
ICANN68 | Virtual Policy Forum – GAC Communique Drafting (2/5)
Wednesday, June 24, 2020 - 15:00 to 16:00 MYT

GULTEN TEPE: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone.

Welcome to the ICANN68 virtual meeting for the communique drafting session on Wednesday, 24th of June. We will not do roll call today but GAC member of members' attendance will be available in the annex of the communique and minutes. In case a member does not have the ability to raise hand or see names of other panelists, we advise you to leave the room and join again with the link that was sent to you.

GAC members who have the ability to rename themselves by entering names, surname, country or delegation. If you have used a different email address, you will not be promoted or able to speak. If you would like to ask a question or make a comment, please type it in by starting and ending sentence by 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 and questions live during the 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 use the both Zoom and the interpretation platform operated by Congress Rental Network. Attendees encouraged to download the application following the instructions in the Zoom chat or from meeting details available on the GAC agenda website page. 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, you will be given permission to unmute your microphone. When speaking make sure to mute all other devices, including the CRN application. Please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English. Please also speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. To read the real-time 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 your reference.

With that, leaving the floor to Manal Ismail, GAC chair. Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Gulden, and welcome back everyone. This is, as Gulden mentioned, our second communique drafting session, it is scheduled for an hour. And thank you, Fabien, for getting the communique on the screen. And thanks to those who started filling in the text, really appreciate it. I know this was a parallel task to the sessions that were already ongoing so very much appreciated. I saw some text from Luisa and Jorge for subsequent procedures. I'm not sure if there are any further text.

So I think we can go directly to issues of importance with anything new at the beginning, Fabien? If not, then let's go to the issues of importance.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Manal, nothing to report at the beginning of the communique. If maybe the comment that the leadership had on the reference to the ICANN68 GAC -- the minutes.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes indeed. Thank you for the reminder. And I hope -- do we have Kavouss in the room? Just checking because he was the one who...

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: I see Kavouss in the list of participants.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. So just for the benefit of everyone, and then we can wait to see if there are comments. We discussed the point of referencing the minutes during one of the breaks and during the GAC leadership and support staff and thought maybe referencing the transcripts would be faster and more accurate and I know -- it will be faster, more accurate, it will not be run by the board so it will not delay our issuing of the communique. So I hope this is an acceptable proposal coming from the GAC leadership. Any comments?

Kavouss, can you please let me know if you are in the room and can hear us? If not. Then maybe we can make sure this is brought to his attention. So thank you, and thank you Denmark for flagging this during the first session.

Now moving to the topics of importance to the GAC. First we have the subsequent rounds of new gTLD, again with thanks to Luisa and Jorge, the text reads the GAC prioritized consideration of policy issues related to subsequent rounds of new gTLDs during ICANN68, notably by devoting three GAC sessions to this topic, reviewing the GAC scorecard and engaging in the GNSO new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP working group, the GAC wishes to thank the SubPro PDP working group co-chairs for their participation in GAC sessions on this topic and recognizes

the extensive and diligent work of the SubPro working group to deliver the final report.

The GAC considered an update from the SubPro PDP working group co-chairs on work conducted since ICANN68, in particular consideration by the working group of the inter-sessional compilation of individual GAC members input, and the SubPro PDP working group timeline. The GAC notes that the draft final report is expected to be posted for public comment in July 2020 for 40 days.

Some GAC members expressed concerns with the use of a standard 40-day public comment proceeding for a topic of high priority to the GAC and the community -- and the ICANN community. The SubPro PDP working group co-chairs noted such concerns while confirming that the final report will be delivered to the GNSO council at the latest by the end of this calendar year.

The SubPro PDP working group discussed -- sorry, discussed two pending topics during ICANN68 and provided an update to the GAC. One, private resolutions of string contentions, predictability framework for next rounds of new gTLDs.

Regarding auctions as a private mechanism to resolve string contentions, some GAC participants expressed concerns in light of prior GAC positions on the issue asking why other options have not been further considered by the working group. As to mechanisms to provide for predictability to applicants in future round, work group co-chairs flagged to the PDP working group recommends establishing a new predictability framework along with a new standing predictable implementation review team, SPIRT and noticed that the creation of a spirt may add complexity and raised concerns on its constituency 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.

GAC vice chairs provided overview of the topics identified by the GAC during ICANN67, applicant support, closed generics, public interest commitment, global public interest, GAC early warnings GAC advice and community based applications.

Some GAC members expressed the view that lack of a formal PDP working group recommendation on the delegation of closed generics would imply that the relevant board resolution from the 2012 round would still apply. Additionally, while supporting a new round of new gTLD in principle, some GAC members recalled the importance of a cost/benefit analysis being conducted prior to the next round. GAC leader and topic

leads will continue to coordinate inter-sessional work on the high interest topics. The agreed next step is to develop GAC consensus input to the public comment period expected in July 2020 on the PDP working group final report. Interested GAC members are encouraged to consult the GAC scorecard on subsequent rounds of new gTLD and to approach GAC topic leads in order to contribute on any of the relevant policy topics. So if we can go back to the beginning and let me open the floor and ask if there are any comments.

GULTEN TEPE:

Yes, we received a comment in the chat box from Russian delegation. We propose to add an item on the need to continue work on topic of workstream 2 that are relevant for GAC.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Russia, noted. So like we did with the IGO protections, I think we need to factual sentences, indicating the topics that have been discussed during the session and I see Kavouss' hand up. Please go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Thank you, Manal. I have one comment and one proposal. The comment is about this famous spirt, I would like that to say some GAC members say that may create, it totally destroys the

way that GAC as an advisory committee act on the interests of the government on the public policy issues. In the government bylaws, two distinct paths. One is the [indiscernible] proposed recommendations and two, the advice, from the advisory committee which is [indiscernible] our advice is to go to the ICANN without any intermediate and without any other mechanism to ICANN board and ICANN consider and there is a criteria how to agree with that and if opposed to that or not agree with that GAC consensus advice with opposition of 60 percent, then it will come back and then there's another mechanism they have to sit down to see how this problem should be resolved. Only GAC and ICANN, no other intermediary.

So I have serious difficulty with these terms and with this provisions and difficulties that it may add complexity. The third line from the bottom, would totally modify the current procedure as contained in the bylaw. Would modify the current course of actions and procedure as contained in the bylaw.

I would like to know who in the GAC would like to have this, to create this spirit, that whatever advice we provide it goes to the ICANN board and then ICANN board will give that one to the spirit -- we don't want to pronounce any other mechanism, it is up to the board when receives the GAC advice to search and look whether there is a need inside the board members how to

proceed but don't want to proceed a mechanism for that and that is a change of the bylaw and the change of the bylaw, it's a fundamental bylaw and there are procedures in power so I don't agree with this course of action. Would modify.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kavouss. So I believe some is just to be cautious, the reference to some, and I think the language was already not in support of this review team but you want more stronger explicit language.

I see Jorge's hand up as well. Please, go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Thank you, Manal. This is Jorge Cancio, for the record. Just let me elaborate a little bit on this sentence. So we had a discussion in the GAC sessions on this SPIRT. And in the discussion at least my recollection is there were two kind of arguments and some were raised by myself. The first was the complexity and good governance argument which raised doubted whether this instrument really adds an added value which compensates for the additional layer of complexity created, and this is addressed by the sentence where it said that it may add complexity and also by the last sentence

of this paragraph that if established, the new mechanism needs to be lean, inclusive and transparent.

The second, and I believe this is where Kavouss was leaning, was also that this complexity may or could have the potential of affecting the roles and responsibilities of different players including the GAC according to the acting bylaws and this is why we drafted this as raised concerned on its consistency.

So I really think that this would cover these inputs and these concerns with that proposed language. Because in the end we didn't have a conclusive and exhaustive discussion on this, and the spirit is still something under discussion in the PDP working group. So we don't have a proposal where we could really nail down concerns as grave as Kavouss was formulating, especially considering that even in the case of forming part of the final recommendations of the PDP working group, it has to go through many layers of decision and the GNSO council and then the ICANN board and in any case, at least my understanding is that under no circumstances it can change a fundamental bylaw because it's impossible as a matter of law.

So I would really urge to keep the original language in case it is needed to nuance it but not to jump to conclusions which are still a bit far away from the moment we're at. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much Jorge and Kavouss. After hearing from Jorge the clarification, would you be good with deleting the text in blue?

Kavouss, please, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Do you hear me? Yes, I am not convinced of the argument given by Jorge, with all due respect to him. I think he said that at the end nothing will change because fundamental bylaw is fundamental bylaw. But this provokes the modifications, if Jorge insists, but I don't know what members would [indiscernible] our role be even lesser, maybe some people would like that but, I would suggest that some GAC members expressed serious concerns that concerns about creation of this spirit due to the fact that it would add complexity, serious concerns. Some GAC members, not noted, expressed serious concerns -- please replace noted by expressed serious concerns on the creation of spirit due to the fact that such creation would add complexity on the current procedure -- add complexity on the current procedure. These GAC members also raised -- and then also raised concerns on its consistencies with the bylaw. Raised concerns on I say consistencies with existing roles and responsibilities. And raised serious concerns on its -- okay.

This is the minimum, after hearing Jorge, we are not noting something, we are expressing the concerns, and that's the situation and two concerns, one is complexity, add are more layer, and the other, consistency with the bylaw, which is very important. This is the minimum, Manal, I don't want to be pushed or pressed or obliges to accept less than this. This is the minimum. Otherwise, I would say we are against such creation. But these are the concerns and concerns are to be expected. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. Kavouss. Let me propose something quick for you and everyone to think about and then will give the floor to Vincent from France. Because I understand the topic is still under discussion, so it's not finalized. So maybe a middle ground would be some GAC members expressed serious concerns that the creation of a spirt if adopted may do so and so.

So again, this is for everyone to think about. And meanwhile, let me give Vincent the floor and I see your hand again, Kavouss.

VINCENT GOUILLART: Thank you very much, Manal. Can you hear me okay?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, go ahead.

VINCENT GOUILLART: Fantastic this is Vincent Gouillart, French ministry of foreign affairs, for the record. While I hope I'm not coming too late because seems we're already heading toward the middle ground but anyway, there are some general arguments that I would like to tell the GAC. And for this I will once again speak in French. Thank you.

(Through interpreter) I will give you a minute to get your headphones. I wouldn't be quite as pessimistic as my distinguished colleagues Kavouss. However, it is clear that the proposal to set up this spirit mechanism could be an issue for France. And it would be in competition with the tools that the GAC has at its disposal.

First of all, the consensus advice of the GAC. I have the feeling that this proposal is part of a general effort of the working group to streamline the early warning and recourse mechanisms and that is useful and something we want, something we can see in the recommendations of the work group in this mechanism, spirit mechanism, it can be noticed in the GAC advice, seen in the rules and in the [indiscernible] as well, but I am not certain that the streamlining goes in the right direction. I have the feeling

that the working group is trying to limit the tools at its disposal or at the disposal of various communities or at the disposal of the ICANN community, and France believes that it would be good for several parts of the ICANN community to have different tools at their disposal for new situations whenever they come up, whether before or after the new round.

And I think we shouldn't try to limit those tools too much, the proposals of the working group are going too far. In my opinion, for us we need to keep flexibility in case of unforeseen events and also we need to ensure already different mechanisms to available to the entire community and to the different structures. I think it is a condition of the multi-stakeholder model that we have these tools at our disposal. The GAC has consensual advice, the board can publish voluntary PICs, and I think there are other tools perhaps. I don't know the ICANN system as well as some of you might know it so it's good to want to streamline the process and make it more visible, both tools has the spirit but I think the current proposals of the working group are going too far and I think there is a risk to the community as as a whole to not be able to face unforeseen circumstances.

In the substance of the community, it would be easier this way. So I would like to propose something else for the text of the

communique on this point, perhaps it's no longer necessary given that we have been discussing Kavouss' proposal and maybe it suits everyone already. But I would like to propose that we rewrite the GAC appreciates the efforts of the working group to streamline the [indiscernible] mechanisms, but shouldn't affect negatively the ability of GAC and community to intervene at different assumptions of the future new gTLD round and we could refer to GAC texts, I don't think I'm saying something new, I thinking arguments have been expressed in the SubPro texts -- that was France's general position and I would be happy to discuss this with you all. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Sorry, I was on mute. Thank you very much, Vincent. I have Kavouss and I also have a request from Jeff to clarify a few points to make sure there is no misunderstanding. So Kavouss please, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Just one or two sentences, (speaking French)

I would like to thank you sincerely Vincent for your intervention and I would like to present some proposals -- Efforts to add serious concerns if the spirit is created and instead of may, could act. Manal, if you repeat yourself, I don't know if you want to

have if created. Some GAC members expressed concerns on the creation of the spirt, if it is created, you said if created after spirt, Fabien, please, could you put created which could, instead of may -- which could add -- instead of may -- which could add complexity to the current procedure and delete and also raise serious concerns because we have already covered, don't need to repeat that. And potential inconsistencies, with the existing role and responsibility of the ICANN bylaws.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Just a second, Kavouss. So that we reflect the text that you are proposing accurately.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Potential inconsistency. Allow me to finish, I want to come back again. With respect to what Jeff is saying, it is his view. I would say it could increate inconsistency and with respect to my French colleague -- we want to express some GAC members there are serious concerns about this situation in create and we say could add complexity and could have inconsistency, neither Jeff or me, not legal persons, more technical person even with legal background, so we leave it to the empowered community to see and ICANN bylaws whether it creates inconsistencies or not. I have no problem with the French proposal but as a added at the end of this sentence. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kavouss. And just one minor thing in the text -- and thank you for accepting the proposal. So some GAC members expressed serious concerns that the creation of a spirt, if adopted or any other word so that we can just avoid using -- okay created twice -- and then I will give now the floor to Jeff.

Again, he kindly offered to provide a clarification, it's not a certain proposition, just to give him the floor to make sure we have the right understanding and then we will continue our discussion.

So Jeff please, go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thank you Manal. I know this is a little unusual in that non-GAC members usually don't participate in these so thank you very much for giving me the floor.

A couple notes. The first is that if you look at the initial report and a number of other products from the working group, you will see that other options have been considered for string contention. So I understand that the GAC may not want auctions or private mechanisms but I think to make it a little bit more accurate you might want to say something other than why

other options have not been further considered, as they have been.

And the second thing on the, SPIRT Team, it's not a decision making body, it is purely advisory to the GNSO. There is no current procedure right now when a change wants to be introduced. So in 2012 when there were changes that wanted to be made to the program, there was no process, ICANN board and staff just kind of made it up on an ad hoc base. Some of the changes went out to public comment, some didn't. Some went to the GNSO, some didn't. Some of them had created some or got some technical advice; some didn't either.

So I just want to make it clear that the SPIRT Team is designed to give advice to so the GNSO, and it has no decision making authority, it doesn't take the place of any other process that is there and that's in the text within the working group recommendation.

And I apologize, I know I'm not supposed to be commenting on the GAC language, I just want to understand why there are concerns and to hopefully address them, you know, it can't make policy and that is in the language of the recommendation, it can't ever supplant or -- can never take away the ability of GAC or anyone else to provide advice, that is also in the language as

well. And we're still in the process of deciding or coming up with the exact (no audio) at the end of the day, it's not a decision making body and in fact it doesn't provide advice or anything else directly to the board itself -- [overlapping conversations]. Sorry about that, I will stop now.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jeff so two factual information well noted that other options has been considered and spirit is an advisory -- a comment from Morocco: We agree with Kavouss' opinion that accepting the spirit mechanism means opportunity to the GNSO to [indiscernible] process, amend bylaws and opportunity for GAC to express a clear opinion on these issues.

So thank you, Morocco. I have Kavouss and then maybe I can go back to France for -- if there is a specific proposal as I don't see anything else reflected on the screen if there is something specific, please be ready take the floor after Kavouss.

Kavouss go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. I understand the explanation Jeff said that this is intended to be an advisory entity for GNSO therefore it is not necessary in the GAC communique we refer to the need or

otherwise or comment that the advisory entity GNSO, it's up so the GNSO if they want advisory entity they can but they have to go to the bylaws to see if they are able to have -- because the structure of all SO/AC's are very carefully legally explained and expressed and stipulated in the bylaws, so it's not up to us to talk about the bylaw needs GNSO to have advisory.

If they want to have advisory they can go to the ICANN board and say we would like to have an advisory entity. Is there any need to modify the bylaws they can -- so not up for us to talk about in the communique, I do not agree with that explanation and this is a very important issue with we have to have that one and look at all the legal issues of this. This is a GAC and we have to express our concerns about this situation and I change the language from need to could and put potential and so on, so forth. So that is that.

And then whether you add the whatever proposed by my distinguished colleagues from France I don't have a problem but I have to look at that one in the same text at the end of that moreover and add what Vincent mentioned and we have to look into the language he used. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Kavouss. So again, please consider the text as it stands on the screen, and I see a question from [indiscernible] to Jeff. I hope Jeff can answer in the chat. I think this is a communique discussion so let's keep it as such.

Jorge, please, go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Thank you so much, Manal. And appreciating the factual information received before, I would like to make frankly an amendment to the text we had on resolution procedures which would change the tense we are using and instead of asking why other options have not been further considered -- because it's true that other options were considered in the past -- the clarification would be why other options are not being further considered. Because it's the presence situation, what we saw on Tuesday early-morning hours in Europe was that they were no longer on the table.

So I think that with that, we got it more factually right. And on the other piece, on the spirt, if we have more community sessions, I would humbly suggest that we take some time and think it over and maybe come back later. Thank you, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jorge. A fair ask, and we still have other sessions to finalize the text. So this paragraph now reads regarding auctions as a private mechanism to resolve string contentions, some GAC participants expressed concerns, in light of prior GAC positions on this issue -- 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, work group co-chairs flagged that the PDP working group recommends establishing a new predictability framework along with a new standing predictability implementation review team (spirt) and noted initial community support of such recommendation.

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.

So it's for your consideration we can get back to the text later. That said, any other comments on any other parts of the text?

If we can scroll down and if not, do we have any other parts that need to be reviewed, Fabien?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Manal, this is Fabien speaking. I believe we were expecting text from the underserved region working group, but it's not inserted yet so I believe there is no new text added.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. I see a comment from Cathrin saying we have text on DNS abuse. So is it possible to insert this text? We still have 11 minutes. And meanwhile I have a question for you, Kavouss, because I was not sure you were in the Zoom room at the beginning of the session and I see your hand up so I will give you the floor afterwards.

On the board meeting, we agreed earlier today to make reference to the minutes of the meeting, and during one of the breaks the leadership and the support staff discussed in light also of what Denmark suggested in the northern the reference could be made to the transcripts being more accurate and being faster and it will save us the hassel of going back and forth between the drafting and the board, so run this specific part of the minutes by the board.

So I hope it's okay with everyone and with you to to just change the reference to the minutes to the transcripts. Is this okay, Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, I have seen that text in the chat yesterday by Denmark. And I was in the chat up to 11:30 Geneva time -- also always present, omnipresent, have not been sleeping, lunch or not lunch, I don't talk about that -- I think a reference to the minutes in one way hyperlink, I have no problem to that one.

I would like to ask Jorge please any development of the text that we have agreed -- the part by the way, in the square brackets, which was a redundancy, put should be deleted, no longer grammatically accurate and also raises serious concerned should be deleted and if Jorge wants to revise, always open but request him kindly to share with me on email before being put on the screen because I don't want it says this has been agreed in the [indiscernible] group and so on, so forth.

As I said, I'm busy in the other meeting until 1:00 Geneva time but no problem, I always systemically open my emails I have two computers, and I open one for [indiscernible] and one for emails, but that is, Manal, the minimum we could agree. I wanted to help as much as possible. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Kavouss and I didn't mean you were not in the room, I meant I try to get your explicit confirmation and that's why I'm asking, to make sure I get your explicit

confirmation on something you proposed and something we are proposing to change. So thank you for the confirmation, and indeed the text between brackets is for deletion, we just keep it until the very end to make sure everyone is okay. Do we have the text on DNS abuse?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Manal, we have introduced the text in the follow-up and previous advice section of the communique, and I understand this is suggested by Cathrin with other European stake [indiscernible]

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay and this text reads the GAC heard presentations on the impact of COVID-19 related DNS abuse and on efforts of authorities to counter abuse and provide awareness raising materials for consumers and businesses. The presenters noted the efforts of registries and registrars to address DNS abuse, both pro actively and reactively as well as the initiatives by SSAC and ICANN o CTO to support the detection of abuse and collect and share best practices. The GAC commends these efforts which have contributed to greater cyber security, to preventing fraud and to preserving public health and safety, likely saving lives.

The GAC notes that new efforts to tackle DNS abuse should not replace but rather complement existing initiatives to improve accuracy of registration data such as accuracy reporting system and to implement policy on privacy and proxy services which are currently on hold despite having been recommended by a number of review teams and endorsed by previous GAC advice. The GAC calls on the board to implement existing advice and on the ICANN community to seize this opportunity and give new impulse to its different work streams on DNS abuse, aiming for security, safety and the protection of individual and public rights and freedoms.

So any comments on this part in the remaining five minutes?
And thanks to Cathrin and drafting and other penholders as well.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

I have no problem with the text. I think we can adopt that. There is nothing here that is not reflect the [indiscernible] way of thinking. While I have the floor. In my previous intervention, I in no way wanted the to undermine the extensive work and guidance and activities and tireless effort that has been done by Jeff and by Cheryl. We really appreciate them wholeheartedly. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kavouss. Noted, and I hope Jeff is still in the room and has heard you. I see a comment from Russia in the chat. So actually it doesn't have to do with the DNS abuse text but rather on workstream 2 proposal in issues of importance to the GAC. So I think Russia, this is text proposed for the communique? If yes, Fabien, if we can -- is there a way to take the text from the chat and --

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: This is now integrated in section 4 of the communique.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So the text reads GAC members can you do issues related to the implementation of workstream 2 recommendations that are of interest or directly impact the GAC and discussed how those might be assessed, prioritized and implemented in an effective manner and note needs to continue work with workstream topic which cause concerns among some GAC members.

Thank you very much, Russia. Might need to fine tune but -- Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I fully support the text proposed by Russia. In fact in some of the recommendation of workstream 2, some course of action

already there and [indiscernible] it is mentioned if the procedure could not be implemented practically there is a need to look at the other form of actions, and I think the text of Russia is consistent with that report of the [indiscernible] workstream 2, therefore, we support that text.

Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Kavouss. I think we're at the hour, we need to conclude. And thank you everyone. So this concluded the second communique drafting session. It is now time for a 30 minute break and please be back in the Zoom room in time for the next meeting which is our bilateral with the board starting 16:30 Kuala Lumpur time, 1830 UTC.

Thank you all very much. The meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]