
ICANN68 | Virtual Policy Forum – GAC Communique Drafting (3/5)
Thursday, June 25, 2020 - 10:00 to 11:00 MYT

GULTEN TEPE: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. This is Gulden Tepe from ICANN support. And I am the remote manager of this session.

Welcome to the ICANN68 virtual meeting with the first session of the day, GAC communique drafting session. We will not do a roll call today for the sake of time but GAC members' attendance noted and available in the annex of the GAC communique and minutes. In case a GAC member does not have the ability to raise their hand or see the names of other panelists, we advise to you leave the room and join again by individual link sent via email by ICANN.

If you would like to ask a question or make comment, please type it by starting and ending your sentence with question or comment to allow all participants to see your request. Please be mindful that session leaders may not be able to address all comments or questions live during this session. However, they will remain part of the permanent session record.

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.*

Interpretation for GAC sessions will be conducted using both Zoom and the remote simultaneous interpretation platform operated by Congress Rental Network. Your microphone will be muted for the duration of the session unless you get into the queue to speak. If you wish to speak, please raise your hand in the Zoom room. When called upon by session leads, you will be given permission to unmute microphone, kindly unmute mic at this time and take the floor. When speaking make sure to mute other devices, including the CRN application. Please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if other than English. Please also speak clearly at a reasonable pace to allow accurate interpretation. To view the realtime transcription, click on the closed caption button on the Zoom tool bar.

Finally, this session like all other ICANN activities is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. You will find a link in the chat for reference. With that, I would like to leave the floor to the GAC chair, Manal Ismail. Over to you, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Gulten, and good morning, good afternoon, and good evening everyone. Welcome to the fourth and last day of our meetings as Gulten mentioned. This is the third of five GAC communique drafting sessions scheduled for on

hour, and thank you, Fabien, for having the communique on the screen. So we will be going through any additions or changing from the version we reviewed yesterday starting by the process itself. And as you can see on the screen, we're highlighting the agreed date and timestamp for the review period after the final communique is circulated on the GAC mailing list. So it's Saturday, 27th of June, 1800 UTC. I see Kavouss' hand up, please, you may be on mute.

IRAN:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, Manal, I sent you and all GAC members text relating to the difficulties that we and some other [indiscernible] facing with respect to the use of the DNS and we want this should appear in the communique below the part added by Russia that we have already supported that is now in that text relating to the recommendations of [indiscernible] and something we would like to be mentioned.

I sent it to you first, to all GAC members and I followed that but due to the time differences, it was not possible to receive your actions. I'm sure that Fabien also received a copy and I ask, put it there and this is simply saying that we would like that ICANN board taking necessary action with respect to implementation of the recommendation relating to [indiscernible] workstream 2. That's all. Thank you

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Sorry, I was on mute. Thank you very much, Kavouss. And I hope everyone had the chance to receive the email and see the text. I'm a little bit hesitant whether this is related to workstream 2 and wondering if we can like in previous instances include this in the minutes of the meeting. Is it possible to have the text on the screen?

IRAN: Yes, I sent it to -- sorry, hello?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, I can hear you, Kavouss.

IRAN: I sent it to everyone, to you and to Fabien, I think it must be -- has been already typed somewhere.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yeah, we thought to check first whether we can put this in the minutes of the meeting.

IRAN: No, it is not a minutes situation, it is something that is generally related to the recommendations of the work stream 2 and it should be in the part after the expressions made by our colleague from Russia that we have already supported that and

it is nothing, just asking implementation of the recommendation of the work stream 2, and [indiscernible] and it's not everyone, those that are not interested, don't have problems, no difficulty. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. So again, let's -- Fabien, please, if you can, let's get the text and put it under work stream 2 as Kavouss suggested, and then we can discuss it when we get to this part.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Manal, this is Fabien speaking to confirm we are working on it.

IRAN: Thank you very much.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Can we scroll again to where we stopped? Okay. So again, just highlighting where we had changes from yesterday, we have reflected the date, 27th of June is when we plan to issue the communique, and the highlighted section reading [reading] sorry, I forgot to switch on my video just to keep it a little bit [indiscernible] If we can scroll down, I hope it okay, just pausing to see if there are any comments. If not, let's scroll down. Nothing changed here.

We received text from Pua on underserved regions working group and the text reads: The GAC underserved regions working group updated the GAC on mutual initiatives in response to the COVID-19 situation to be conducted in collaboration with the ICANN community and ICANN's government engagement and global stakeholder engagement teams.

The GAC underserved regions working group completed the review of the current GAC travel support rules according to its work plan and will seek GAC input and approval after the ICANN68 meeting.

Just to note that this will happen tomorrow at the very last session at the wrap up session. We will be receiving this update from the underserved regions working group. But since this will happen at the very last session and we will have been finalized, the communique, so that's why it's there before it happens. So any questions, comments? Okay. If not, then similar case here with the universal acceptance and IDN working group. We will be receiving an update also tomorrow during the wrap up session, and the text reads: The chair of the GAC universal acceptance and IDN working group reported on the working group's inter-sessional activity since ICANN67. Among other activities, work group members have worked to prioritize their 2020 work plan effort to focus on, one, developing a basic

introductory document on [reading] and two, awareness building among and communications to governments on UA IDN matters.

The working group chair shared that the working group is closely coordinating with the universal acceptance steering group and the UA communications working group on communications plans and strategies. This includes the development of universal acceptance related content for use by governments and relevant authorities and a potential webinar series aimed at informing GAC members and their colleagues about universal acceptance developments and initiatives.

The working group chair also noted that the working group hoped to seek GAC endorsement of the group's draft terms of reference originally shared prior to ICANN67 shortly after the ICANN68 meeting.

Any comments or questions? Okay. Then let's move on. The part on GAC elections is the same, nothing changed. Issues of importance to the GAC, we have reviewed the subsequent rounds of new gTLD. So [reading] [refer to slide]. SubPro PDP working group co-chairs noted such concerns while confirming that the final report will be delivered to GNSO council at the latest by the end of this calendar year.

Another concern noted by several GAC members is the absence of mechanisms to address DNS abuse and other issues raised by the CCT review in the SubPro draft report. The SubPro chairs noted such issues apply to all gTLD and merit a more holistic approach. And the part highlighted on the screen is the part that was added by ICANN [indiscernible] Vernita Harris.

GULTEN TEPE: Thank you, Manal, this is Gulden speaking. We received a question in the chat pod from Japanese delegation asking in the second paragraph of subsequent procedures for new gTLD, isn't it since ICANN67 instead of since ICANN68? Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Japan, noted and fixed on the screen. Thank you for spotting this. So Jorge please, I'm sorry, go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Hello. Good early morning from Europe to everyone, this is Jorge Cancio from Switzerland. I was just looking at the text proposed by Vernita, and although I agree that it is a fair point, I'm not completely sure if this is the right place to put it in. So that's my first concern that I would need to look at the whole text again. Because we are talking about a

different subject there, about the timing, about specific architect of the substance, and as an additional comment, we are aware -- and Manal please correct me if I'm wrong or if it's not the latest art that the GNSO is looking into the this issue after the PDP working group sent them which was in a way a reaction to the concerns. We expressed both at ICANN67 and inter-sessionally through the GAC compilation.

So I think this needed a bit of fine tuning, because otherwise it seems we are repeating something that we said already in ICANN67, and it's also placed in a bit of a strange place in the communique. So I would look into this and try to see where we can build it in more properly, if that is okay.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much Jorge and for flagging this. And indeed, as we mentioned during the opening plenary, there was a discussion with the GNSO leadership on this, and they confirmed they are looking into it. And also given the wide interest from the community, the GNSO is currently working on some sort of a framework paper and will be sharing it with the community soon on how to tackle this issue of DNS abuse.

Discussing the different alternatives, whether it should be -- or it could be a cross community working group and what does this

mean in terms of being more flexible on the topic and discussing it in a more broad sense or a PDP which would be more limited in terms of scope but could be enforced on the contracts of the contracted parties and other options if maybe or a mix of approaches starting by a cross community working group and then continue being with a PDP when the discussion is more mature.

So again, to keep this short, I agree with you, Jorge, that there is there was follow-up from the GAC with the GNSO, and there is a response and current work taking place. So with this in mind, let me check with the US if -- first if you are okay with deleting the text and if not we can then discuss where to put it do have we have the US in the Zoom room? And if not, maybe we can flag it for now and bring it up again when we have the US available.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Manal, this is Fabien speaking. So I'm reading a comment underneath Vernita's suggestion, a suggestion by Switzerland -- -- [reading] [indiscernible]

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you Fabien and for flagging that it's taken care of in the comments. So let's continue scrolling down. I read this part because I don't think it changed from yesterday but just to clean

everything, making sure that we also agree on the edits on the screen. So the text reads: Regarding auctions as a private mechanism to resolving string contentions, some GAC participants expressed concerns in light of prior GAC positions on the issue, asking why other options are not being further considered by the working group. As to mechanisms to provide for predictability to applicants in future round. Working group co-chairs flagged that the PDP working group recommended establishing a new predictable framework along with a new predictability implementation review team SPIRT, and noted initially community support some GAC members expressed serious concerns that the creation of a SPIRT if adopted could add complexity to the current procedure and potential inconsistency with existing roles and responsibilities according to the ICANN bylaws as well as its added value. It was proposed that if established the new mechanism be lean, inclusive, and transparent.

Jorge, please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO, GAC VICE-CHAIR:

Thank you, Manal, and sorry for coming in again. This is Jorge Cancio, for the record. I was just referring to the text we discussed before from the US, and I would ask secretariat to put it in brackets. Because it's not

accepted to be there, so that it's clear to everyone this is on the [indiscernible] discussion, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jorge. Can we put the US text in brackets for now? I think there is, yeah. Okay. I see also a comment in the chat from Egypt. Can we replace participants by members? I assume this is the first line in the paragraph starting regarding auctions as a private mechanism to resolve string contentions, some GAC members instead of participants. Any objections to this? Okay. I see none. Then that's reflected on the screen. If this part is acceptable then we will be cleaning the text.

Now moving to this last paragraph -- is this a new paragraph? A proposal from France. Okay. The GAC appreciates the efforts of the working group to streamline, alert and appeal mechanisms, but its propositions shouldn't significantly affect the ability of the different constituencies and both sides of ICANN to express their concerns and take remedy action at the different stages of the future round of new gTLDs.

And I see Paul's hand up, UK please go ahead.

PAUL BLAKER: Can you hear me now?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, go ahead.

PAUL BLAKER: Paul Blaker from the UK, for the record. I wanted to make a comment about the text regarding the team SPIRT Team where it says some GAC members expressed serious concerns. And I wonder if we should think again about using the word serious here because it suggests some of our concerns are serious and some are not serious. So maybe we can -- it's enough to say that some GAC members expressed concerns, and we shouldn't introduce a new category of concerns by using the word serious. I would suggest deleting that, if others agree. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Paul, for the suggestion. And yeah, we normally try to avoid qualifying the verbs, but let me revert back. I think the proposal was from Kavouss. So Iran, any objection to just expressing concerns and delete the word serious? Kavouss, please, go ahead.

IRAN: Thank you, Manal, two things here. One is collaboration of all of us together to facilitate our work and the other is the argument that word serious before concerns may have the interpretation that you have two categories of concerns. That argument is not

valid. There are different degrees of concerns. But I come to the first point to collaborate with the UK. If UK also collaborates with everyone of us and every one of us collaborate with each other and everyone of us doing flexibility. In that sense I have no problem to delete the word serious but not with the argument given, just in terms of collaboration, mutual understanding, and so on, so forth. And I expect similar things from others. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kavouss. So you would like to keep serious?

IRAN: Manal, hello?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, I can hear you, Kavouss.

IRAN: I said that in the spirit of collaboration, I agree to our distinguished, friend and colleague from UK to delete serious but not following his argument, and I said that this is a mutual collaboration, that we need to collaborate with each other and understand concerns of each other. So that is the case.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Understood.

IRAN: I hope I'm clear now and I hope UK also understands the request for collaboration is mutual and something on all sides and so on, so forth. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kavouss, I'm sorry, I got distracted by the chat but I thank you for your understanding and flexibility, much appreciated, Kavouss, thank you. So can we delete serious, please. And do we have any comments on the last paragraph? Which I believe is a new one, it's a proposal from France. Jorge, please.

JORGE CANCIO, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Thank you, Manal. And this is more of a question. As we normally only introduce in the GAC communique issues that were discussed in the corresponding plenary sessions, and maybe it's because it's 4:30 in the morning in Europe, but I don't recall that we discussed the points that are mentioned in this new paragraph by France. So I wonder whether Vincent could collaborate and perhaps refresh our memory on when this was discussed. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Jorge, and Vincent already has his hand up. Please, France, go ahead.

FRANCE: Thank you very much, Manal. This is Vincent Gouillart from France, for the record. Hello everyone, good morning, good day, and good evening, I hope you are all well for this last day. Sorry, I posted this paragraph before logging in. It appears it's anonymous but it was me indeed and I proposed this on the basis of my intervention yesterday.

So I have to say first -- and I wanted to tell you this anyway to explain my proposal, but thank you, Jorge for asking your question first -- this paragraph is not only about the proposed SPIRT -- well, first, when I wrote about streamline -- about alert on the [indiscernible] mechanisms that comprise several things that have been discussed lately and among them the proposed SPIRT, that's why I put this paragraph right after, the one in which SPIRT is already tackled. But it's about different kind of mechanisms that allow GAC and other parts of ICANN to express opinions and to react if needed. So it's also about the scope of GAC advice, the ability of GAC to adopt advice by categories of potential gTLD [indiscernible] application of the new applicant guidebook. I know these last two points, I don't believe they have been discussed during ICANN68 but this paragraph is

definitely about SPIRT which was discussed, and even though the SPIRT mechanism is not explicitly mechanism, but it's about more generally about the attempts of the working group to streamline such mechanisms, some of its proposals but interesting but mostly going too far in our eyes in France.

So this is totally open for discussion but I think on the efforts to the streamlined is commendable and thanks Kavouss for expressing support yesterday on this idea but this paragraph would also be a reminder that the GAC considered it important that all parts of the community must keep different tools in their hand to monitor the next round of gTLDs and if needed, to react and that the GAC will be especially vigilant and alert on what concerns its own tools and powers, so this was the rationale for my proposal. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Vincent. I see Jorge's hand up but I'm just checking a question from Japan. So it's on the expressed concerns so let's finish this point and get back to the question from Japan. So over to you, Jorge.

JORGE CANCIO, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Thank you, Manal, and thank you also Vincent. This is Jorge Cancio again, for the record. And

although I appreciate the rationale and the reasons given by Vincent for introducing this -- I guess with its present formulation, it is quite broad and it's not clear that it is prepare referring to the SPIRT. And at most, drawing a conclusion out of the discussion on the SPIRT. So I would really suggest that we try to keep true to this principle of reflecting things in the communique that have been discussed in the plenary. Because otherwise we transform the communique session in a substantive session, and that is not the intention I think of anyone, and that the paragraph is really reformulated to link it clearly to the SPIRT discussion and to also clarify what is meant with for instance alert and appeal mechanisms. After all, the applicant guidebook and the policies that the SubPro is looking at is a very intricate and complex mechanism that we could call alert or appeal within it so if we include such wide a stretching paragraph here, it's not clear what we are referring to. And I think it's important that we deliver useable and concrete and as precise as possible messages to the community, in this case especially the SubPro working group, trying to focus our comments on specifics, because otherwise the message might be misunderstood, might be lost, et cetera.

So because of this substantive reservations and the general principle I mentioned before of not putting new elements in the communique that were not in the plenary discussion, I would

very friendly urge Vincent to rework the paragraph. And while this is done, I would request to put it in square brackets.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Jorge. And just to give some guidance to Vincent, so would explicit reference to creation of the SPIRT Team would address the point?

JORGE CANCIO, GAC VICE-CHAIR: This is a question to me, I guess.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, sorry.

JORGE CANCIO, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Thank you, Manal, just still waking up a little bit. I think that the present wording, if I wasn't clear, is way too broad. Because alert and the [indiscernible] at least mechanisms, at least to me it means many things and none at the same time. So we really need to really rework the wording to make it as specific to be clear what we are meaning for instance with constituencies and body, remedy action and so on. Very broad term. So let's really please stick to what was discussed and to also link it to precise messages on the concrete aspects which we discussed. So this in my eyes means that just by

inserting SPIRT in this text is not enough because it would still be too broad and too far from delivering such specific messages as I think we have to do.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. Thank you very much, Jorge. And I hope this gives guidance to Vincent, and Vincent, appreciate if you would kindly work on the rewording and share the text whenever it's ready.

So Kavouss, I see your hand is up. Is this on the same paragraph or on something else? Because I have a question --

IRAN: Same paragraph, if you allow, yeah, it's the same paragraph. Yes. I appreciate Jorge is, was and is and will be, always a flexible person. Today I don't know. Something he talks about clearly, talk about communique session -- this is a GAC plenary session. Whether talking about this or talking about that. I don't think such a division. Already been discussed and so on, so forth. So I ask you first of all, Jorge, to be a little bit more flexible. Second, I agree the term alert and appeal mechanism may not be clear to several people, to me it's also not very clear what this mechanisms is or are so we request our distinguished colleagues from France, Vincent, to kindly if possible change the text and refer to the SPIRT rather than general terms alert and

appeal mechanisms, that would remove the things. It is quite understood I support him yesterday when referring to SPIRT, and still I continue to support him. Perhaps you may need to change that but you would not say this has not been discussed even in many other meetings, something has been discussed several times and now it is the place and time to raise it. So I don't think there is such a restriction that don't talk about anything in the communique plenary because it's -- this is the GAC meeting, that's all.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kavouss.

IRAN: Please kindly revise the text, alert and appeal mechanism replacing with something -- sorry to explain that very clearly.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kavouss. Now I have a question from Japan regarding the structure of the sentence that refers to expressed concerns about its value added. So if we can highlight the sentence. Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Fabien.

So let me read sentence again. Some GAC members expressed concerns that the creation of a SPIRT if adopted could add

complexity to current procedure and potential inconsistency with existing roles and responsibilities according to the ICANN bylaws as well as its added value. And I agree with Japan -- so does it read well like this? Kavouss, is this a new hand? I hear you. Is it to this point?

IRAN: Yes, Manal. Please be sure, I'm always talking on the point.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: No, maybe you have a concern --

IRAN: No, I am disciplined person. I suggested to delete as added value.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kavouss. I'm not sure whose text this was. Maybe Jorge, any objection to deleting this? Jorge please, go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Thank you, Manal. I was just [indiscernible] by another part of this section, but going to the original sentence added value, had the meaning of expressing the thinking that in considering the creation of SPIRT, the GNSO

PDP working group should or could look into the balance between creating more complexity and establishing a new layer of procedure or mechanisms with the added value. So it's a cost/benefit analysis.

If we take out the added value, this thought gets lost. So I'm unsure that this change would be really meaningful. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So Jorge, could we look to the structure of the sentence maybe if we are to keep this part? If you can please read Japan's comment in the chat, and we can get to this later. I really was hoping that we can do one full reading of the communique, and we only have 12 minutes now. So let's keep this highlighted and continue with our discussion. And I have Kavouss, that is new hand, right?

IRAN: Yes, new hand. Manal, we have to look into the structure of the sentence. The beginning is some GAC members, not all. So either we don't change that if Japan is not insisting on that, or we have to change that and delete added value, because it is some GAC members but not all GAC members. And some is uncountable number. Maybe one or maybe two or maybe three. It's not several, it's not many, it's not overwhelming. Some. So

we have to do that one. So I have difficulty. If Japan agrees not to delete that, maybe as it is, I have no problem. If somebody has no problem with that, I have no problem to delete it as well. Because sentence starts out as some members.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I hope I am reflecting accurately what Japan intended to say which I believe the referral is to the structure of the sentence and not an objection to the added value, per se. And I was revisiting this because each time I read the sentence I stop here so maybe because I'm not a native speaker, but I can see where Japan is coming from. But again, that said it's a minor issue, we can look at it maybe during the break. I would like to move on to read other parts that are new to the text, and we have only 10 minutes for this session remaining.

So it would be helpful, Fabien, if we're able to clean this text since it's almost agreed with the exception of as well as until we revisit it during the following session.

Jorge, sorry, go ahead. Is this a new hand? Okay. Old hand, then let's move on. Sorry, I can see hand from attendees, so if you can please let me know if we're having requests from GAC members. And now move to go the EPDP text, can we scroll a little -- yeah, this part there was an addition by the US.

So let me read the paragraph from the beginning: GAC leaders and topic lead will continue to coordinate inter-sessional work on the high interest topics using the GAC's scorecard as the basis. So the US added using the scorecard as the basis and with your permission, Vernita, I suggest we add the word GAC as well so it's the GAC scorecard, if okay with you and if okay with everyone, of course.

So any objections to the added text? If not, then let's move on to the EPDP section, and this is new text. So EPDP and need to evolve. Again, it's not reading well to me but let's move beyond the title. The GAC small group highlighted the need for any final Phase 2 recommendations to include an effective mechanism for the SSAD to evolve including in response to future legal guidance. Such evolution should be consistent with the Phase 2 policies recommendations, particularly with regard to to the topic of what categories of disclosures become subject to automated responses.

Then under the title EPDP and legal/natural data accuracy, the text reads: GAC would request the board to obtain an update from the GNSO as soon as possible on its progress toward developing a specific plan to continue the policy development process to address the unresolved issues related to the distinguishing between natural and legal entities and ensuring

data accuracy. Such future policy efforts should start no later than 30 days following publication of the Phase 2 EPDP final recommendations and conclude within six months. Further, we note that the GAC and other advisory committees such as the SSAC and ALAC should participate in any scoping or terms of reference to for future efforts.

If we can scroll down, please: Data controllership for key data processing activities such as disclosure. And the text read: The GAC expects more clarity on the status and role of each of the data controllers and processors in the SSAD model. To this end, the GAC ICANN or ICANN org and the contracted parties complete the respective data protection agreements between them as soon as possible so that they can be shared in a timely manner and support the irt in its implementation activities.

Then we have the title explore anonymized email solution, and the text reads the use of anonymized email may be a solution to protecting the registrant's identity while serving some of the legitimate domain name registration data access seekers' purposes. We therefore suggest a feasibility legal study to guide the availability of a publicly accessible anonymized email by the contracted parties.

And there is a title background: Under which the text reads: Temporary specification for gTLD registration data specifically recognized that: ICANN's mission directly involves facilitation of third party processing for legitimate and proportionate purposes related to law enforcement, competition, consumer protection, trust, security, stability, resiliency, malicious abuse, sovereignty, and rights protection. ICANN is required by section 4.68E of the bylaws subject to applicable laws to use commercially reasonable efforts to enforce its policies relating to registration directory services including by working with stakeholders to explore structural changes to improve accuracy and access to generic top level domain registration data as well as considering safeguards for protecting such data.

Moreover, the temporary special case principles for processing required that data shall be accurate and if necessary, be current as appropriate to the purposes for which they are processed. And accuracy I think all these are experts from the reference text. If we can scroll down please.

The environment also consistent with the GAC's -- requirement is consistent with the GAC advice in its Abu Dhabi communique which recalled the 2007 GAC WHOIS principles recognizing the need [reading] hence, data accuracy is called for to facilitate ICANN's mission for consistency with GDPR, the expectations of

the EPDP Phase 1 team and prior GAC advice. Regarding anonymized emails, the EPDP received legal guidance that pseudonymization is useful privacy enhancing technique [reading] this technique may be used under approach circumstances.

So is this the end of the text? If we can scroll down to make sure this is the end of this section.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Confirmed yes, this is the end of the text.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. I see Georgios Tselentis' hand up, please go ahead.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thank you. Georgios Tselentis for the European Commission, and thank you and apologies for all this long text that has to be inserted at these early hours, for Europe at least. I want to also highlight the there is another part which is relevant to that which is following past GAC advice which is further down the text. It is related to the topic but this is up to you, Manal. I think we can visit that as we go sequentially. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So under which next I'm sorry, where is the remaining text? Is it further down?

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: It is follow-up from previous advice, so chapter 6 and related to the PDP and again here, we make reference to the San Juan communique where we had EPDP related text, and this is related to the topics that we present here. I was not sure where exactly to put it in the communique, and I ask you just to confirm that we did correctly put it there -- we did it correctly to put it there.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Again, I haven't read it but I think if it's new text, even if referring to previous GAC advice, then maybe it should be under topics of importance to the GAC. Because I believe under follow-up on previous GAC advice, it has to be just reiteration of an exact previous GAC advice. And I hope this works for you and I hope this aligns with the understanding of GAC members as well.

So we're past the hour, and we have a 30 minute break so maybe if okay, Georgios, you can look into moving this text under issues of importance to the GAC.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Fine with me. If you confirm this is the place it should go, then I will do so.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So this is my suggestion. I stand to be corrected by GAC members if they feel differently or yourself, of course. And that's why I'm suggesting to revisit during the break. But I think it's more relevant to issues of importance to the GAC. So -- yes, Georgios.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Manal, if I may, hesitance in the background which is quite extensive and we put it there, I don't know if you should put it in the end or beginning, we just wanted to have some support for what we are having as issues which were presented in the WHOIS topic session at the GAC session. Also the background of the first part of the text that you read, whether it should go at this particular part of the communique or not.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So it's quite a long text and I think everyone needs a second read so maybe we can benefit from part of the break so that everyone reads the text again and maybe come with a better view on where to allocate everything, if okay with you, Georgios.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Yes, Manal. Thanks.

IRAN: Manal, I request Fabien to put the text I said yesterday and the small one I spent to the chat channel for Fabien to put it in the work stream 2 after the text of proposed yesterday by Russia and put this in a way that people could have a look during the break. So could Fabien kindly put it there in order to be seen by everybody in an appropriate manner. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Kavouss, and I see Fabien's hand up. So Fabien, please.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Manal. Kavouss, I have tried to clarify with you in the chats whether there were two pieces of text you wanted to insert one you sent in email yesterday and one you sent today via our chat. So I would appreciate if you could clarify whether those two texts were complementary or your recent text in the chat was to replace what you shared via email. Thank you.

IRAN: Can I clarify?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Go ahead, Kavouss.

IRAN: The text that was sent in an email to everybody, to yourself and to Fabien is a text and the one I sent this morning is in addition to that, that means the actions saying that these GAC members therefore. So that is that. So both of them are to be there, and one last part is the actions required.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So I see Fabien working on reflecting that you said on the screen. Fabien, please.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: If we can scroll down a little bit so we see the entirety of the end of that text, two perhaps that were just added. Kavouss, may I ask you to confirm that this is what the entire text that you would like to see in this section.

IRAN: I'm sorry, Manal. Fabien may not have properly grasped what I said. What I sent yesterday was the text in the email --

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Which is the first paragraph, right?

IRAN: No, it is not --

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: The paragraph on the screen.

IRAN: The paragraph on the screen but before that, wait a minute, this is a beginning -- could you please kindly, Fabien put the text I sent in email? Because we could not say depriving individuals. There is an introductory part to the text in the email.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Sorry. Kavouss, may I display the email you sent to verify we are talking about the same theme I have tried to extract what I understood was the communique text in your email but I may be wrong. Could you confirm that --

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Or maybe -- Manal, speaking here. Maybe Kavouss you could resend the exact text as you would like it to appear on the screen to Fabien to we can make sure we have the right text at the beginning of the next session.

IRAN: Yes, I would do that.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. Okay. Then it's time for break now. I'm sorry we took eight minutes from your break, so please enjoy and be back at half past. Thank you everyone. This session is concluded.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]