better placed in its original position in that section for that reason. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, UK. I have Egypt and then Switzerland. Egypt please.

EGYPT: Thank you. First on the word some, I think it has been used before in the same part, so I don't see a problem leaving the word some. And on leaving that part in the rationale, I would say that it goes with the rationale because if we are following up and asking again, we are asking for a forward looking and not just for the



---

matter of asking. I think it reflects what has been said during the discussion, why this discussion is happening, why the questions being put again, and I would agree with Switzerland that it is forward-looking and it should be there. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. I have Switzerland, Iran, and the U.S.

SWITZERLAND: Perhaps I may come back later?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: OK. I will take Iran, U.S., and then -- Iran, please, go ahead.

IRAN: Yes, Manal. At this meeting, I try not to oppose anybody or support anybody, to remain neutral. Even if you converted this issue to question it is still causing advice and this is not part of rationale because it is not consensus when you say some. You can put this sentence in other parts, discussion Board and GAC, relating to two-character advice. If you put the part of the rationale, some people I don't want to name outside us, put the finger this is no longer a consensus. Division. You will lose the weight and objective of this paragraph, Chairman. Believe me, it is better not to put this sort of majority/minority in one way or the

---

other in the part of the rationale. If you can't put it was indicated, if you can't say the views were expressed, but you want to put some, it is not a good place here. Put it elsewhere. Just for the benefit of those people behind the .AMAZON. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kavouss. I think the intention was that some is used before, but I take your point. U.S. please.

UNITED STATES: Thank you. Yes, Ashley with the U.S. and I actually have two points now. To respond to Iran, this is not consensus advice, so I think it is perfectly appropriate to have references to some. With that being said, I would like to conquer can what the U.S. said earlier which is this is not supporting the language at the top. It reflects the conversation that we had during the Board discussion, but it is not supportive of the statement and the question that we are asking the Board to respond to, so, again, I would ask that we not include it here. I am happy to have it included as part of the reflection of the Board/GAC discussion, but it is misplaced in this section. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, U.S. Would you like to comment now, Switzerland?

---

SWITZERLAND:

Yes, thank you, Manal. Just to comment a little bit, I think that here we are having a follow-up advice to the Abu Dhabi advice and the Abu Dhabi advice called for a facilitation process with a mutually acceptable solution, and that is really the heading of what we are following up. Under that heading, we are asking specifically to obtain something in writing, but I think in the rationale or the explanation, it is well placed. That is the only thing we have been asking for in this forum but some members, at least some members, have also looked forward and asked the Board and all interested parties to explore all available means because this is not a decision which has been already taken. It is not final. Therefore, I think that it could be placed in the account of the Board GAC conversation but here, we are also looking forward, asking for this explanation and It would be fair to also reflect that some of us have asked for something more than just explanation. We have asked for trying to avoid and that this process end with a solution which is not acceptable to everyone. I think that this reflected in the some, of course, if we want to strike some, or we want to put it in a passive voice, I have no problem with that, but that said, I think it is well-placed here. And finally, I think we can perhaps put it in some -- I don't know. Perhaps if the problem is formality, as it seems, that this is not directly linked to the specific ask of this follow-up to the advice, we can separate it somehow, but it is connected to the advice of

---

Abu Dhabi and it is connected to the goal we sought with that advice.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Switzerland. I have the Netherlands and then I have Iran.

NETHERLANDS: Thank you, Manal. To follow-up on the suggestion and if I may ask Switzerland, I think we could say furthermore some GAC members based on the discussion you said with the GAC had with the Board, GAC members urged all parties et cetera, so furthermore GAC members based on the discussion -- well, no. With the Board. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Netherlands. I have Iran and the UK.

IRAN: I think we should be mindful we could urge the parties, but we cannot urge the ICANN. We can say urge parties with the assistance of the ICANN but not urging ICANN. We should find a vehicle. How we urge the ICANN? If you separate that, or put it with the assistance of ICANN, yes, that is previous advice that facilitating the work by ICANN and so on and so forth but still it

---

doesn't matter whether you put it here or put it in the discussion with the Board and GAC elsewhere. It doesn't make any change. And when I said somebody commented and said I didn't say it is advice. It is not advice as such because you have rationale. Never for any question you need to have rationale. A question is a question. If you ask me something, you don't explain me rationale of that question. You ask me the question. Rationale is only asked for GAC advice in the bylaw.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Kavouss, if I may, I think this changes the meaning a little bit because with assistance of ICANN Board, as if we already know up front that ICANN Board are OK to do this assistance. I mean, the urging here, urging everyone means we are asking them to provide, so I see U.S. and UK. U.S. please.

UNITED STATES: I am sorry to prolong the discussion, but the U.S. cannot accept this language being here. It is starting to sound more and more like we are instructing ICANN to do something. I am not sure what this adds to this section if that is not the intent. I just do not feel comfortable having this language in this section.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: UK?

---

UK: Thank you. Well, just to explain our concern it is not dissimilar to the points made by Iran that this section is called follow up on previous advice and putting non-consensus rationale here is something we should be very cautious about. I think we have got here a very balanced compromise that the interested parties have worked hard to achieve, and we should be careful about unbalancing it. I thought perhaps that the Netherlands made a very helpful suggestion to try to find a compromise and I would maybe make a couple more suggestions to it just in case it helps. So if we could delete the word furthermore and if this could be reflected on the screen so colleagues can see it. If we delete the words furthermore and then say some GAC members during the discussion and then leave the rest. That then is more of a factual statement of what happened in the discussion. Again, I continue to have concerns that it is here at all because I think it sets a bad precedent, but I just offer it in case it helps find a compromise. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, UK, for trying to help. So the sentence now reads "some GAC members".

[Captioner disconnected]

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: A constructed way forward proposed by the U.S. I see Egypt nodding. I see Switzerland nodding.

IRAN: Reported proposals. You never qualified by proposal be constructive or not constructive. I am sorry. I don't think it is. Either take the proposal of the Netherlands moreover or furthermore and we separate that from rationale but not put it at the beginning. I am sorry I can't agree with that.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I am sorry, Kavouss. I lost your last part. What's the proposed?

IRAN: The last part for proposal of Netherlands. Put it furthermore, that means separate that from the rationale, and say whatever you want to say. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: But I think the originally intention was keeping it as part of the rationale.

IRAN: Let me say furthermore is not part of rationale. It is additional statement.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Egypt?

EGYPT: I would like to respond to the esteemed colleague from Iran which we asked what is the idea of putting this here and again to reiterate. This proposal from Switzerland is showing a good faith way forward and not going against any measures or applicable procedures but in line with all that and I think moving it above, like was suggested by the U.S., is good. I would ask colleague from UK if we could still add the word furthermore. I think It would still go if we said furthermore some GAC members joined the discussion. If that would be acceptable?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. So, would the UK go OK with maintaining furthermore? UK please?

UK: Thank you. The problem for us with furthermore is that it strongly connects the sentence with the previous rationale. It implies that it is part of the same rationale. That's why we are not happy with the word furthermore. It makes a much stronger connection, in fact. We could maybe think of an alternative. I can't think of one right now. If you give me five minutes I can try but I think It would be simpler to have nothing here is take the Australian method of



---

keeping it simple. Adding the word furthermore complicates it and makes a stronger connection to the rationale. Thank you. Image thank you, UK. Egypt?

EGYPT: Maybe separate instead of furthermore? Would that help?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Separate? UK?

UK: I think that's an excellent suggestion from Egypt. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: The proposal is to replace furthermore by separately. Iran?

IRAN: Thank you. Separated from what? What is separated? Everybody says OK, OK but what is separate? In addition maybe? But separate? What does it mean? Separate from what?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Can we say on another note? And not separately. Maybe separately needs more clarification. I see Colombia and Egypt?

---

COLOMBIA: Separate sounds weird.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So there is a proposal for additionally, on another note, and I see Egypt requesting the floor.

EGYPT: Ma'am, it is actually clarification. I thought understood from the colleague from Iran that we are trying to separate this from the text and furthermore and in addition doesn't do this. I would agree on another note.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Iran, are you OK with on another note? Any objections? Iran?

IRAN: Please kindly clarify what we are doing here. You have a question and put something between the two? Is that case?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I think we are explaining the basis on which the question is being proposed to the Board. We are proposing this question based on our rationale and based on our discussion with the Board. Does this help? India?

---

INDIA: Thank you, chair. If I may suggest, could we consider maybe moving to the next item and then regrouping on this one? If we are in able to reach some kind of consensus on this matter?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I think we are almost there. If I feel we will be taking longer than this, I will take your proposal to move on and then come back to this. I felt some consensus around maybe on another note. So any violent objections? So then let's proceed with on another note. One missing part to agree upon is whether we delete or keep including with the assistance of the ICANN Board. Frankly speaking, as I said, I think this is changing the meaning and putting words in the Board's mouth. I leave it to GAC colleagues. I see suggestions for deletion. I see nothing. Good. I think we are done with the Amazon part. Thank you, everyone, for your efforts and your flexibility. Now on two-character codes. 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 that meaningful steps are taken to ensure this does not happen in the future. I am just wondering about the underlining.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: My understanding of the underlining may be associated with a comment from Nigel that you can see on the screen here that is

---

suggesting a slight change which would be replacing meaningful steps are taken by meaningful steps be taken.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Fabien. Any objections to replacing are with be so it reads and advises that meaningful be taken to ensure this does not happen in the future? OK. Then the following paragraph moreover, the GAC notes the provision of a search tool by ICANN. GAC members have highlighted that the efficacy of the tool is still being evaluated. The GAC urges ICANN to continue to engage with concerned GAC members in order to address their concerns. I see the U.S. and Iran. U.S. please.

UNITED STATES: Thank you. Ashley with the U.S. If I could in the second paragraph, last sentence, if it could be the GAC urges ICANN to continue to engage with concerned GAC members in order to address their concerns with the tool.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Fabien, I think the proposal is to add with the tool at the end of the sentence, yeah. Iran?

---

IRAN: No, not at all. We are not dealing with at all. We are dealing with concerns of the two-character letters of some countries. Separate from the tools. This is one point. The other point I suggested instead of efficacy says effectiveness. I don't want to add to specify the issue with concerned country under tools. This is not something we have asked. We would like to engage with us to remove our concerns about the release of the two-character letters to be used at the second level. This is the issue. I don't want to mix of the situation. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kavouss. I see Oman and the U.S. Oman please.

OMAN: For the record, Oman is [indiscernible] of registering the country code in the second level and subsequently see no reason to discuss the tool in the advice as this indicates we are suggesting the registration whereas we are not. We suggest to remove the mention of the tool in the advice.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: OK. I don't think this was the intention of the original language, but I remain to be corrected. I have a request from the U.S.

---

UNITED STATES: Thank you. So it is not clear to me now after the comments from Oman is the recommendation now to remove that paragraph entirely?

OMAN: The recommendation is to remove the mention of tool in the advice.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: U.S.?

UNITED STATES: So is that to remove the entirety of the paragraph? Sorry, it is getting late.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Can you, please, speak to the microphone and remember to close it after you speak. Go ahead.

OMAN: In principle, we are rejecting the idea to register the country code in the second level. We don't want to mention anything about the tool in the advice as this will indicate that we are accepting the principle of registering the country code in the second level.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Oman, but if I understand correctly, we have already accepted the tool and we are already, GAC members are trying the tool, and we promised to provide feedback on the tool by the Montreal. I think those are things we have agreed before. I have Iran and if you request the floor again I will give you the floor. Iran please.

IRAN: Thank you, Manal. I agree with Oman. As I mentioned in the very small meeting, it should not be [indiscernible] it should be in the Board and GAC discussions. I fully agree with Oman. The tools and engagement with those governments are two different things. My distinguished colleague from India put them together but they are two different things. We mentioned that issue is not closed. We need time to reflect on that and come back with improvement and engagement of the ICANN with the countries that have concern.

Another teams. It was two separate teams. I don't know why they put them together. I agree with Oman this is not part of that. It should go to the GAC Board discussions. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Oman please.

---

OMAN: I agree. It should be put in the discussion not in the advice.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So you suggest removing this to the BGRI section?

OMAN: Yes.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Iran?

IRAN: Not BGRI.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Sorry. The GAC Board discussions. Oman meant that, and I supported that.

In fact, we don't have BGIR. It is BGIB so double sorry. There is a suggestion to move this specific paragraph? Or? So, Fabien, are you able to follow us?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: I have copied the text we were discussing but I am just a bit troubled to find the place where to paste it here. I guess it could go here. Is this the intention?



---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Iran?

IRAN: Yes, we have six bullets and at the end of that comes this or we say in regard with two-characters. We have six bullets. Each of the bullets have title headlines. Two of them have notes. You add another one saying in regard with the release of the two-characters and put the sentence under that. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. So let's park this here and can we go back to the advice language? Deleting the second paragraph now. I see nodding. India?

INDIA: When we are doing this or planning to do this, we must be mindful we run the risk of what possibly the Board was also suggesting during their interaction when they were rightfully assuming that the issue would be closed now. But with the development and ongoing activities concerned relating to the notification tool and its improvement, and possibly with the earlier language, regarding addressing the concerns of the concerned GAC members, by moving this out of the advice area, we run the risk that the Board will consider the matter to be closed and may not in fact stress or devote that much energy and effort into the

---

further development of the notification tool which is at-most essential. I want my esteemed GAC colleagues to be mindful of this when they are suggesting this because even during our interaction with the ICANN Board on the other separate .AMAZON issue, they had commented that where is it in the GAC advice. For issue to engage there continuously, I think we have to bring out the issue within the GAC advice and not in the Communique. I want my esteemed GAC colleagues to be mindful of this. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, India. I believe there is commitment in regard to the tool. I think otherwise it wouldn't have been deployed at the first place. I think we can see serious commitment when it comes to the tool. I also believe it is a matter of following up with ICANN Org on the tool in specific but anyway.

IRAN: When this issue was discussed, and the Board said it was closed we said no, it is not closed. I don't think that the transcription is almost available, and they know it is not closed. I wanted to have some agreement because Oman opposed to delete that here and if you have this agreement, we have discussions for another half an hour or hour, I didn't [indiscernible] without problems or if you want to delete it, delete it. I am happy with any of the two

---

suggestions. Thank you. I can see consensus around moving it to the GAC Board discussion if I read everyone correctly but India please. India?

INDIA: If I may suggest, rather than moving the location of the text, if we could consider the advice portion and make adjustments within the text to make it acceptable to allow the sweep of the users or GAC members then perhaps it may continue to retain its importance as well as perhaps be more meaningful in terms of our Communique to the Board. So it is only a suggestion on my part. As far as my view, or the view of the government of India is concerned, I state we strongly recommend we retain the text within the advice portion and within the follow-up advice portion if required modifications within the text. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So any objection to maintaining the text in the advice part as it reads on the screen? Iran?

IRAN: Thank you. As I mentioned, I have no problem with that but if the amendment to be proposed now or when we want to do that, you have to satisfy Oman. That is the situation. If you can introduce

---

something to satisfy Oman I have no problem, but I heard they don't want to be here.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Oman, would it be acceptable for you to maintain this here moreover the GAC notes the provision of a search tool by ICANN, GAC members have highlighted the effectiveness of the tool is still to be evaluated? The GAC urges ICANN to continue to engage with concerned GAC members in order to address their concerns with the tool. Iran?

IRAN: Can I suggest to my distinguished colleague from Oman. The text said that GAC notes. We have not said we have agreed. We have not said we confirm. We note. Notes have specific connotation and meaning. We note that. I don't think it is harmful to retain it here as it is if our colleague from Oman agree with us. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. Iran is OK with the text in the GAC advice. I have Oman and India. Oman?

OMAN: In that case, can you please remove the last three words "with the tool"? So I think I have India and then Iran please. India?

---

INDIA: Thank you, chair. Government of India for the record. Just to remind this esteemed gathering here that we had discussed this amongst ourselves during the coffee break and most members had agreed to this language and as a result of that this consensus text had been put out. However, I remain open to any corrections at any stage which may be suggested, and I defer to that most respectfully. However, I would suggest that we try and meet each other halfway in the true spirit of consensus. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Iran?

IRAN: Thank you, Manal. I fully agree with Oman. When the tools was added a few minutes ago. It was not in the initial text be discussed. This was not discussed. It was proposed, and we don't agree with that. If you delete that, I have no problem, but I still retain here without this. I don't want to associate discussions of ICANN with government related to the tool. I don't need any discussion with the tools. We can check the tool. We have sufficient possibility, knowledge, availability, to check the tools. We not going to send somebody to the moon that we need consultations or other things. I don't think that we agree to -- delete it here. We are grateful to Oman to agree to put it here. That's all. Thank you.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. Any objections to deleting "with the tool"? OK. I see none. We are move efficacy and maintaining effectiveness. -- removing. Any further comments on two-character codes?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: May I ask conformation in terms of how the sentences are presented in the text? Should we group these two sentences together? Are they separate? I am just trying to understand, and I don't want us to make an edit that would change the intention of the text. I would like just a clarification on that.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Iran?

IRAN: We have discussed that we want it to be separate as it is. A separate paragraph. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Separate paragraph? Or separate lines? Because the question is whether to --

IRAN: Separate lines not continuations.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: OK. Is the text OK as displayed on the screen? I see nodding. OK. Then WHOIS and data protection. The GAC reiterates its last advice in Kobe Communique and welcomes the actions being taken on the 2nd phrase of the EPDP. I see European Commission and Iran. European Commission.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Yes, I will try just to say how we came up with this. It's a very small part which refers to the previous GAC advice. We didn't want to restate all of the things we said in the previous GAC advice. We welcome, however, that there was a response to that. We have, for example, milestones and things that are proposed, but by reiterating the last advice, it means we stay vigilant with what we have said before. There are more things that we want to say but these are not contained in this part of the follow-up of the GAC advice. That's why we have a very short part here after the drafting discussion we had here. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So things are implicitly included by referencing the Kobe Communique. Noted. Iran?

IRAN: Yes, this sentence, although it is small, was taken half an hour to agree. The only thing identify problem with last -- in this regard,

---

how many advice we have? We have only one advice. It is not last advice. Could you just please correct me whether on this title we have several advice and you want to have the last advice? I suggest you delete last. Kobe Communique advice. GAC Kobe Communique advice.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Is this OK? I see European Commission nodding. Switzerland?

SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Manal. Without wanting to infringe on this very delicately crafted text, I want to ask our colleagues from the commission, and the other drafters, why we use reiterate? Why don't we use recalls which is more standard in a way because we are not really putting the advice again, we are recalling it, but it is just a question. And then welcomes the actions could be maybe very generic. Maybe what we want to express is welcomes to progress and the progress is linked to the advice, but I feel some discomfort in the row behind me.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: OK. So there is agreement on replacing reiterates with recall? I don't see objection. And welcoming the progress, I see strong objection.



---

IRAN: Very strong objection. We discussed 20 minutes with Germany and we don't agree with progress. Let us be quiet in this area. It is not we agree with the progress. Two and a half months to spend to see whether we talk about access or talk about disclosure. We say we don't say it. We said welcome. I think we have negotiated that if you kindly, respectfully, agree with that. I have no problem with recall and reiterate. They are two different things, but I have no problem. You are the legal person, lawyer, I have no difficulty with that. I also have some legal background. I don't like leave it to the progress. Let's be ambiguous. We welcome actions being take in this regard. You take it as progress? I don't think it is progress. But we don't mention that. If you kindly agree with that, please, keep it as it was with recalling instead of reiterating.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Is it too early to agree with the progress?

IRAN: In Montreal we will agree with the progress if there is sufficient progress.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: You feel it is too early?

---

IRAN: Yes, it is very early. Thank you. Any comments? Germany?

GERMANY: Thank you. Germany for the record. We had proposed progress, but we could support the word actions as well. I am a lawyer as well so be on the safe side. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Germany. I see the text agreed as it stands on the screen in the spirit of compromise. So thank you for your flexibility. I see nothing else on the advice part, but I believe we have a few things to clean at the beginning, right? It's 6:30, yes, European Commission.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: As I said just before when we were at the GAC advice follow-up with the GAC advice, we have entered the text under if you scroll down.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Issues important, important issues --

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: This would be discussed in order to [indiscernible]

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. And I think we haven't discussed this section, even the IGO protections, right, so it's timely now that we agree on its text. So issues of importance to the GAC. We have the IGO protections and the text reads the GAC notes a discussion between representatives of the GNSO council, GAC, and IGO's, which was observed by a Board member concerning the shared hope of agreeing on parameters under which to charter a focused group to produce a policy recommendation which addresses concerns raised over IGO access to a curative dispute resolution mechanism. Any comments? Switzerland.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you, Manal. Just this small amendment that Fabien is typing, instead of at policy recommendation, as we don't know whether one or various, we could talk about produce policy recommendations? General.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Switzerland and Fabien. Any other comments? Okay. Moving on to the WHOIS and GDPR, [reading] [refer to slide] any comments? I see none. Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: I have a question in terms of our editing the communique and consistency in terms of heading, over the last two communiques,

---

at least I believe we have named the section on this matter as is WHOIS and data protection, so I would just like confirmation as to whether we should keep using that heading.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Yes, I think consistency issue and I agree with the suggestion.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, European Commission. Iran.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, when we discussed this issue we had no problem to transfer this issue of progress so the important matters for the GAC, but we would like to introduce a relative focus because still we don't know whether there is sufficient progress that we expected, and we don't know how the discussion is going on. In the way I see this discussion going on I think we still have a long way to go so we should not give this impression that we are happy with the progress, relative progress, so that is what we have agreed to put it here, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: This is relative to --

---

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:           What we expected at the very beginning within one year we have everything completed and we don't know still whether that will be or not.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:   Germany.

GERMANY:                    Thank you, this was part of the compromise, we do not agree to adding relative, no one would understand it and progress has to be assessed always for a time being. I can't support this proposal, to be very clear, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:   Thank you, Germany. Any other comments.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:           Thank you, I think we try to agree with each, I know it was part of the discussion but still doesn't matter whether we put it here or elsewhere, exactly the same thing, I suggest colleagues to find something that the progress reflects, at this stage we're not sure that the progress is the course we wanted, it is the term we wanted, maybe for Germany is everything, progress has been made, they are at the end of the year, they have the access, they don't have this problem of disclosure, everything will be resolved,

---

but we're still not sure and would like it go today to be done, and would like the Germany and European Commission to mention not 100 percent saying the progress is what we have expected.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So Kavouss, I think assessing the progress doesn't really mean there is good or bad progress. I mean, there could be zero progress, and we could end up really upset and say there is no progress, and there could be good progress. So it's without any qualifications at this point in time. But -- does this address your point? I mean we're saying we are going to assess the progress. Could be good, could be bad.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Could you read the sentence again.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: The GAC will keep monitoring and assessing the progress by the GNSO EPDP and will assess again this progress by ICANN 66.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, I have a problem with the verb will. Nobody could say we will do this because it is beyond our control, this is a deterministic verb and we cannot say this, have to find would maximum but

---

cannot say will, because it is beyond [indiscernible] attempts, maybe, plan, maybe, have in mind maybe.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: We're not talking about someone else, we're talking about the GAC, right.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: You cannot say will, you cannot say you will do is that, no guarantee.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. Any comments? I see Germany thank you, [indiscernible] from Germany, thank you, Manal, your explanation was brilliant, it covers everything, for support. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Germany, any other comments?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: And when I proposed something I said several options, plan, intend to assess and would assess, three different suggestions, any of that would be satisfactory for us.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: And Kavouss you are proposing this to replace both wills or just one.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: The first will, intend to assess, plan to assess or would assess.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: We have two wills here in the sentence. The GAC will keep monitoring and assessing the progress by the GNSO and EPDP and will again assess by ICANN 66.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: We should delete the second will and will only will, one will be replaced by would or intends or planned and connect the two parts together without the need to having two times will.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. Can we have this on the screen? European Commission.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: I didn't, as a compromise proposal, perhaps we could say the GAC intends to keep monitoring and assessing the progress, and assess again so we just drop the will.



---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, European Commission. So is the sentence now reads the GAC intends to keep monitoring and assessing the progress by the GNSO EPDP and assess again this progress by ICANN 66. Can I suggest something? Maybe the GAC intend to keep monitoring and assessing the progress by the GNSO and EPDP assessing again? Or to assess again.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Intends to assess again, so the form is right, here it's intends to keep and here intends to assess again, so it should be fine.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So is it okay with to or without? Without? Okay. Any other comments.

RAHUL GOSAIN: Thank you, Chair, government of India, for the transcript. I just had two comments regarding the first sentence, if I may. The first is more in the nature of syntactical suggestion, instead of members of the GAC perhaps we may wish to use the standard terminology used in all communiques, elsewhere the GAC will seek to provide rather than members of the GAC and second is more in the nature of a substantive contribution as part of a person who has been also closely following the progress on behalf of the GAC in the EPDP is that as of this point the final

---

contours of the access disclosure model are not formalized or fully clear. So what will be the shape and to whom we have to provide this list is ultimately not entirely predictable. So we may like to think about whether we want to retain the sentence here at this point, although I fully understand the importance that this matter continues to be important for the GAC in terms of in light of the letter from the GAC to the [indiscernible] chair and while we are working at it. However, whether that reply would be relevant as of now to the ICANN Board -- because the GAC communique is basically the information being put out at the end of each meeting by the GAC to the ICANN Board, so I don't know how relevant this information is at this juncture to the ICANN Board.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I'm a bit lost regarding the proposal, so the proposal is to delete members of and maintain for consistency as we always use the GAC.

RAHUL GOSAIN: That is the syntactical part and [indiscernible] at this juncture in terms of the fact there is still fluidity around the shapes and contours around the shape of the access [indiscernible] model, was wondering whether we retain this or dispense this sentence at this time altogether and I leave it open to my colleagues in the GAC also involved in the EPDP to perhaps comment about it, but

---

I somehow tend to feel it is a bit premature to be mentioning this sentence perhaps at this juncture. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. India. Any comments on this? So I think we shall keep it, India, if you don't mind. I see no objections. Fabien, please, sorry.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So I just have two suggestions, will start with the most important one. I think as we discussed earlier today in the [indiscernible] protection GAC session, I think this request for the list of eligible parties is coming from a document from a unified access model document that was shared or published on the 20th of August 2018, so I think this letter for September 2018 was on a different topic. I think it was requesting to EU member states to assist ICANN in identifying mechanisms to shift the liability from contracting parties. So I would suggest we consider revising this reference, and I can work with the subject matter experts to make sure that we are indeed on the same page but again, I think this is the reference we used this morning on this specific topic, so that's the first suggestion which I highlighted with the comment here. The second one is regarding the words nonpublic RDS data, you may want to consider Claire that this is nonpublic registration data maybe, so those were my two comments.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Fabien. Switzerland and Iran.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you, Manal. This is a question or a clarification request to the distinguished colleague from India and also to those colleagues who are more intimately privy or involved in this work because the change at the beginning of the sentence, I don't think it's just syntactic, it now seems that the GAC will make a big compilation of lists of public authorities and other relevant parties and I at least don't recall this position having been taken by the GAC and in fact as far as I recall, let's say this is an issue that pertains to the national [indiscernible] I'm not sure whether here we are giving the impression of engaging in a very wide collection effort from the GAC when this is something that has to be dealt basically on a national basis. So.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Switzerland for flagging this.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Manal. First of all, I have not been involved in the text of that in any case, could not engage to provide a list if I don't know what is it and don't want to engage my government in providing this list if I don't know what they are. Some GAC members have no problem but we don't want to commit

---

ourselves to thinking what Switzerland mentioned quite clear entering into the national policy of every country and that is not the issue of GAC. So I suggest taking the proposal of India [indiscernible] or put some at the beginning.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I take your points. So Fabien, if we can undelete the deleted part is this acceptable to everyone? Some members of the GAC will seek to provide indicative lists of public authorities and other [reading]

RUSSIA: Thank you, Chair. I fully support intervention made by Jorge because I don't understand how GAC in practice will do it with this great uncertainty. But some members create uncertainty as well, what does mean some? Some who are [indiscernible] members of GAC may be on a voluntary basis. In this case a decision will be under each state. Some members will provide, some members will not, but members of GAC on a voluntary basis, maybe it will remove this uncertainty. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Russia.

---

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, I can also live with that provided formulate as follows: GAC members may, comma, on voluntary basis, comma, and continue. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Germany?

GERMANY: Thank you, I cannot support the proposal of Iran. It's a fact that this exercise has already been carried out by the European union and I you heard today 22 of 28 states have already provided their response so this is a fact, this can't be denied. We can discuss the wording, but I cannot live with the wording may on a voluntary basis seek to provide, that's not correct because the exercise has been carried out, I could live with some members of the GAC volunteered to provide indicative lists and so on. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Germany.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, I agree with Germany who disagrees with me with the wording that you mentioned. (speaking German)

---

GERMANY: (speaking German) Chair, thanks to all involved. Some members of the GAC volunteers to provide indicative lists of public authorities and other relevant parties requiring [indiscernible] public registration date in response to the request from the letter of 4th of September 2018 from ICANN CEO to GAC chair.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So we will provide a text that will change this to something like in response to the question included in the draft framework for a possible unified access model for continued access to WHOIS data published on the 20th of August 2018 by [indiscernible] this work is in response to another document.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. Comments? I see nodding. So let's move on. I think we finished the advice part. So this is the GAC Board meeting. And we started with the agenda as has been agreed, the six questions we have or six topics we have posed to the Board. But we also have text on .Amazon and text on two-characters. On .Amazon the text reads during the meeting with ICANN Board several GAC members expressed their concerns about one, the recent Board decision to find the Amazon corporation proposal of 17th April 2019 acceptable. And two, directing the ICANN org to continue processing of the .Amazon applications according to the policies and procedures of the n new gTLD program. Three, the possibility

of the outcome in the .Amazon case becoming a precedent for similar cases for delegation of contentious strings in the future, in future, and I think we have agreed to change contentious to replace it by whatever we have agreed. And I think maybe we need a comma after the second bullet and, and delete the and after the first bullet.

Several members referenced rationale for the follow-up on previous GAC advice expressed in the ICANN60 Abu Dhabi communique in which the GAC recognized one, need to find a mutually acceptable solution in the case of the .Amazon gTLD applications for the countries affected and for the Amazon corporation, end quote. The comments to the Board reflected concern that -- sorry, the comments to the Board reflected concern that such a mutually agreeable solution has not yet been achieved. The ICANN Board responded to those concerns noting specifically that GAC advice was not followed by ICANN as reflected in their decision. The ICANN Board noted their efforts in facilitating parties coming together, efforts that were conducted in good faith and with a view to reach mutually agreeable solution as articulated in the Abu Dhabi GAC advice. The ICANN CEO further stressed that the Board takes GAC advice seriously, not just because they think it is important but also because notice accordance with ICANN bylaws, the GAC [indiscernible] looked forward to the communique and will stand ready to respond to



---

GAC members. GAC members urged all members including the ICANN Board to facilitate a mutually agreeable solution.

Is this between brackets or -- preclude the possibility of the outcome in the .Amazon case, prejudicing similar cases for delegation of sensitive strings that the fact has stressed as raising public policy concerns in the future. Yeah, I think this part is redundant and covered elsewhere. In regard with the release of - - so let's stop here, see the .Amazon and then continue with the two-characters. Any comments, Trinidad and Tobago.

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO: Thank you, Manal. Karel Douglas. If you just scroll back up, I saw the one and was wondering why, so in this case, right, one would imply there's another number, so it could be removed if it's the only one. If it's a list then we will have one, two, three. So could join the paragraph just preceding it.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Trinidad and Tobago. Anything else or shall I continue with the queue.

---

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO: You can, I'm sorry, also on the second bullet, the comma should be -- is it a semi colon? Similar to the one at the first bullet. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, I have Brazil and Jamaica.

BRAZIL: Brazil's reactions if to the paragraph added by the US, starts with the ICANN Board responded to these concerns. First of all, we wonder whether it would be more accurate to replace ICANN Board with the ICANN CEO, because we heard during that session the considerations by the CEO and not necessarily by the ICANN Board itself.

The second point is where the verb responds to these concerns. We think it would be proper appropriate to reflect what really happened during that session and that was disagreements were expressed. So we would suggest stating the ICANN CEO disagreed with these concerns. Finally, in the sentence that reads noting specifically that GAC advice was followed, we would suggest adding as he considered that specifically the GAC advice was followed, because this was his assessment of what took place, and we heard the ICANN CEO speaking to that.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: In the sentence that reads noting specifically that the GAC advice was followed.

BRAZIL: As he considered specifically that GAC advice was followed. You would replace noting with as he considered or considers. Thank you, sorry, and as you will note as well, there is still reference to ICANN Board's views when in fact those views were expressed by the ICANN CEO. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Sorry, I have Jamaica. I have the US.

JAMAICA: Thank you. If we could scroll back up. Yes. Just for clarity and to be -- just for clarity, I would recommend that the words the recent Board decision also be included in that second bullet so that the sentence would start the recent Board decision directing.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: US.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, responding to the proposals made by Brazil, I would like to note at least in one instance here the statements were

---

made beyond the ICANN CEO and were actually made by Maarten Botterman, so don't see it appropriate to reflect the CEO, and unless I am incorrect, the CEO is also [indiscernible] also the insert here of disagreed with, I think perhaps a better alternative here is -- will sound redundant, the alternative views, the ICANN Board expressed alternative views with respect to these concerns. And not to go to fast, to replace he considers with they consider.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Can we just say considering the GAC advice --

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Sure, that's fine.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay.

BRAZIL: Brazil will be fine with those suggestions if we can delete as reflected in their decision. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil. Any comments?

---

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. Obviously, they express alternative views. What does it mean alternative views?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I think what is meant here is different views.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Alternative is not different, different is different, alternative is something substituting something, different is different views. So it's not alternative. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: US.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thanks. Again, this is Ashley with the US. I would like now to comment on the sentence following this paragraph which is some GAC members urged all parties. I believe now this is included in the follow up to previous advice that this is redundant, so I would recommend deleting it.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Any comments?

---

SPAIN: Javier [indiscernible] for the record. The middle of the paragraph still not corrected, still states [indiscernible] CEO, should be coherent with the former sentence and to be completely coherent, the efforts as he stated were conducted in good faith or efforts they stated were conducted in good faith.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I think I saw other hands. Brazil.

BRAZIL: Thank you, Madame Chair. With respect to specifically to the suggestion to delete the reference to the ICANN CEO in this part Brazil would disagree because the CEO was tasked with the ICANN Board to conduct the facilitation -- and the CEO was speaking specifically in that capacity as facilitator, someone who has played that role in the past and then he referred to his experience and the paragraph as it was seems to be a more accurate reflection of what took place.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil. US.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you. Ashley with the US. To go back to the point, expressed by Brazil, yes, indeed the CEO did articulate his views

---

on this subject but looking back at the transcripts, actually, Maarten Botterman spoke to this issue as well, so I would ask that we maintain reference to the ICANN Board.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I have Switzerland, I have Iran, and I'm asking whether we would like to take like ten minutes drafting to agree on this part or we're good with the screen? Switzerland.

JORGE CANCIO: Yeah, it's just a procedural point. I have seen that [indiscernible] intervention has been undermining and as much as I agree sometimes with [indiscernible] this time it was [indiscernible] speaking.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Correct me if I'm wrong, during the discussion, none of the Board members except CEO took the floor, how could we say ICANN Board, which ICANN Board expressed? It was the CEO or president of ICANN at every intervention, they just replied in a one-to-one dialogue. Who other raised the floor, Board member so I don't think -- the CEO expressed various or different views and so on, so forth, could you please correct me that which ICANN Board raised any different views? There was only one person and that was the CEO.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I think Maarten Botterman participated in the discussion, but yeah, he made a couple of intervention it's, but I have the US, UK, and Egypt.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: As I said previously and reflected in the transcripts, Maarten Botterman made these comments himself and also the ICANN CEO is a member of the Board and this was a discussion with the ICANN Board, so I think it's highly appropriate to reference the ICANN Board here.

UK: Thank you, Chair, Paul Blaker for the UK, I don't think it's right for our communique to isolate and name individual members of the Board in this way. It was a meeting between the Board and the GAC. We do not name individual countries in our communique, quite rightly, and we should not name individual members of the Board. The ICANN chief executive was clearly speaking for the Board, the chair of the Board was sitting next to him. It was quite clear I think, and I don't know our communique should name individuals in this way.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, UK. I have Egypt then Switzerland.



---

EGYPT: Thank you. Christina [indiscernible] for the record. Yeah, I was going to say that Maarten did respond during the session as well, good to keep ICANN Board. We might just note in the second paragraph the ICANN Board noted the ICANN org effort in facilitating because it was actually facilitation if I understand correctly was done by the CEO, so might want to note here this so the ICANN Board noted ICANN's efforts in facilitating, one point. The other point regarding the last paragraph that the US suggested deleting, I think that what we are doing here is repeating many of the things that we already put down there in the sake of having a comprehensive view of all the points mentioned in the Board GAC discussion, so I would suggest keeping it maybe exactly with the same language we agreed upon in the follow-up part. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. So Fabien, if we can undelete the okay, and with the exact wording that was agreed, thank you. This was efficient. Switzerland?

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you, Manal. On the question of ICANN Board or ICANN CEO, I have to agree with Paul and with Christina and other colleagues, because it's normal practice that the ICANN Board designates somebody out of the Board to speak on their behalf, and unless

---

other Board members don't speak up, it's the position of the Board in that conversation.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Switzerland. So any comments on the last amendments? Spain, are you requesting the floor?

SPAIN: Someone should take a look at the whole paragraph and take the principles that have been agreed upon here, for example, particularly the part of the CEO and take a good look at the wording so it is coherent.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So one final reading --

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I have no problem if you are consistent, I have no problem that if the CEO spoke on behalf of the Board, that was correct because I remember that when it was the first issue was raised, somebody pointed out, finger toward the CEO, so I have no problem if you maintain ICANN Board, but at some point some parts Board and some CEO I don't agree, it should be consistent. Thank you.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Agreed, and I think the highlighted part is going to be fixed in order to be consistent, right, Fabien? So is this going to be ICANN Board? So let us do one last reading and fix things as we go if needed. Can we go up, please, and then we will fix the text as we go the paragraph reads the ICANN Board expressed different views with regard to these concerns considering that GAC advice was followed by ICANN. The ICANN Board noted ICANN org's efforts in facilitating parties coming together, efforts that were conducted in good faith and with a view to reach a mutually agreeable solution as articulated in the Abu Dhabi GAC advice.

I think something is not reading well here? Or maybe I'm not reading it well. So the ICANN Board noted ICANN org's efforts in facilitating parties coming together. And then we have efforts again? Efforts that were conducted in good faith and with a view -- okay, sorry, my fault -- and with a view to reach a mutually agreeable solution as articulated in the Abu Dhabi GAC advice. The ICANN Board further stressed that the Board takes GAC advice seriously, not just because they think it is important but also because it is in accordance with ICANN bylaws, the ICANN Board indicated they looked forward to the GAC communique and will stand ready to respond to any GAC consensus advice.

On another note some GAC members during the discussion with the ICANN Board urged all parties to exhaust all means consistent

---

with applicable procedures to facilitate a mutually agreeable solution, Iran and Egypt.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I think the sentence is too long, and number two, we should not put ourselves in the place of ICANN Board saying whether it was in good faith, but say they further expressed -- it's their view it was in good faith, so please full stop after the together and then have a new sentence saying they further, the Board further expressed or claimed or indicate that the issue was conducted in good faith, what they said, not what we qualify.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I have Egypt, Trinidad and Tobago, and the US.

EGYPT: Sorry to come back on this last paragraph again. I think since we are talking about the discussion between the GAC and the Board we might not need during the discussion with the ICANN Board and that specific paragraph. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. Egypt. So this is a proposal to delete during the discussion with ICANN Board from the paragraph in red. Since we are already on the right section. Trinidad and Tobago.

---

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO: Thank you, Manal. Karel Douglas, Trinidad and Tobago. A small minor attempt as we change the ICANN CEO to Board, there is no need to repeat the Board again. So we could simply say the ICANN Board full expressed that it takes GAC advice seriously, just a small minor, remove the Board since we know it is the Board speaking of itself, so it just says it. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Trinidad and Tobago. Any other comments? Is everyone okay with the paragraphs as they are displayed on the screen? I see nodding. So let's move on to the two-character? Which now reads in regard with the release of two-character country codes the GAC notes the provision of a search tool by ICANN. GAC members have highlighted that the effectiveness of the tool is still being evaluated. GAC urges ICANN to continue to engage with concerned GAC members in order to address their concerns. India.

RAHUL GOSAIN: Thank you, Chair. Government of India for the record. I would suggest that Fabien just pull up the same language which agreed upon, the same text and paste it for ease and for quicker resolution, because this text seems to have been the old version and seems to have missed quite a few of the edits which took place later.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I think basically its --

RAHUL GOSAIN: Also the procedure for [indiscernible] two-character country code [indiscernible] language.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. Noted. Okay. So the highlighted text has been pulled from the agreed part and it reads moreover, the GAC notes the provision of a search tool by ICANN. GAC members have highlighted that the effectiveness of the tool is still being evaluated, the GAC urges ICANN to continue to engage with concerned GAC members in order to address their concerns. This is agreed text.

RAHUL GOSAIN: The first part of it which was proposed by Brazil is perhaps missing so we may consider also incorporating that [indiscernible] to accurately capture what was agreed upon during the, the agreed text decided in the first plenary session which was proposed by Thiago, remember?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: It's already in the advice part, so you want to us repeat the whole thing again?

---

RAHUL GOSAIN: We can just put it here and see what portion we want to retain here and depending on if you don't find it relevant we can even omit it just so that it accurately captures the whole extent of the discussion which took place because I believe it was clearly mentioned to the Board that this is the GAC advice which we are going to [indiscernible] as part of our communique to them.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Exactly, and we have stand to our promise. We're pulling it anyway. So the GAC remains concerned that the GAC advice on the procedure for the release of country codes at the second level under gTLD was not taken into consideration as intended and advises that meaningful steps be taken to ensure this does not happen in the future.

RAHUL GOSAIN: Thank you, Chair. India for the transcript. Can we insert one word, the GAC [indiscernible] apprised the ICANN Board that it remains concerned that GAC advice -- that its advice, that its advice --

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So before getting into wordsmithing, I'm wondering why are we repeating again the same paragraph here? It's even in a more

---

important part, it's with the GAC advice. So I think I saw a hand -  
- some hand here but I also now see UK.

UK: Thank you, Chair, yes, Paul Blaker. I think which all want a  
communique which is effective and easy to understand without  
confusing people or duplication. So if the room is happy, if this  
text is already in the advice section, I would suggest we don't  
need to repeat all of it in this section here.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, UK, and I see nodding. Did I miss any hands here --  
yeah, I think I have Iran and then Oman.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, I think two paragraphs of the advice was now moved  
here [indiscernible] the first one it should not be that. Fabien,  
there's a problem with all of this color, sorry, my eyes is not as  
strong as yours, I have difficulty with all of this very nice color, I  
can't read it from here and there and changing.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Kavouss, if I understand correctly you are proposing we don't  
need to repeat the paragraph again here.



---

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Exactly, don't need to repeat, doesn't make any changes, ten times if we take, doesn't add any value.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Agreed. Point well taken. Thank you. I have Oman and India.

OMAN: I agree with Iran. Thank you.

RAHUL GOSAIN: Thank you, Chair. Government of India, for the transcript. I agree with both my colleagues of Iran and Oman, and I suggest we may do away -- just omit that because it already features the advice to the Board. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: We have floating paragraph. During the ICANN Board GAC session GAC requested that the Board consider a suitable (sic) model for the capacity building efforts of the GAC in ICANN's strategic planning, specifically in the allocation of ad adequate resources and budget rounds. Any objections to having this paragraph? On capacity building.

---

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:            Instead of suitable, necessary. Not suitable. I don't know. You talk of resources, necessary resources, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I'm sorry, it's my bad reading. To consider a sustainable model. My fault.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:            Sustainable, yes [indiscernible]

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So Columbia.

COLUMBIA:                      It's known we are talking about the GAC ICANN Board session, no need to repeat it here.

EGYPT:                              Was wondering for the sake that people would understand if we move the last paragraph just after the six bullets since it comes in sequence before the .Amazon, and then start the .Amazon part with regarding the .Amazon point, if that is acceptable. If not, I'm not [indiscernible] but I feel at the end after a part about .Amazon, it's not visible.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I think it makes sense maybe that we put them in the order they are listed but -- Iran.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: It's 7:30. Let us not [indiscernible] stylistic [indiscernible] rearrangement, I think in the future [indiscernible] [indiscernible] we are part of a government and there's a [indiscernible] any comments, one, two, three, approve. So this is approved, I don't think we can separate that and no stylistic change.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I have Trinidad and Tobago.

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO: Thank you, Manal. Karel Douglas, Trinidad and Tobago. And just to agree with the suggestion, in the same manner in which the list appears as so should the items appear. So it would make perfect sense to be consistent with the list that you would have those items fallen in that same manner.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. I see nodding and I hope you trust the chair and the GAC leadership and support staff in taking care of this. So any other parts? Sorry, Fabien, any other parts that we have not -- okay. I see nodding. European Commission.

---

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thank you, Chair. Just wanted to share some thoughts on the statement that [indiscernible] made this morning about taking away the legal risks from the contracted parties for providing WHOIS data through the unified access model so this is not something for the communique since we did not discuss it during the ICANN Board but just to share some thoughts from our side, I think what is important is that the persisting activities involving the unified access model and the responsibility for the activities are equally well defined, so of course the whole purpose of having a unified access model is to concentrate certain processing activities and responsibilities for the disclosure of WHOIS data with the entity providing the or operating the model but it cannot be excluded that for certain processing activities the contacting parties have a role and in fact this is what the EPDP is going to do now, to define the different processing activities, define the legal basis, the roles of the different players involved and that is the level of reflection and the level of discussion we need to have with the data protection authorities, because the data protection authorities are not going to vet the unified access model, not going to say this is fine and there is no legal risk involved for the contracted parties.

What they will reply willingly I think is if you present the different components of the unified access model and they would be able to say in line with GDPR or if it's not. So very important that this

---

work is conducted inside the EPDP and we are as specific as possible, and I understand there's a meeting tomorrow and important to prepare to ask the right questions and put on the table the right elements of the unified access model and get the appropriate level of [indiscernible] and of course we are happy to help in this as part of the EPDP and in general. That was the point I wanted to make.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, European Commission, for bringing this to our attention.

BRAZIL:

Sorry to come back to this, a slightly correction to something that is wrong there. Following the UK's suggestion we added the word rationale. We have already discussed this offline in the Abu Dhabi communique with regard to the .Amazon applications there are both follow-up and previous GAC advice and GAC advice. In one of those two there's a rationale in which something particular quoted appears and follow-up is exactly what is quoted there. So avoid having to explain all of this, perhaps we could just say Abu Dhabi communique, so the sentence would read several members referenced the Abu Dhabi communique in which the GAC recognized and Brazil would be happy with that.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. Brazil. Is this okay with everyone? So since we have it in two occurrences, instead of complicating matters we're just referencing the Abu Dhabi communique. I don't see objections. But I see people still looking at the screen. Can we move on? Okay.

This is rewording to the meeting of the GAC and ALAC and agreed to progress their joint capacity building and efforts to cooperate on policy issues of interest for governments and end users regarding subsequent round of new gTLDs. In principle GAC and ALAC exchanges could take place within the GAC focal group on subsequent rounds of new gTLD subject to further consideration. So there was a mention of the extension of the capacity building efforts. Kavouss, you asked extension of what and this was noted and corrected. So let's move on. [reading] and then with the GNSO suggested highlighting the connection between ccTLD -- with the GNSO, one in -- OK. This is the original proposal by Russia with the suggestion by Iran to delete the text between brackets. And I have Russia. Please, Russia, go ahead.

RUSSIA: After internal discussion we decided to remove it at all.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So after discussion it was agreed to delete the whole thing? Any objections to deleting? I see nodding. Thank you. Moving on. Yes, Iran please

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: It is working party. Work party?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: This is the terminology they are using. The ATRT3 told us they have four working parties and we can double-check the exact language they are using, and we can stick to the terminology they are using. If it is working, we will change it, if not you will find it as it is in the Communique. So, moving on, under the public safety Working Group we haven't -- this is new text. The text reads the GAC public safety Working Group continued the discussion with the GAC on abuse mitigation measures in line with its previous Communique, the GAC noted that DNS abuse threatens the security and stability of the DNS, the universal acceptance of TLDs and consumer trust. This is also reflected in the recommendations of the consumer trust, consumer choice, and competition review team. CCTRT. Whose importance the GAC highlight in the Kobe Communique. The GAC agreed to engage with the ICANN community on a more effective approach and also with a few of effective abuse mitigation policies for subsequent rounds of new gTLDs. Next steps should include the renewed

---

engagement with the ICANN organization to obtain further clarifications on a number of implementation questions contained in the next. The follow up on the CCTRT recommendations and a cross conversation at ICANN66 in Montreal. Any comments on this text? Iran?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Sorry, I don't remember that Communique. Why we need to go that far? What is that? Let's just make it as short as possible. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, please, Fabien, if you know the reason behind this.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: The reference here is the Communique that requested the ICANN Board to respond to question and that led to a number of exchanges for the following six months around questions of concerns with respect to [indiscernible] prevention and mitigation of abuse. This is the reason why there is the specific reference.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Iran.



---

IRAN: I think we addressed this issue at the last meeting. We had a meeting and some recommendations were agreed, some were subject discussions, and some were outside the Board mandate. I think it has been recently addressed. It may not be appropriate we would not take the latest information on this and [indiscernible] and ignoring or [indiscernible]. I am not quite sure what is this issue. I have doubt that it may create some confusions. We had discussed at the previous meeting. I remember we had this sorted. So could you kindly clarify all that.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: I think you refer to the Kobe meeting during which there was a discussion of the CCT Review recommendations relating to [indiscernible] mitigation. This is a separate set of recommendations. Here reference is made to these two sets of engagement or developments. There is on the one hand the CCT Review to which you are referring which was discussed in Kobe and there are the specific questions that the GAC had asked to the ICANN Board in the [indiscernible] Communique. Those are two separate processes. One is tied to the CCT Review and the other one was a set of questions from the GAC to the ICANN Board. They both deal with mitigations, but they are two different sets of questions -- on the one hand, recommendations and on the other hand, questions. I think this is referencing those two parts of work on this issue.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, Iran.

IRAN: Fabien, please correct me if I am wrong. I think we answered both questions at the last meeting. The person was serious and raised the questions and we have addressed that. I don't think we need to pick up something from the Beijing Communique or other Communique far from the discussions.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Kavouss, I think it is a Working Group report which is, I mean, they are just referencing the something that is there that is not in the other references, but I mean in all cases, if it is even redundant, again, it is just the Working Group report, but Fabien, please.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Just one additional element. The reason why the reference is to there a GAC Communique in 2016 is because the attention and efforts of the PSG were overtaken by the work on the WHOIS compliance with GDPR starting in mid-2017. This is sort of a work item that was initiated in India that was sort of left unfinished from the PSOG's perspective. This is why the reference today is to the past developments they want to pick up in a sense.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Fabien, for the clarification. Iran, is that OK to move on?

IRAN: The Working Group indicated that.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Which? The whole section comes under the GAC public safety Working Group. So the whole thing is being attributed to the Working Group. Are you suggesting something explicit inside the paragraph?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I said it was also indicated by the Working Group. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Fabien. Kavouss, does this address your point? Thank you. I think the human rights, we read it and there were -- so it is work track five that we are -- and the -- I don't see work track five on the screen. There is here a supplement and complement and we need to choose one. Just to refresh minds:

[Reading from the screen]

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: There is a suggestion to put supplement instead of complement. Any objections to replacing complement by supplement? I see none. Can we reflect the change please? We are keeping supplement. I think the gap vocal group on subsequent procedures is this new text? No. OK. Work track five. A high-level summary of comments received on the work track five supplement initial report was presented to the GAC. At this stage, work track 5 is seeking agreement on a set of recommendations that will be set to the new full gTLD procedures, PDP Working Group for consideration and formal consensus code. Any comments? Factual reporting of this morning's session. So let's move on.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: I believe the last edit is our suggested change of reference concerning the members of the GAC providing least of public authorities and other parties requiring them to create registration data. So we will make sure that we have agreement of the topic leads on this matter.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. Let's -- yes, Iran.

---

IRAN: Thank you, Manal. Sorry. Could you go back to the subsequent procedures and the 12 members area? I don't know whether I have raised it or not, but I think it is very good that we have 12 people and also good that they encourage them to participate. Perhaps at the end we should put GAC encourages or whatever you want that those who have signed up for that participate in the activities. I am participating and sometimes I only see one or two.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: You mean participating in the PDP itself? Because they have already volunteered to participate in the focal group.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: They should contribute to the activities of that. I only see very few. Jorge is always there and no others. How can we do that?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Exactly my point. You mean the PDP itself? They should? OK. Yeah, yeah, I understand. I will try to be kind. Let's read out. The focal group will brief the GAC on its deliberations and discussions. I am just trying to find out where we can insert this sentence. 12 GAC participants have volunteered to participate in this effort and are encouraged to contribute to --

---

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Let me explain. You have 12 members in focal point and they report to the GAC. This should be conveyed to the group. How do we do that? The only thing is either from these 12, or anyone else, you urge the GAC members to participate in the activities of the PDP group dealing it with the subsequent procedures. We are also encouraged to participate in the activities of -- of the PDP Working Groups. New gTLDs subsequent group dealing with the --

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. Thank you, Kavouss. Let's move on. That's it. Excellent. So anything else? I am sorry. It is Egypt.

EGYPT: Just referring to the point where Egypt was saying a comment and it wasn't accepted. I would appreciate that no countries not putting their comment. Thank you very much.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. So this concludes our discussions today. I am sorry it is 8:00. Sorry to keep you that late. Apologies to the interpreters as well. I thank you very much as well for your efforts and for your participation and for your flexibility and understanding. That helped to reach an agreed Communique. I hope you keep the momentum until tomorrow. We are starting at 8:30 with some important discussions on ICANN reviews including

---

with ATRT3. We will have specific questions to the GAC. I will see you at 8:30 and thanks again to everyone. I hope you can still enjoy your night.

[ END OF TRANSCRIPT ]