
HYDERABAD – GAC Communique drafting
Tuesday, November 08, 2016 – 13:30 to 18:00 IST
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you all for being here, coming here, we need to start. While you have received the latest draft of the communique, there are two things that I beg your attention on because we need to somehow have a clear idea what to do with these two things.

One is participation of the GAC in the charging organization and Cross-Community Working Group on auction proceeds. And the other thing is what do we do with the SSR review team where we are supposed to endorse or not put some candidates forward as GAC as one of the seven SO/ACs.

So, to start with the auction proceeds working group, as Olga mentioned already earlier, she has participated in the drafting team. And, basically, the question that we should -- the thing that we should decide is whether or not we want to adopt a charter and sign up to that Cross-Community Working Group. And then we would become a member of that Cross-Community Working Group.

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.

You know, what this means from the CCWG that we've been working on as part of the transition.

And we would identify -- need to identify up to five members from the GAC that would participate in this Cross-Community Working Group as members. Of course, everybody is free to participate as participants, and the members would have voting rights on this.

And maybe let me give the floor then to Olga. Just one important point about this. I think the guiding question is there a public interest in this working group? And, to avoid any misunderstandings, this working group -- the CCWG is not going to be set up according to the charter for actually deciding what's going to be done with the money. So it's not about allocation of the money. But it's only -- but this is an important issue to define the process in which -- which will be used to actually allocate the money.

So it's only the process. So those are hopeful or fearful that that would be a way to actually allocate money, no. This is not the case. It's only about defining the process. So the question is: Do you think that it is a public policy issue that the GAC is there as part of those who refine the process about what is going to happen with the money or not?

So let me give the floor to Olga, because she has been following this. And she has a proposal what the GAC should do that we should quickly spend a few minutes and see whether we could accept such a proposal, whether there's no objection.

If there would be an objection, then we would need to work on this electronically in the coming weeks to get to an agreement whether or not we would want to participate.

So, Olga, please help us understand the details. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Chair. As our chair mentioned, I participated in the drafting team that prepared the charter for the Cross-Community Working Group.

One thing that the GAC should do now is accept or not the charter. That's the first step.

Then there will be a call for participation in the Cross-Community Working Group where it is expected that each SO and AC that becomes -- that may want to become a chartering organization would appoint up to five members.

The drafting team was chaired by Jonathan Robinson from the GNSO and co-chaired by the ALAC chair is -- help me, please.

Alan Greenberg. Thank you so much. I'm very lazy today. My English is very bad.

And there were three board members participating. I was the only one from the GAC participating. We have members from the NRO, and I think that's it. It was a small group, but quite active.

So the draft -- I think it's a good document. I have circulated it among the leadership team. I don't know if the full GAC has received it. I don't think so. So my suggestion would be that the GAC should be a chartering organization. As our chair mentioned, the purpose of this cross-community working group is defining the rules for assigning the funds. It's not assigning funds. So in that definition, it could be important to have the input and the views from the governmental perspective.

And I heard this morning that our colleague Alice mentioned also that they were part of the working group that she's chairing are interested in being part of that.

So have that in mind, of course. All these working groups are open for global participation and general involvement. So I will stop here. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So the proposal that Olga makes to you is to adopt the charter. Of course, you'd have to give us some time for us to read the charter to make sure that we don't miss anything. But the proposal is that we tend to adopt the charter unless we would find something problematic and think it's in the public interest that the GAC is a chartering organization in that process that is defining the roles for assigning the funds at the next stage.

Iran, you have a request for the floor.

IRAN: Yes, briefly. In the Alice group I raised the issue that we consider, once the charter is approved, once the GAC becomes a chartering organization, which I don't see any problem, why not be -- it cannot be -- why we cannot be a member. But I raised the question that the group, which had been established, allocating some part of that money for the outreaching of countries, for underserved, and so on and so forth. And that was supported by the one board member who was in that meeting. And they said that, in order to do that, you must participate. That means GAC should participate in that -- in the working group. And they encouraged me that, if you want to say something, come to that group or if other GAC members want. If you don't come, your voice is not heard. This is quite clear. So

we are talking of that part of it. Not the entire issue. Entire is different.

For allocation of some part for these underserved countries and so on and so forth, there are ways and means to do that. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. So you would support that we join this working group as a chartering organization. I see France.

FRANCE: Yeah. Thank you, Chair. We think GAC should definitely participate in this working group as well as a chartering organization. As Olga said, it's about the process really about how to allocate the auction proceedings. So it would not actually be about deciding who or what organization are going to be selected.

I think it's very important for GAC to participate to make sure public interest is going to be taken into account in the process, for instance, taking into account diversity, underserved region, digital divide, or, as Kavouss said, maybe outreach to some countries. And, of course, it would depend also if we actually have some GAC members that would want to be involved, would volunteer to be members of the group. That would be a

condition. But, if we manage to find that, France will support that GAC becomes a chartering organization. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. African Union Commission.

AFRICAN UNION COMMISSION: Thank you. We had this discussion with the Underserved Regions Working Group and also support what France has said and other colleagues, the importance of the GAC being part of this cross community working group to determine the process of how the auction proceeds should be allocated. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Does anybody have serious concerns about us being part of this working group? No. Egypt.

EGYPT: Not concerns. But also to remind ourselves that we mentioned this in the GAC secretariat funding as well. So we need to really understand the process and be there for the underserved regions and the GAC secretariat, too.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Good point. So may I take it that, basically, we have the view that the GAC should become a chartering organization but that we don't put this down on black and white but we say -- we give each other 14 days' time to go through the charter because we haven't really -- all of us haven't really had the opportunity. And, if during this period, nobody comes up with a concern that we would then need to discuss after 14 days, that would be the decision that we would join-- this group. Then the question is, of course, how many and who would be the members from the GAC in that group? I don't think that we have much time to discuss this now because we will have to -- you will have to think about it. And I guess you can express on the email list, if you're interested in participating. And we'll try to sort this out also in the next coming two weeks or so. There is not such an immediate deadline. I don't know what exact deadline is for defining that the members -- because there will be a deadline. Is there one already, or is that not yet -- Olga, do you know that?

OLGA CAVALLI: What we should do is send a message that we accept the draft. That's the next step.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: That's the first step. Okay. Yes, Iran.

IRAN: It is not immediate establishing of that group. The idea is that it takes -- and I told to the Board member that we are very busy for this remaining part of the Work Stream 2. And she said that, yes, the only thing that she agreed with the concept of the group and then we have time. So we shouldn't rush. But the only thing we have to tell them clearly is that yes, we are interested as a chartering organization and we will provide the membership. Finished. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. So thank you for that clarification. So we are clear with the carrot of 14 days to make sure there really is no problem that we are forgetting now. We will participate in that group as a chartering organization. Thank you. So that's agreed.

Then the second thing is the security, stability, resiliency or whatever the exact name is review team. Where also there, the process, unfortunately, is not yet fully clear because this is the first time that the new bylaws apply. Actually, the call for experts was made before the bylaws applied. And there was a transition in the system during this process. But the situation was we've briefly touched on this that every SO and AC can appoint up to three -- basically, we can recommend seven

people, but the assumption is that if we propose three or less people, that they will be automatically part of that team.

All of us sent around a number of emails on this issue. We have three candidates that have self-declared them as affiliated to the GAC. We are currently looking into to what extent, whether this is actually true and whether -- but this is not a binding condition for the GAC to put these people forward.

We can -- if we think they're affiliated and there's an assessment of ICANN staff about the expertise, whether this -- all the candidates to what extent they fulfill the expertise. But we should get a sense before we leave here about what we intend to do. And from what I hear, that deadlines are like tentative that these things should be established by mid December. The review team should be established by mid December and then get operational by sometime in January. But we should have a common understanding is that do we want to go for more than three? I don't think that that makes sense? I hear some other SOs and ACs are proposing only one or two. That would leave the size of the group, which would be 21 if everybody would come up with three people, which is rather big compared to the previous review teams which were normally around 15-17 people. So we can also decide just to put forward one or two persons in case we would decide. We could also have a look at the so-called independent experts that are not affiliated, which

is something that a little bit has fallen off the thing that, before that, in the previous system up to now where it was the GAC chair with the CEO of ICANN who was basically making the selection out of the candidates.

There were a number of independent people that were chosen that were not affiliated to a particular group. And this time, if everybody brings two or three forward, there will be no space for independent people. And the idea is that they can be consulted on specific issues. So we may think of whether or not we want to put forward other people than the three that self-declared themselves as GAC. We can't go on with this too much. So, basically, the proposal, given the time where we are, is would you agree that the leadership team looks into this a little bit more closely in the coming days and weeks and will make a proposal to you of up to three names with a reasoning behind why we proposed to you these names? And then you could then discuss this electronically and try to agree on this electronically in a certain deadline? If somebody has a strong clear view or clear feeling what we should do or not to guide our work, of course, that is helpful. So let me give you the floor now. Maybe a few delegations.

So, very quickly, tell us whether you think what I have just outlined to you makes sense or whether you want to give us more specific guidance with regard to looking at those who have

self-declared themselves as affiliated to the GAC and what that would need to mean in your perspective or whether you would leave it up to us. And us, within this case would be the group of the chair plus the outgoing and the incoming vice chairs. So that would be 10 people, in fact, that would take care of looking at this. But let me give you the floor to get just a quick feedback to see whether we -- you share this proposal. Iran. Thank you.

IRAN:

Thank you, Chair. We are very happy to leave it in the hands of those 10 people to look into the matter. And, if anybody volunteers or is welcome, provided -- provided that they are available, they are devoted, and they are experts. They participate by action but not by name. I have seen delegates or members even never the name appeared in any of those meetings.

Not only in the chat, not only in the discussion, but even the name. Just a number. That's all. I don't want to disclose names of anybody, but let us tell these people please self-identification, if you really can devote yourself and are available. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. Other views, additional views, support, objections, comments? Can I take that the fact that nobody's wanting to

take the floor, that you basically agree with the proposal? Okay. Thank you. We'll do our best to do some research, of course, with the support of our able support staff and secretariat to come up with something that we think is -- should work out fine.

Okay. With this, I'm happy to now lean back, go to sleep for two hours, and let Tom do all the work on the communique. Well, of course, I'm still here for the next two minutes. No.

So let me give the floor -- hand over the floor to Tom for the communique. We have tried to take in all the contributions. But we have discussed them and also in the light of recent discussions and so on and so forth in particular, for instance, with regard to the IGO issues, what has been going on in the discussions with the Board, with the GNSO, and also some informal discussions that I and a number of others had because people are approaching us and talking to us, we -- this is why we have come with a slightly different proposal with a different proposal and that one, for instance, than what the IGOs have sent us previously. And we'll be happy to explain the reasons. And, of course, we are in your hands.

Also with the two-character codes, somehow we should reflect where our decisions -- or not our decisions. Our discussions with the Board. And also if you want to reflect the -- the decision taken by the Board this morning, and so on. So there may be

some -- have some changes to the text as they have been sent when they were sent because of what has happened since then.

Let me, with this, give the floor to Tom. He will, as usual, go through the document section by section in case -- explain, to what extent it is necessary, why we propose you this text as the start. And then we can go through section by section as a kind of a first reading.

We just note -- We won't go too much into details. We will note whether there is a basic agreement on what is written there goes in the right direction; whether you can -- the text is already fine or we have to refine the text, or whether there' fundamental need for more fundamental discussion because we don't agree with the direction or the scope or whatever.

So this is just -- we will not go into detail. We'll just try to go through the whole text and identify the hot spots, so that will then help us for a second reading to basically see how to -- how to prioritize resources.

So, yes, Iran, please.

IRAN:

Thank you, Chairman.

I just submit for your considerations, all party of the communique is important, but I suggest we start with the GAC advice first, first reading, to give us a little bit of time for reflection to come back. But not the (indiscernible) introduction and fight on the words, and so on, so forth. Go to the essential part, more delicate, more sensitive part with the GAC advice. Go through that one and then come back to the beginning, and the next time go to the second reading for the GAC advice.

This is more important, and not leaving everything to the midnight of any night, either tonight or tomorrow night or whatever.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. I very much appreciate your efforts to help us be efficient. I think that is -- that is -- But I think it's actually -- if we just go -- the first reading. We will not spend more than two minutes, or more than a minute, on every of the initial sections, but just that you get them read out once, and then we can say, okay, this is done. Because then we don't even have to look at this anymore. So this is why I would propose the first reading, we go through it in the way it is written, and then we can basically take aside everything that we know is -- so that helps us also to know how much time we have for the rest. If you don't

object, Iran, then I would prefer to do the first reading in the way the text is written, and just basically hook off the items that we have.

IRAN: But we don't need to read the text word by word. It is time consuming.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. That's a -- So we can -- Yeah. Okay. We don't read it. You just say this is the first, this introduction, and then everybody can read it. If that is -- I'm happy to follow that.

Okay. So let's do it like this.

So Tom will just introduce the parts but will not read it. Will only start read it when it's about the advice section, if that's the proposal.

Okay. Thank you.

Tom, please, go ahead.

TOM DALE: Thank you, Thomas. I think I understand that, I think. And that will save my voice, of course.

The text on the screen is the same as the document that was circulated by me to you on the GAC list about 15 minutes ago; okay? So it incorporates a number of changes that have been put forward by members this morning. So to be clear.

The introductory sections are fairly straightforward. There are sections dealing with the meeting of the Board, which are factual. Meeting with the GNSO. The meeting with the ccNSO. The GAC's meeting with ALAC. The fact of the high-interest topic sessions and the GAC's involvement in them. A note of thanks to our host concerning outreach activities. And a note concerning GAC community engagement and scheduling issues.

Following that format, there is a section on internal matters for the GAC. We have one new member to welcome. The results of the elections for the chair and vice chair are noted.

The section on the BGRI is noted. There are a series of updates that follow from the GAC working group. So I'll go through those. Just scroll through those. Those are factual updates from the working groups.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

So we don't want to read -- we don't want to be read out this part. Okay.

TOM DALE:

Thank you. Good.

There is a statement concerning GAC participation in the NomCom, which was raised by a number of countries this morning. And finally, there is a statement concerning the independent GAC secretariat.

The next section of the communique deals with, as it always has done, as a separate section, with the IANA stewardship transition and enhancing ICANN accountability.

And then there is a statement on -- there is a section on other issues which are as follows: The meeting with the CCT review team, the session -- the plenary session that the GAC conducted on new gTLD policy issues, the briefing that the GAC had and the discussion concerning the review of the trademark clearinghouse, a statement on the .WEB option issue, and just to note, because that was provided by -- I'm sorry. I'm actually not clear. It was either European Commission or Argentina, I think. My apologies whoever supplied that. It was a GAC member, anyway. I didn't make it up.

There is a section on protection of IGO names and acronyms. That's a statement which has been submitted by Peru. And the -
- Yeah. And that's specifically about the letter from the U.N.

Secretary-General to ICANN. And then the section commences on GAC advice to the Board. So should we read this out? Is that correct? Thank you.

The following items of advice from the GAC to the Board have been reached on the basis of consensus as defined in the ICANN bylaws.

Now, that's a statement in accordance with the new bylaws.

The first element of advice in the draft communique is on future gTLDs, policies and procedures, the process and timing. The GAC advises the ICANN Board that it reiterates its advice contained in the Helsinki communique concerning process and timing with regard to development of future gTLD policies and procedures. And the rationale for this advice is the same as that contained in the GAC Helsinki communique, to which the GAC has not yet received any response from the Board.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

I think after every section, we will ask for comments. So any comment on this one. Any problems?

If you don't comment, we assume that you agree with the text.

Iran.

IRAN: I don't know whether it is comment or information. Yes, Board has not look at -- into our advice, which was quite clear, but in the meantime, Board wrote to the GNSO, and GNSO Council wrote to the working group dealing with this new round of the gTLD, and to mention that, okay, before you finishing, can we start to do something? That means clearly they have not taken our advice into account.

So they want to start to open the gTLD, new gTLD, without finishing the study. Whether you want to react or not, that is up to you. This is information from the participation in the group I can put at your disposal.

The reply has not been given but the action of the Board is this one. That means have (indiscernible) communique. They want to start. They ready to push.

So, please, we act or not, it is up to you. Just I wanted to inform you that that is the process.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Iran. But you don't suggest that we change anything in the text. We basically refer, and we wait an answer whether they accept or reject the advice. Is that correct? Okay. Thank you.

TOM DALE: Sorry. China, I believe.

CHINA: Thank you, Chair. Thank you, Tom.

In the part of the GAC participation in the NomCom, I would like to put the name of China in the paragraph because we agreed to the substance made by -- made by Argentina.

Thank you.

TOM DALE: Thank you. That is noted. That section of the communique will be amended.

Thank you.

Unless there are further comments, I'll read out the next section of advice to the Board.

This advice was drafted from the Public Safety Working Group and is substantially the same as the one that was circulated to you in the zero draft two weeks ago. It reads: The GAC advises the ICANN Board to provide written responses to the questions listed in annex one to this communique. And there is a substantial list of questions attached to the communique, as it was to the zero draft a few weeks ago. And the rationale for that is given as you see on the screen.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Comments, questions on this text?

That is not the case. We can move on, I think.

Sorry. Alice, African Union Commission.

AFRICAN UNION COMMISSION: That's on the domain name abuse. We had provided additional text giving dates, asking the ICANN -- ICANN were could have responded at least five weeks prior to the Copenhagen meeting.

I hope that's acceptable. So that we have -- the GAC has time.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Given our experience with data, I would think that that may help to, yeah, clarify the expectation until then.

AFRICAN UNION COMMISSION: Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So if that's not contested, we'll put that date in. That somehow has got lost apparently.

AFRICAN UNION COMMISSION: Thank you.

TOM DALE: Thank you, Thomas.

And, Alice, yes, you did provide that letter this morning and, yes, it was overlooked. At this time of the preparation, I admit to overlooking some things, and I'm sorry.

Now, the next section of GAC advice to the Board deals with two-character country and territory codes at the second level. It reads: The GAC advises the ICANN Board to, one, accept the advice provided in the GAC Helsinki communique with regard to two-character country and territory names at the second level, and, two, deal with this issue in a timely and transparent manner that allows for appropriate interaction between the GAC and the Board and that follows procedures in the bylaws for GAC for dealing with the GAC advice before action is taken by ICANN.

Now, that has been -- been the subject of discussion this morning, you will recall, from the Board concerning the chair resolution. So that's an additional bit of information that is not reflected in the communique at the moment.

Thank you, Thomas.

Okay. Well, I'll complete it by reading the rationale at Thomas's request.

The rationale provided for advice in the Helsinki communique on this matter remains valid with regard to timing and transparency. The Board had not responded to the Helsinki communique at the time of preparing the Hyderabad communique, and this is not (indiscernible) resolution of outstanding issues.

And of course the type B, that's not strictly correct anymore, as of this morning, but that's just left for your discussion at the moment.

Thank you, Thomas.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Iran.

IRAN: Two question. In fact, one comment. I suggest, Tom, you replace in one the word "accept" by "take into account." We don't want we accept or not accept. They have to take into account that. It is not acceptance. This is just editorial.

Still, I'm not clear on the wording of number two. It's quite ambiguous. They may not understand it. Can we -- Can you please further clarify what really want to tell them? To follow the bylaw? They follow the bylaw.

What is the message in number two?

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. I think we have to be cautious about using the word "take into account," because we've had some experience. Take into account doesn't mean follow. So maybe we should -- could use the word "follow" instead of accept because it sounds a little bit more swift. But if we say "take into account," the answer will be "yes, of course we took it into account."

So we should be careful. And that's also something I learn from the Board in the exchanges when I sit in the boardroom, that we need to be very clear about the words we use with regard to the expectation.

So the experience is if we say "take into account," that doesn't mean that we expect that they actually do what we advise.

So if we say "follow," this is -- if we say "follow," it's much clearer what our expectation is. So if "follow" is okay for you, then I think we use the word "follow."

Sorry, your second -- Maybe you continue on your second point that was about the second -- Tom, do you have an answer on that one? On point two.

Could you repeat, Iran, your second point?

IRAN:

My question, my comment was the text is not quite clear. Deal with this issue in a timely and transparent manner. Okay. That allows for appropriate interaction within the GAC and the Board, and that follows procedures in the bylaw.

What do you want to tell them? They do that. They take into account, or whatever, your advice. If they agree, they agree. If they don't agree, they reject. If they reject because it is the consensus advice, they come back to you.

So what we want to tell in number two?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

That was a proposal to express some reflection on the situation, at least in our collection. Correct this if you see this differently.

In this resolution they say they have taken into account the advice, but they haven't informed us -- before taking action this morning, they haven't informed the GAC and said we have taken this into account, we accept the advice, this is how we implement it. Or they haven't also -- they haven't told us whether they accept or reject the advice. Because if they had come back to us and had said, "We reject the advice," there would have been this -- this procedure to talk to us and find a mutually accepted solution before an action is taken.

So this is just a proposal to reflect the situation that we would expect that there's a communication to us about whether they accept or reject the advice before they take a decision. This is -- This is the idea.

First of all, tell us whether at you think that you want to see this reflected or not. And if yes, whether this is an appropriate way to reflect it or whether you want to see it reflected differently. That is the question that we're basically asking you.

Iran.

IRAN:

Why we don't say what you said? It's much better. Rather than this one. This is too much diplomatic and unclear and ambiguous. Exactly what you said, put it in.

Thank you. Don't be shy.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. So Iran -- Iran is proposing we say what I said, whatever that has been. We'll find it on the transcript.

Is that supported by others or not? Is there any objection to making a reference to this?

This seems not to be the case. So we'll try and -- and say it more clearly.

Tom.

TOM DALE: Yes. I've noted that for the next version. Okay. Not a problem.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So we -- Yes, China.

CHINA: Chair, I have a request, because I haven't found the ICANN Board resolution regarding the two-character country or territory codes. I mean, by the ICANN Board.

Could Tom or his colleague circulate ICANN resolution to the mailing list so we can --

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: This resolution has been taken this morning, so it's not -- it's going to be published in the next, I don't know, few hours. But Olof can explain you the actual situation. It was public in the sense that they read the whole resolution at the -- at the board meeting this morning, but it's not yet printed or electronically available.

Olof.

OLOF NORDLING: Please check your inboxes because I distributed the text of the resolution as well as the link to the actual measures in a mail that I sent ten minutes ago.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So we have the text in our mails. Is that right? Of the resolution and of the measures that the resolution is about. Okay. So you can -- in the meantime, then, while we print the document for the second reading, you can have a look at this.

So we will rework that bullet two.

Is there any other comment on this? Is there something missing or is the rationale something that you think is -- European Commission.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Yeah, sorry to come back on this, but it's all -- it's a moving target, obviously. And this was absolutely correct before we saw or knew that the resolution had been taken and before we saw what the resolution says.

From our very, very quick reading, literally in the last minute, and very -- on the diagonal, it seems that the resolution takes into consideration the GAC advice and applies it in the measures to be applied and gives 30 days' advance notice to ccTLD owners and governments who -- who have the ccTLDs.

So it seems to reflect -- It doesn't? Okay. So we read it too quickly.

So my only point was if our comment now in the GAC communique had been completely overtaken, we could say something more along the lines of what you said, because the advice seems to be integrated.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: There are two issues here. One is the procedural issue of what I was saying before, that we expect the Board to come to us, communicate to us and make sure that we are in line if they think they accepted the advice before they take the decision. That is the point that I was trying to make.

If on substance you think -- Because in the view of the Board, the way that the resolution is -- is written, they think that they accepted and implemented the advice, and that's the second step. If the GAC thinks that it's fine, then we will not say that we have a problem with the substance, only with the procedure. In case the GAC thinks that this is not implemented -- if that is accepted, this is not implemented in a satisfactory way and we should have had a discussion about their proposal how to implement it, because we think, or we would -- yeah, then this should have preceded the decision, then we will formulate something.

But let's give each other then time to go through this and then we come back in a second reading. If I get this correctly, because I was reading the measures before. I didn't find the measures after. And Fabien has looked into this a in little bit more detail. This 30-day registration -- pre-registration period was compulsory in the original and is now voluntary in the revised measure, and a few other changes. But, yeah, if those who have the time can look into this a little bit more in detail, and then we need to discuss whether we agree with the way it's been accepted and implemented or whether we have comments to make on -- on the implementation.

Okay.

Any further comments? If not, we'll move to the next part as this is just a quick -- supposed to be a quick reading.

Thank you. Tom.

TOM DALE:

Thank you, Thomas.

The next section of advice deals with protection of IGO names and acronyms. Now, to provide some explanation, there was some draft advice circulated recently by the IGOs concerning this issue for the -- circulated to the GAC list for the GAC's consideration. We obviously still have access to that draft text. But the text in the version of the communique that was circulated was done at the request of the leadership group to reflect discussions with the GNSO and with the Board concerning this issue and the possibility of some further, fresh process. So that's just by way of explanation. I'll read out firstly the text that is in the draft.

The GAC advises the ICANN Board to work with the GAC and the GNSO in facilitating a process in which all parties connect in good faith and in a transparent manner to resolve outstanding differences with regard to protection of IGO acronyms on a permanent basis.

The GAC's initial input to such process would be previous GAC advice.

The proposal sent to the GNSO Council by the Board on 4 October 2016 could be used as part of any compromise agreement that might be reached.

The rationale states that the GAC intends to make every effort to find a satisfactory resolution to this issue. To avoid further misunderstandings of previous and former processes, it is important that future processes are clear as to their aims, inclusive, and transparent.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. Before I give the floor to some explanation about the elements, one thing is that -- the key I think is what is the process. We have to have clarity on the process before we engage, because if you engage in a process that people see differently as inclusive or not inclusive or secretive or what. So we need to be -- That should be avoided. So we need to have clarity about the process, and we signal this should be a basis that allows us to work in good faith, transparently, and that all parties concerned should be part of it.

So these are the key elements that we want to signal that, in our view, are relevant for the process.

Then another thing is the question is if and how we refer to the -- to this proposal that has been developed by this small group structure, this informal structure over the past two years and has been sent to the GNSO. We have two ways. If we -- we could endorse that as the GAC or we could say we can use this as an element that can become or can be used for getting -- coming to a compromise.

The thing is that our proposal is that we state that the original position of the GAC is the standing GAC advice that we've basically developed over the years, and that the document could be part of a compromise or could be the basis for a compromise or whatever. But to signal that -- if we say we are accepting this small group proposal now, that will then become the starting point of a way to compromise. I don't know if I'm making myself clear.

So we should make clear, so that means that we would have the GNSO recommendations and not the initial GAC advice as a starting point of each other's position, but we would have the GNSO recommendations and this new informal proposal as starting points. And we propose that we make clear that the initial starting points have been the decisions by the two bodies as they have been in the beginning, and this proposal is something that we have been -- the IGOs, with some GAC

members, have been part elaborating in the idea that this would be a compromise that we would see viable.

So that is the logic behind this formulation, but I'm happy to take your views on -- on -- on this.

I have France, Iran, WIPO, and U.K. for the time being.

So France, please, go ahead.

FRANCE:

Thank you, Thomas. I understand your point about the distinction between substance and process. I think you're right, we should probably focus on the process. However, I think the language we have here is too weak, especially compared to what was circulated by the OECD last week. There was very strong support in GAC last week, much stronger language in the Hyderabad advice. As we said before, you know, it's time to conclude on the issue. It's been discussed for four years, and the issue here is a Board inaction and a (indiscernible) of willingness to solve the issue.

So what I propose is to add a paragraph before the paragraph we have here that would read: So the GAC advises ICANN Board to take action and commits to enable the community to deliver an acceptable solution for both parties in a timely manner.

And then you would have the other paragraph as a second paragraph.

So maybe if Tom can take that into account.

And the other proposal we have is to add at the end of the -- of this -- there would be a second paragraph to add that GAC supports the proposal made by the small group.

Thank you.

You want me to repeat the first paragraph?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: We won't do online drafting now but we take note of this.

FRANCE: Okay; sure.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Iran is next in line.

IRAN: Thank you, Chair. What was read by is France mix it up the two paragraph. Because the two paragraph almost say the same thing. Maybe the wording proposed by France is better, but we should avoid repeating something, number one.

Number two, "to work" is a weak word. To undertake, engage in something, not to work.

Number three, what is missing here, a deadline. "Timely manner" could be two months, two years, something other. Yesterday you mentioned some deadline, implicitly. So we should mention this deadline. As soon as possible but not later than, sometime engagement should start.

So we have to put all this element, and something is missing in this paragraph that Tom wrote was mentioned by France, mutually accepted by two parties. This is important. Resolution of the matter in a mutually acceptable way. So we should inject that idea, but not only resolution of the matter on one side. Both sides should agree on that. So these are the elements should be worked out and to redraft the paragraph. We cannot add. We should redraft the paragraph to put all these element.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

WIPO.

WIPO: Yes, thank you, Thomas.

I think we're in your hands in terms of how to go forward with this. I would just maybe recall for our collective consideration, in the initial working group, because the GNSO has a different means of achieving consensus than the GAC does, there was deemed to be consensus about a certain set of recommendations that IGOs had to fight to have a minority position read into the final report. So that was sort of the genesis of the request via the GAC for specific protection that wasn't granted in the original PDP Working Group. And in -- in the ICANN bylaws, one of the core values is that the policy development processes ensure that entities most effective can assist in the policy development process. And I think there is sort of a threshold question as to when IGOs have participated in the first working group, we've participated, albeit not as an active member but as an observer to the second working group. We have, on two occasions, been asked by that working group for advice on the status of IGOs under international law with respect to privileges and immunity specifically. Our legal counsel has twice provided answers to that working group, but because they didn't like what it said, they then sought a third opinion from a legal advisor that they hired at ICANN's expense.

So I think there's sort of a threshold question as to when the affected parties have actually participated in the policy

development process, how ICANN ensures that that's brought into the discussions as required under its bylaws.

And I think, in terms of simply reflecting back to old GAC advice on the subject, there's a potential risk for confusion. Whereas, of course, if you recall initially, there was a request to actually have a preventive mechanism whereby, prior to registration of a domain name, there would be a dispute resolution process before it was even allowed to be registered by a third party.

Over the years we've agreed to move away from that and look more at the curative side of things. So we only raise that to say, if we only reference old GAC advice because the GAC advice did shift over time, there might be confusion over what specific portion of GAC advice we're referring back to. So that is why we suggested possibly some clarity on what exactly it is in terms of the old GAC advice we're looking to refer back to might be useful here. And, in that respect, we would submit that referring to the small group proposal might be a useful starting place. Because there we have very specific listed three items that were agreed over the course of this discussion within the small group that had been agreed by IGOs as acceptable.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

Well, I'm very much on the similar track, really. We had that small group proposal. And it made specific proposals. So, in sympathy with what France has said as well, I think we can go further and actually pick out the elements from that proposal as the starting point for the consideration. I think it would be very good for the GAC to make clear this is how you can fix the problem. Okay. It might not be entirely the solution. But start with this. Because this is what the IGOs have agreed. Notification, dispute resolution, based on independent arbitration, and immediate suspension in a kind of emergency relief to protect the IGOs.

So I do strongly advocate going further in this text in that way by picking out those three elements at least. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Switzerland.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Chair.

Perhaps one additional point, apart from what has been put forward by WIPO and the U.K., is that we also should take into

account the ongoing PDP process on curative protections and perhaps specific mention that the relevant parts of the small group proposal should be considered to the utmost extent by the PDP working group in finalizing or in developing its proposals could be adequate. This would be more directed to the PDP working group.

But I think it makes sense to make mention. Thank you

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. European Commission.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Yes. I think everybody else has said so far is what I was going to say. So I reconfirm their comments. And I wonder if it would be useful for us to sit together in a small group and provide specific text. And you don't have to have this in the big plenary. Thanks.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yes, I think that makes sense. So we'll take note. And I would advise those who are interested in this that you come up with some text that would replace the one that we have on screen here in the light of what you just set out. If that's okay. So that we would move on with the next section.

TOM DALE:

Thank you, Chair. I would just note, in regard to the proposal for further text, the term "small group" is perhaps being -- carrying a lot of baggage in this exercise. Perhaps a "not large group" or something. Sorry. I was trying to be funny, and it was not a good time to do that.

The next section of GAC advice to the Board deals with protection of Red Cross, Red Crescent, and Red Crystal identifiers in names of national committees.

It reads, "The GAC advises the ICANN Board to conclude an outcome in accordance with previous GAC advice that the current provisional protection of Red Cross, Red Crescent, and Red Crystal identifiers should be made permanent in accordance with the distinct policy grounds for such protection." The rationale given in the draft is that the GAC has previously advised the Board to make the relevant provisional protections permanent in view of the potential for abuse, including consumer fraud and the special positioning enjoyed by the Red Cross Red Crescent movement as an international non-governmental consideration, those considerations remain valid. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Switzerland.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Chair.

We are working on an alternative proposal which is a bit more specific on what we are really asking from the Board to make sure that our advice includes all the elements necessary to really trigger a process that finalizes this process of switching the temporary protections into permanent ones. We will share this as soon as possible with the secretariat. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. And you can, of course, also share it to the whole GAC advice by sending it to the GAC. Thank you. U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM: That's, basically, what I was going to say. So thanks.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. All right.

Should we ask for -- is everybody clear on what direction that will go or -- do you know in the sense to get a feedback or should we wait until we see the text or you want to comment? Iran.

IRAN: Yes, better we wait until we see the text. The only thing I request Jorge not to put something like "an outcome." We should specifically say what we want. Not "an outcome."

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Let's move to the next session.

TOM DALE: Well, next section of text was prepared through the GAC's Underserved Regions Working Group. It reads, "The GAC advises the ICANN Board to take required action to enable implementation of the GAC working group on underserved regions work plan, which includes, but is not limited, to capacity building and participation in ICANN policy processes." And the rationale given underneath is that the multistakeholder approach that is fundamental to ICANN has contributed to impressive collective efforts towards developing complex policy and technical processes. However, it is imperative that we acknowledge and remain mindful that while the approach is meant to enable inclusiveness and diversity, providing all stakeholders full voice and influence in our ICANN decision making, developing regions still face a multitude of challenges that constrain their participation. The GAC has developed a work plan that aimed to address some of these challenges and provide recommendations."

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I see the Netherlands and Iran. Please.

NETHERLANDS: Yes, thank you. I think there is a small contradiction in the advice. We say the Board should take action to level implementation of a working group work plan, which I think is not -- well, I think the Board cannot be advised to have the work plan from the working group be implemented. It's something that the GAC has endorsed or something like this. Because it says in the last line, the GAC has developed a work plan, which I think is the working group work plan, which is endorsed by the GAC.

And the second question is: Maybe I was not in on every occasion here. But was this also endorsed by the GAC itself in this occasion or another occasion? Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I think you're right. And we discussed this. It looks a little bit odd if you ask the Board to do something with a work plan of the GAC working group.

So let's try to grab the idea. I think the idea is, if I get this right -- and correct me from the -- that we'd like to have -- ask ICANN for

support in whatever way that helps us implementing maybe this work. Because we want to make sure that you have meaningful participation for people all over the world. So maybe you have to reformulate it in that sense if you share this.

I have Iran and Argentina. Please.

IRAN: Yes. Perhaps we should say in the advice to take required action to enable implementation of the work plan has been developed by GAC. And we could -- where is that work plan? We should attach all cross -- because where is the work plan? And then try to avoid duplication. Because these applications. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Argentina.

ARGENTINA: I would suggest to take out work plan and instead of that say "activities." Group on underserved region activities which includes but is not limited to. It's simple.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: We want them to support the activities that the GAC is undertaking through the working group and so on to foster participation. Sorry.

Yeah. Okay.

So African Union Commission.

AFRICAN UNION COMMISSION: I just want to support and agree those suggestions, very useful. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: We're going to rework the text and try to make it more clearly reflect what the intention has been.

All right. Next section, similar --

TOM DALE: Next section GAC advice to the Board deals with the string similarity review. Now to remind GAC members, this was an issue raised about six weeks ago, perhaps a little more, by the European Commission through the GAC list. The GAC agreed to some light comments after the public comment process to the work of the panel.

And the text that the GAC had agreed to provide and which was provided to ICANN is now reproduced essentially here in the draft communique.

So reading it out, "The GAC advises the ICANN board that the board should take into account the views expressed by the GAC in a letter from the GAC chair of 28 September 2016 to the ccNSO chair concerning the extended process similarity review panel working group proposed guidelines on the second string similarity review process.

In particular, 1, ccTLD policy is a matter for the local Internet communities to determine;

2: an IDN ccTLD application represents the free choice of a specific linguistic community that has full right to use its language and script in the DNS space.

3: Where a finding of potential confusability has been made, rather than rejecting the application, the process should allow the applicant to propose mitigation measures and to assess fully the possibility versus probability of any such confusion.

4: Where there is a split recommendation between upper and lower case, the finding relating to the lower case shall prevail and the application shall go forward where probability of confusion is low.

5: ICANN must ensure consistency in the evaluation of the IDN strings throughout the TLD space and remedy the current

different approaches that are present in the gTLD and ccTLD space.

None of these would endanger the safety, security, or reliability of the DNS."

And the rational states facilitation of IDN ccTLDs through the relevant local Internet community has always been supported by the GAC as a way of making the domain name system more inclusive and accessible. Issues of potential confusability can and should be addressed on a practical and workable basis. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. Just again here, why don't we say we need to be aware of what that means. If we say the Board should take into account, that means that they will look at this, they will assess this, and then decide what to do. And that will be, in their view, the -- they will then conclude that they have accepted the advice. They have taken it into account.

If we want them to follow or to do what is written here, then we would have to find another word. So I'm not saying what we want. It's just be clear what you say. So it's in your hands. European Commission.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Yes. Thank you very much. Just in the interest of space and time, because communique tends to be rather long. And, given what you have just said, would it be useful to just say the GAC advises the ICANN board to take into -- not take into account -- but to apply the results of the extended process similarity review panel as proposed in the GAC chair's letter of ... and just leave it like that? I wonder if that might be simpler without going into detail of all the issues. But I have no problem with the issues below. Those have been presented in your letter. They've been submitted to the entire GAC. And then as a rationale you add that none of these will influence or have a negative impact on the safety, security and reliability of the DNS, which, in fact, I see in this revise -- it should have been in the rationale rather than in the first part. It's just an alternative proposal.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. United States.

UNITED STATES: I just wanted to draw your attention to the one sentence that states, "None of these would endanger the safety, security, or reliability of the DNS."

It's not clear to me that this is a statement the GAC should be making. I believe there's other advisory groups perhaps a bit better suited to make such a statement. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. What is your proposal, to delete it or reformulate it?

UNITED STATES: I think the easiest would be to delete it. I'm certainly open to consider alternative approaches. But I just don't think it's appropriate for the GAC to be making that assertion.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yes. Thank you. Iran.

IRAN: I had the same view. We should delete that one. It is not up to us what the saying is. Leave it for them.

And the wording proposed by European Commission is could apply. Perhaps we should use the same word in the previous one. When you said follow or -- so it is better to apply. Neither take into account. Because I don't want to discuss that. It is correct taking account. But apply is a better word for all cases. To apply.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. So we will delete -- we don't negotiate. But the next -- the plan for the next version is this sentence will be deleted and the introduction will be short and in accordance with the letter that has been sent sometime ago. Is that the overall plan. Okay. Thank you.

So next section?

TOM DALE: Thank you. The next section of advice deals with the respective roles of the board and the GAC. It reads, "The GAC advises the Board that the Board, the GAC, and supporting organizations work together to resolve any systemic problems and ensure a common understanding of respective roles. So the best policies outcomes are achieved to by all stakeholders. The rationale is given as there appear to be systemic issues both in terms of the bylaws and established practice and expectations in resolving policy outcomes where there are differences between the GAC and supporting organizations.

Secondly, there appear to be differing perceptions between the GAC and the Board on their respective roles in this regard. At the first -- and also as part of the rationale -- at the first post communique conference call between the Board and the GAC on

20 July 2016, it became clear that board members and GAC members have different perceptions of their respective roles in preparing and responding to GAC advice, including our responsibility for ultimately resolving areas of disagreement on specific issues. The continuing difficulties in resolving differences between some GNSO policy development processes and GAC advice suggests the problem is systemic."

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. This is an attempt to reflect the discussions that we had. But I'm -- I'm realizing while reading through this is maybe we should not only or so primarily focus on the respective roles but on the ways we communicate and the mutual understanding of the advice, because that element may be missing. We make sure that we first understand the nature and expectation of advice as part of the respective roles. But Iran. Please. Your feedback on this.

IRAN:

Yeah. Thank you, Chair. I don't support this at all. It's creating problems, put confrontation between Board and the GAC saying you don't follow what you should follow. Criticizing the other -- let us either not to put it at all or put it another way. There is a

need to be a more closer collaboration between if and why in order to avoid that. But the text as it is, I don't support that. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

You have views on the text and on the proposal of Iran, to either not have it or formulate it fairly differently? First of all, the idea is -- or the first question is: Do you share the idea that we should express a wish to engage and, basically, you could say we already are doing this with the BGRI with the GAC effectiveness work.

Up to you to guide us

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Egypt?

EGYPT: Thank you, Chair.

I sympathize. I think it's good to highlight it. I think it could be put in a more positive way like you mentioned, engagement other than we have a systemic problem.

And maybe also the title itself, respective roles board and the GAC. I mean, as if there is some confusion between our roles. I don't have a concrete suggestion on top of my head now. But I think maybe we can look also into the title. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. That is, I think, helpful.

Other views? Should we have something on this at all? Or do you think it's not necessary? That's the first question.

And then the second question is, if you think that we shouldn't have a text in that direction, what should we focus on and how should it be phrased? Yes, Paraguay.

PARAGUAY: Yes, Chair. I would suggest to erase the whole thing.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: You mean delete.

PARAGUAY: Yes. Yes.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: What do people think? People are hesitating to delete. What is it we are trying to say? Let's capture the idea clearer and then decide what do we agree on that. Iran.

IRAN: Chairman, as I mentioned, perhaps we should mention under some title a need for closer collaborations and so on and so forth between -- we mentioned GNSO, GAC, and so forth. Because we are creating difficulties, differences. And we put ourselves as enemy of the board or vice versa, that we don't agree with them. They don't get in the role. They don't play their role. So let us put it in a more friendly collaboratively say the need for closer collaboration, cooperation, among the concerned constituencies, SOs ACs. And put GNSO and GAC. Something like this. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Argentina and Egypt.

ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair, I would also agree with our colleague from Iran. Not deleting them, but giving a positive message of mutual collaboration to have a better outcome for policy development. But not deleting it, but changing the name of it. More positive.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Egypt.

EGYPT: I also agree with Iran and Argentina. And maybe the title could be GAC/Board post communique exchanges or something like that. And then we can try to stress inside in a positive way the importance of whatever engagement or collaboration we are looking for. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. That is quite concrete and may help us that we advice the Board to institute -- maybe go in that direction what we said at the end, institutionalize a communication within four weeks and use that as a concrete example within four weeks and exchange on the advice and mutual understanding blah, blah, blah within four weeks after the meeting. If that is something that we -- I'm just proposing things. U.K. is next and then --

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, Chair. In the internal matters section, we have a section on the BGRI working group. So maybe a statement along these lines could be moved under that brief account of work of the

BGRI working group. Because that's the context. That's the aim, isn't it, of the working group? So it's an affirmation of the aim.

Do we have to formulate it in advising the Board? We're working with the Board in this framework. Thanks.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. To give you insight on how the Board works, whatever is advice, they take note as advice. Whatever is not advice and is somewhere else in the one of thousand pages that they have to read, it has a different status. So we can do whatever we want. We just need to be aware the priority that we're giving something whether it's an advice and they have to respond. If it's somewhere else in the text, they can take note. But whatever that means. Sorry. Argentina, I forgot. I skipped you on the list.

ARGENTINA:

I would suggest that we just simplify the text. The Board, and GAC, and supporting organizations work together in a cooperative or constructive way to ensure the best policy outcomes.

That's it. Make it simple but keep it like that there.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Chair. Perhaps the title could be: Enhancement of mutual cooperation or collaboration between -- and you put whatever you want -- GNSO and GAC. And in there you say that the Board undertake necessary action in order that this mutual collaboration be adequately or necessarily or whatever enhanced. So we have put it in that way. Engage them in that. And say whenever we talk of cooperation, we need to inject the word "mutual" but not one party as collaboration for others and do nothing. They should have mutually actions together. That is always a key word. So the title would be enhancement of mutual collaboration among or between and put GNSO or GAC and whatever you want to say. And they say that the board undertakes necessary action in order that the mutual collaboration among be enhanced in order to -- in order to do what? In order to reduce the difficulties in order to have on time solution for the matter before becoming a bottleneck. Something along the line of that. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

I think we're getting clearer, and I think that is probably the better way.

My last question to you: Should we include as an example of institutionalization of communication between the Board and the GAC on the communique within four weeks after meeting as a concrete action item or not. It's in your hands. It's a proposal. We put it in in the next draft and then see whether you like it or not. Can I take this? Okay.

Tom.

TOM DALE:

The final piece of advice to the Board in the draft communique concerns ICANN meeting preparation. It reads, "The GAC advises the ICANN board to take action to ensure the planning for the next ICANN meeting commences immediately upon completion of the current meeting. Be fully transparent and support all supporting organizations, advisory committees, and other stakeholders. The rationale given for that is the experience of planning for ICANN 56 and ICANN 57 has shown that coordination of cross-community activities and the work of supporting organizations and advisory committees is complex and challenging. The GAC is committed to working with other SOs and ACs, ICANN and other stakeholders using the mechanisms established some weeks before the Hyderabad

meeting. However, this should be a continuous process starting immediately to ensure the most productive use of time at ICANN 58.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. This is the last item. And then we'll make a break.

So do you share the idea; one, that we communicate this as an advice and then do you share the way it's formulated?

Iran and then nobody for the time being. Okay. European Commission.

IRAN: Thank you, Chair. This issue was raised in an implicit manner in the public comment. And it was mentioned that, at the end of the year, they make a survey to see how to improve that. I don't think that this is advice. It is already taken care of the Board and we don't need to put in advice. Thank you. Thank you, that may be a point. It's obvious that this is going to be done anyway. Who we want to move this to a section earlier where it's not advice but we just comment that this idea that we have also like everybody else realized that things can be done better is that he okay? All right. And with that, that would then be -- do you agree that the next meeting will be held during ICANN 58 in

Copenhagen, Denmark, scheduled from 11-16 March. European Commission. Sorry, I forgot.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thanks a lot. No, I agree with your proposal to move that to another part, but I had a related comment, and that's why I raised it in this area, but it can go somewhere else.

Yesterday in our meeting with the Board, I understood that the chairman of the Board committed to looking at ways of making the Board activities more transparent, including pre-notification of pending Board resolutions, et cetera.

So what I was going to propose, and I thought I had mentioned some wording to Tom, but perhaps not, some wording somewhere. And this was one area where I thought it might go, but of course if we move this somewhere else, it could go perhaps up in another area where you talk about Board-GAC relations, to this reflect this commitment to have even more open Board processes.

Thanks.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yes, thank you. Do you mean just the transparency of the processes or also issues of planning that we know what the

Board is going to -- is planning to decide, weather when is it? Is it just transparency or is it predictability as well or -- Would you want to provide us -- Let's put it that way.

I think we ran through. It's 3:00. I think that would be a moment for a break.

So Egypt.

EGYPT: Very quickly. I think there's a norm that we thank outgoing vice chairs.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: They are not yet outgoing. They are only outgoing after the next meeting.

EGYPT: I'm sorry. I'm sorry.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: We still have them.

EGYPT: Good, good.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yes, Iran.

IRAN: One point we have not considered as it was mentioned, we will receive or you will receive a questionnaire from the CCWG, and we want -- we need to reply in one month. And you have to make necessary mechanism and arrangement for that one month. At least it should be reflected in one way or another, or whatever you want. But please kindly show that in one month, the CCWG Accountability SO/AC expect to receive an answer from GAC, and others as well. So I think you have to make some provision for that.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: And you want to communicate this in the communique that we will answer these questions in the next month or --

IRAN: Not in the communique, but I want that you take care of that one, because it's not clear. Internal matter of GAC, maybe?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yeah. But in the communique, you want -- Not in the GAC advice section, but do you want to have a reference to this in the communique? That's my question.

IRAN: I want that you take necessary action that mechanism be established in the GAC that within one month, we reply to that. Neither in communique nor in the other part. Just internal affair of chair with the vice chair and make -- not forget that. Because as soon as we go, one month is expired. I am member of that group and there will be question: Where is the GAC reply?

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: We won't because we have another session tomorrow and then we have an internal briefing session where we take stock of all the elements and there is a decision paper, whatever, that we introduced some time ago.

Spain.

SPAIN: Thank you. I just want to know whether the questions in annex one are the same that were distributed in advance of the meeting or have they suffered any change?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Alice from the African Union, can you confirm that there have been no changes to the questions in annex one compared to what they were before, the questions from the PSWG?

AFRICAN UNION COMMISSION: Yes, I can confirm that there's been no changes.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: No changes.

AFRICAN UNION COMMISSION: No changes at all.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: One element that we may add, we may actually, somewhere under the internal matters, thank Tracey for her services if that's not already there. I think we can find a formulation for that without having to discuss this.

Now, with regard to -- this is thinking out loud. We may take half an hour for trying to get this new text done. Is that realistic? And then half an hour to print copies and blah, blah, blah and take them in. So that we would meet at -- as plenary again at 4:00. Is this realistic? Do you want to have printed or not? No printing? 21st century? Electronic working? Okay. All right.

We aim for half an hour, but that's ambitious. We know that.
Okay.

So we reconvene -- let's give us 40 minutes. But we will start at
1545.

Is that -- is that reasonable?

Okay. All right. I see people --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Reasonable for Tom?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yeah, but it's not just him. Those of you who are working on the
text will need time to do that, and they need to give it to him and
he needs to put it in. It doesn't make sense to be too early and
then everybody is waiting here, but we -- so I'm trying to find a
reasonable thing that we can actually live up to. So let's go to
45. 1545 in the hope that we get there and then we start at 45
for the -- with the second reading.

Thank you

With regard -- We have not gone through the text of the advice.
You may use the coffee break to actually get a closer look on the
text we didn't read of the reporting elements. And in case you
find something that should be amended or is not complete, tell

us. Because since we will not print it, you won't get any new text on that one. So you can actually go through that text your self. Okay? Thank you.

[Coffee break]

TOM DALE: If I can have your attention, please. We will be resuming in about five minutes. We will be sending around a revised version. We will be resuming in about five minutes.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. We are resuming. And before we go to the communique that you all have in your emails, I think we have to give a prize to somebody, which is something like a door prize or inspired by the door prize, but this time there is actually only one candidate that is eligible to get this door prize, which is Tracey, because she's unfortunately leaving us, so we thought we cannot let her go without also giving her a small sign of appreciation in form of this small thing here.

So, Tracey, thank you very much.

[Applause]

We were relying on advice of some capable person in choosing it. We hope that it makes sense to you.

There's about ten onion rings until you get to the thing actually.

TRACEY HIND: Oh, it's beautiful. Whoever picked it, it's my favorite color!

It's my favorite color.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: We'll keep that secret.

Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much.

So let's go through the text. I hope you have --

OLOF NORDLING: May I just add that it was Julia who provided the intelligence needed for this selection.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: I hope you've had the time to go through the elements that we have not read out to everybody.

Okay. There have been some changes so I think it's now time to actually go through the text as it is, and I let tom do this as he's the most capable man to actually do this. Thank you.

TOM DALE: Thank you, Thomas. Good afternoon, everybody again. Here we are.

I'll run through just those sections of the non-advice part of the communique where there have been some changes since the first version; okay? And see if there are any comments.

The -- There were no changes to high-interest topic, none to outreach, GAC community engagement, new members. The working group reports are the same. GAC participation in the NomCom.

Yes, please.

OLGA CAVALLI: We had a request from Indonesia to be included among the countries supporting --

TOM DALE: What was that?

OLGA CAVALLI: Indonesia.

TOM DALE: Certainly. We'll do that now because we're in track changes.
Thank you. And I've added China at their request as well.

Secretariat section is the same. The section on IANA stewardship has not changed. The issues. There were some clarification in the second paragraph of that to indicate that the commitment in the meeting it review research of that group was being done not just by the GAC members of the review team but by all GAC members to the extent it's relevant. So that's been clarified. So it's the GAC which is reviewing the research in that second sentence.

The next section remains the same. .WEB auction is the same.

The wording from Peru on protection of IGO names is the same. This section may need some -- And finally, there's an additional section there which has been included at the request of Estonia concerning use of three-letter ISO country codes as TLDs. And I've just quickly pasted that in in the interest of time, so it may need some -- some adjustment.

So I'll leave it at that for now, Thomas, and see if there are any comments on that section.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. Is it Jamaica? Thank you.

JAMAICA: So I'm not sure which page, but it's the subheading .WEB auction. Right, for internal constituency, on pages one to two, there was no reference to the fact that this was one of the subject areas that was discussed with the Board. So it might be useful to add this in the list of issues discussed with the Boards, that the statement that, as mentioned in the GAC-Board meeting won't seem out of place.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Iran.

IRAN: Thank you. I thought that we come to this sections later on, but now you are on this .WEB auction, I suggest that in the third line from the bottom, "for this reason is the --" No, (indiscernible). "And in the context of the improved ICANN accountability framework." I suggest to delete that, because the issue is now -- people say it has nothing to do with accountability. Is the process.

So why not we delete that and say for this reason, GAC would like to be kept informed? Nothing about to be kept. But not referring to the accountability, because now accountability may go to the -- even removal of the Board. So we are not dealing with that the all.

So delete that one. For these reasons, okay. But after that, "and in the context of improve ICANN accountability framework," that portion, please kindly -- I suggest to delete that.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I have Argentina, Brazil, and Australia.

Thank you.

ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. I think Brazil was before me, but if you let me. I understand your point, Kavouss, but I think it's -- it's about accountability, not the improved accountability framework.

So I think that the concept of accountability could be captured in the text because this is what concerns us, is the general accountability of the process, not talking about the accountability framework.

I'm not sure if I'm clear.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So but then we may say related to the transparency and accountability of the process. Just put the word "accountability," if that's what you want.

Brazil and then Australia.

BRAZIL: Thank you, Chair. It's just a question of procedure. Are we going to review now the first sections before review the second reading of the advices? Or how are we going to deal with that?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: That's like the second reading of everything, but we had a very shortcut first overflying of this section, but we need to go through it once, I think.

Australia.

AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. I'm just a little concerned that this paragraph reads like it's a GAC concern, and I'm -- I'm not sure that it is. I don't think the GAC as a whole have discussed it, and I don't have an official position on .WEB. I haven't consulted at home.

I'd prefer to change it to something like "The GAC has been made aware of" or something like -- I don't think this is a GAC position.

Thanks.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I think that's closer to the fact; that we don't know yet whether something is a concern. We're trying to find out.

So -- Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, yes. That is a good suggestion. Still, I suggest that we delete the word "accountability." No problem about transparency about accountability. Accountability now has a very clear connotations in the new bylaw. Transparency, I have no problem. But accountability, you want to go to the escalation? It may. Why putting this front of? Let us not talk about accountability at this stage. It is not the consensus yet. If we have consensus, yes. If everybody agree with that, I could join consensus. But I think let us limit it to transparency.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: I think Iran has a point in the sense that we're in a stage of trying to find out what's happening which is at this stage mainly a transparency issue. So if you agree, let's not complicate things.

New Zealand.

NEW ZEALAND: We'd just like to present some alternative wording, cutting it right back considering the GAC hasn't discussed this much.

Possibly: The GAC is aware of concerns related to the .WEB TLD. The GAC would like to be kept fully informed of developments in this case.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Would that -- Can you be more precise? I think this sounds useful. What exactly would that replace or where exactly would that come? So to help Tom to hold his electronic mouse pen.

NEW ZEALAND: We were thinking that would replace the whole paragraph.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So please say it again in dictating speed.

NEW ZEALAND: The GAC is aware of concerns relating to the .WEB TLD. The GAC would like to be kept fully informed of developments in this case.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Slower, please.

NEW ZEALAND: The GAC is aware of concerns relating to the .WEB TLD.

The GAC would like to be kept fully informed of developments in this case.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So that's a very short version of an alternative. Is that acceptable? That would replace the longer paragraph.

Any objections? I think it's a signal. It's the same signal but we try to avoid saying too much or the wrong thing at this stage.

Thank you, New Zealand.

Iran.

IRAN: I think still we could inject the word "transparency" in that short paragraph. Fully informed. As a transparency manner. Transparency something which is the whole framework of the mission of the -- of the Board. So we should add transparency there, but I don't know why we could say that we are aware of concerns. I don't know why. If everybody agree again, once again, I can agree. But we say we are aware of concerns.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Or has been made aware of concerns, maybe.

BRAZIL: I actually have a comment to a previous section. Section 4 on the IANA transition. Actually, we believe that the verb "welcomed" actually doesn't properly recognize and reflect the fact that some GAC members actually had some issues with the transition, the transition proposal. So, actually, we suggest that we stick to some agreed language, especially the language the GAC used in its communication to the CWG Stewardship where we used the word "takes note." So I would suggest the GAC takes note of the completion of the process, transition stewardship, the IANA function to the multistakeholder model. And I think and then "and express its appreciation of the effort of all parties involved."

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Something like this.
European Commission?

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Yeah, I'm sorry to be fussy, but I think the appreciation is expressed to the parties for their efforts, or something like that. It's just drafting, but I leave it to Tom and leaders to fix the wording.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Hungary?

HUNGARY: Probably you should use present tense or past tense in both cases. Takes note of and expresses, or took note of and expressed.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Is that okay like this? Is there more text coming or is there just a dot missing here?

Ah, it goes on. Just we don't...

Okay. Yes, Brazil.

BRAZIL: I have an additional comment. On the third paragraph of this section. Actually, although the -- the target date to end the Work Stream 2 accountability is actually mid-2017, but at least Brazil believes that there won't be really -- I think actually the -- the accountability working group will actually take more time. So I think that maybe we could use the language of the last sentence: The GAC looks forward to the completion of this work in due time or, I mean, something more general that doesn't put a precise time here.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: What about the proposal that Tom has now made in accordance with the current work plan.

BRAZIL: This thing is that the current work plan says mid 2017.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: And then be say the completion of this work.

BRAZIL: Exactly, yeah.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Iran.

IRAN: No problem. But I don't see any difficulty if we added "and which currently is anticipated to be mid 2017." We should leave it to the people to know. We don't have ample time to do that. There is a budget. There is a time and so on and so forth. It could not continue for these things. We should mention that currently anticipated to -- or scheduled to be completed so on and so forth. Some people want to work two years. We don't have that time.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Brazil.

BRAZIL: I mean, I think that the position, I think, perhaps, that the GAC could agree on is that we look forward to complete the work. For example, Brazil believes that perhaps the jurisdictional work will take more time. So we cannot agree that we are looking forward this work to be completed by middle 2017. So --

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Can we stop after work? Because I don't think this -- I think we're taking too much time on something that is not necessary, if you agree.

Let's just say we look forward to the completion of this work

IRAN: We should put element of time. Time completion. We could not work for four years from now. Timely completion.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Brazil, is that okay for you? Timely completion or something referring to time?

Any objections to this text now? Okay. France.

FRANCE: Thank you, Chair. Just a question. In the title of this paragraph, we mention both the transition and ICANN accountability. And then we only talk about workstream 2. So should we also mention the workstream 1 part? Just a question.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: I mean, we have a section on workstream 1, which is at least -- our part of that is the implementation of the bylaw changes so the middle part of the free ones that you see is related to workstream 1. Do we have to spell it out, or can we leave it like this? Iran.

IRAN: I think better to leave it like that. I don't think we should go too much into detail. Yeah.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: I see France has been nodding and is holding up a thumb. So okay. I think we can leave it like this and move to the next bit.

TOM DALE: Thank you. As the text is new under the heading "The Use of Three-Letter ISO country codes is TLDs," and I've not had the opportunity for time reasons to make any revision of it. The text

was provided by Estonia. So perhaps they would like to explain the purpose of the text, thank you.

ESTONIA: Thank you. My idea was just to mention the discussion we had and to keep it alive and try to move forward in the future.

But I tried to put in everything I had in mind, but we had a discussion explain the opinions that were expressed from the floor. And just to mention that we will continue these discussions in local communities in GAC. And this was mentioned very briefly yesterday about how the final decision would be -- should be made.

And that's a cross-community PDP, not GNSO PDP.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. So the idea is to keep the discussion alive and signal that we will continue to think about this.

I'm not sure whether people understand what a pro ccTLD approach is. We may need to be a little clear in that. Would you like to retain or have a reference to this discussion under this information section? And, then, if so, does this reflect what we -- what you want to see reflected? United Kingdom.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, chair.

Well, I think the most we could say is that there was a discussion. U.K. doesn't have an agreed approach with regard to what such a top-level domain would -- you know, how it would be managed, run, control over the policy. I mean, this is -- for us it's -- we have no idea. We're in no position. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. We should be very careful of the wording. I think there is a difficulty to say that governments must have full control over the domain policy. There are other constituencies in this house that also study the matter.

GAC thinks that exclusively we want to have full control is too strong. Can we modify that? Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Let me make a proposal that may be -- may fly. If we said GAC has had a discussion concerning 3-letter country codes and then stop there and then say discussions will continue in GAC and in local communities. Any decisions or whatever must be taken using a cross-community process.

So, if these are the elements -- because the rest is probably premature, because we haven't really discussed it. But we may agree on this element. Saying that we have discussed this, that we continue to discuss it, and that we think on this issue a cross-community process would be necessary.

Would that be elements that we would want to retain?
Argentina and then France

ARGENTINA:

Do we know that there would be a cross-community process? Are we initiating it? Are we requesting it? If not, I think that should go away, the last part.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

So you would want to delete this -- I said Iran, I think, is next and then Spain and U.K.

Iran. You wanted to take the floor or no? Okay.

Then Spain.

SPAIN:

I am okay with inserting this text or reference to the discussions on three-letter codes. You have added as potential TLDs -- that's what I was going to say. But as well I don't know if discussions will continue in local communities. The idea

expressed here, if I'm not mistaken, is that we think that the potential use of TLDs is something to be discussed at the national level with local communities. But I don't think we have committed to go after this meeting to our local communities and discuss this.

And I am in favor of keeping the last sentence. Because I think this is -- most GAC members, if not all, agree that cross-community approach is preferable to our GNSO PDP. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, I think we should try not to spend too much time on this. I have France, U.K., and Switzerland. Thank you.

FRANCE: Thank you, Chair. I think I agree with what Argentina said. During a cross community process, maybe there is post support in GAC to follow that way rather than GNSO PDP. It's not launched yet. And we talk about final solution. It's a bit contradictory. So I think we should suppress it at the end of the paragraph. Maybe keep the first sentence. And, if I remember correctly, when we talked about it in the GAC a few days ago, there was a strong support to consider three-letter country

codes as ccTLDs that would be managed by either by the country or by local communities.

So I think we might like -- we should maybe state that at least some countries expressed this preference, maybe not saying many or most, but at least state that some countries wanted to consider three-letter country codes as ccTLDs. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM: Well, thanks. As I said before the most we've done is have a discussion. We haven't considered whether there should be a single harmonized cross-community process to govern the approach. We could well end up with a variety of approaches at the national level according to what the national stakeholder communities could decide. The most I will be happy with is to stay discussions will continue in the GAC. Stop.

The rest of it is assuming far too much. We have not embarked on a track at all.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: That may actually make sense. That we actually do table this as an item that we give some space intersessionally and then with

a session to maybe come up with something more substantial after a more deep discussion.

So what about this? The GAC had a discussion concerning three-letter country codes as potential TLDs. And discussions will continue in the GAC. That will be the option. Switzerland.

SWITZERLAND:

Thank you, Chair.

I think that in the Helsinki communique, we have very interesting language on this question of the three-letter codes. So perhaps we could make some simple reference to that language and recall that we already made some reflections on this that the local communities are important, that cross-community dialogue, blah, blah, blah

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. But the question is: Do we need some text in here, or do we just decide among ourselves that we'll both take this on? Iran and then Argentina.

IRAN:

Thank you, Chair. Have we changed our positions from the Helsinki GAC 56? If not, we just could reiterate that. That's all.

Not have a new wording. Because it would be difficult every time we have a new wording.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Argentina.

ARGENTINA: I support what France suggested. But I think it should be included somehow referring the Helsinki communique.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So you would like to see a reference. Can we then, for the sake of not losing time, asking somebody to write a proposal of a text? Because somebody would need to look back on the concrete text of Helsinki and we make a reference of that look at that and say we continue our discussion on that issue, or something along those lines. Would that be the intention? Iran.

IRAN: I have no difficulty, but I have difficulty to refer to the local communities. It is a national issue. And there we should leave it general and I have also difficulty to put the word "must" in any part of the -- that is too strong.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: That's noted. So the text won't be the same like the one that you see. Who can help us with -- France.

FRANCE: Okay. Thank you. So you will look back at the Helsinki communique and, basically, refer to that and say we continue discussion and will continue discussion. Okay. Thank you.

So let's move on for the time being. They think they may be close to a solution. So I'm giving them one more minute, as you realize.

But I think we -- not everybody is fine with the local community thing. Maybe we say on national level. And encourage everybody to discuss this on national level or something like that. France.

FRANCE: Yeah. Thank you, Chair. I think you should express the last parts "in the global communities." And I will add another sentence saying many countries in GAC propose to treat three-letter country codes at a top level as ccTLDs managed by the country or by the local communities.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Do you really want to say this now?

FRANCE: Some countries said.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: It might be stronger to say all countries agree at some point in time. Because, I mean, this is -- we're not in a hurry here. So I'm just wondering what's the common practice to document held in the GAC, you know. Okay. So we have the proposal from France. If that flies, fine. If it doesn't, we'll stop working on this one and come back to it later.

FRANCE: And you can also mention at the end that some countries wanted to treat it through a cross-community mechanism as well, if she wants.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: We don't actually do -- under the information I'm not sure whether we should go down that road. Australia.

AUSTRALIA: Thank you. I'd also prefer not to go down that road unless we're also going to say other countries don't agree. Thank you.

I think we should just leave that sentence out.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Could we stop after discussions will continue in the GAC? And then we see what these discussions bring at the later stage? I think that is making us strong and give ourselves some time to -- this is not something where the world is expecting us to say something at this stage. So we actually do have the time. Would that be acceptable helpful? U.K. and Iran.

UNITED KINGDOM: There's no agreement on that last sentence anyway. So stop after GAC. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Iran.

IRAN: I agree. But the beginning of the sentence instead of saying referencing "further to" but not with reference. We had no reference. Further to that we continue to discuss.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Whatever. So I don't think that changes it. If that's better, then I'm fine. Okay. Are we fine with this? Great. Thank you.

Now Spain has something -- she wants to come back on something that is higher up. Thank you, Spain. Please.

SPAIN: Thank you, Chair. This is the section of the election of the new vice chairs. I had proposed to add a sentence on underlining that their mandate will start after the Copenhagen meeting. This is a communique for the media, as the operating principles say. If we say that to the media, maybe they think they will start immediately after this meeting.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yeah. Because otherwise it would look odd that we don't thank the outgoing vice chairs, that would send a strange signal.

IRAN: With respect to the vice chairs, I made the suggestion you deal with that tomorrow or you deal with it now.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: I don't think that this is something further for the communique.

IRAN: Why you want to reflect that?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: If you want to see it, please repeat your proposal.

IRAN: If I don't want to communicate the first part, just reason. Currently, not for discussion. Currently, there is no established rules with respect to the election of the GAC vice chair. And also there is no agreement in the GAC with respect to the geographical area or geographical things of the GAC. It should be studied. Therefore, we have five vice chairs. I suggested the six vice, chairs which did not have the sufficient vote to be the vice chair, to be added to the list of five for one year in order not to disappoint anybody and in order to work together and maintain differently the environment in the GAC. Until that time that we have published rules, therefore, we follow those rules accordingly. So I propose that.

So I propose Par would be agreed to assume the role of additional vice chair for one year, and at that time we have established procedure, we may do differently. So this is that and I have discussed with some other colleagues, and I am sure that other colleagues would be in a position to support that proposal.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Well, just to, I think, clarify something, if I'm not mistaken in the current operating principles it says we can have up to five vice chairs. What we can do is the last time it was written up, the three, we declared them as additional officers, or whatever. But we cannot -- formally, we cannot have more than five vice chairs for the time being, but this is just to clarify. We would need to find another term like we did last time.

I see the European Union wanted to take the floor.

Commission. I'm sorry.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: I was just going to repeat what you said. I have nothing to do -- no objection whatsoever to the sixth participant who is also very well qualified, et cetera, but it was just to repeat what you said about the operating principles.

Thanks.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. Argentina.

ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair.

If -- we all knew that there were six candidates and five seats. If this was an idea that was in the minds of some colleagues, it should have been shared with the whole GAC before the elections.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you.

Other views?

Spain.

SPAIN:

I'm a legal background, and it's my tendency always to try to stick to rules. And if there is an election and more -- because there were more candidates than seats, five of them were chosen, I think we have to accept that result.

It's a matter of (off microphone).

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Iran.

IRAN: I'm sorry; Asia-Pacific has 75 countries. What rule says that Europe should have two vice chair?

Which rule says that? Or another region has no vice chair at all. So what is -- what we are doing?

I am not against any -- anybody, but we have to take into account Asia-Pacific is a large region with 75 or 76 countries. So what is the harm?

Don't stick to the rules too much, because rules is not properly reflecting the reality. One region has two countries, the other region has 75 countries. So you stick to the region, one region has two candidate or two vice chair, the other region has nothing. So I think we are -- we have to accept something, so please, distinguished colleagues, don't stick too much to rules that is not really reflecting the reality.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: There are -- Kavouss, but now you're contradicting yourself. You're using the region to explain why we need one more candidate and you say we shouldn't stick to the regions. I'm not sure whether we come up with a coherent logic here.

The fact is that the rules allow for five vice chairs, and as some have said, we have had six candidates for five posts, which -- where the logic is one is not elected, whoever that is.

If you want to change these rules, fine. If we think that we need exceptional measures like we felt the last time, we can do this. This is the GAC can decide. We can decide to ask somebody or name somebody an additional officer or whatever the exact wording is, but we need to have an agreement on this, and we need to have a reason for this, I would also say.

Iran.

IRAN: We have a reason. Five vice chair for five regions.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: You said we don't are regions.

IRAN: No, wait a minute. Five vice chair for five regions, but one region has two vice chairs. What does it mean?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Switzerland.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you. Without excluding any possible outcome on this, I think that we have the established rule or the established way of proceeding that in the communique we reflect what we have

discussed. I think we haven't discussed this, so -- and we have the opportunity of discussing it tomorrow.

In any case, the formal five vice chair positions, which are in the operating principles, are those who have been elected.

Tomorrow, under internal issues, we may discuss about this exceptional possibility of appointing a kind of sixth vice chair, if needed. But I don't think that the communique should be used to have this discussion.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I have Jamaica and Austria, briefly.

JAMAICA: Based on the comment just made from the delegate from Switzerland, I'll refrain. I agree with him that this is not the appropriate time to have this discussion, because this will be -- can be -- well, seems to be or may be contentious. So I'll refrain until -- if it is, Chair, that you're accepting Switzerland's position that this discussion be held tomorrow.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: This is what I suggested when the elections were made and the issue was brought up.

Austria.

AUSTRIA:

Thank you, Thomas.

Well, I'm afraid I see some sort of deja vu. We had these discussions the last time when we elected the vice chairs. It was exactly the same. It was exactly the same situation, and we had -- I don't know how many hours we spent with that topic, and I don't want that we reinvent the wheel.

Well, if it really is such a need to have it regionally distributed, then let's spend at a future meeting, half a day or whatever it takes, to draft new operating principles and then be it. But at the time being, and being a lawyer I have to say let's stick to the rules. We have rules, and I fully understand the idea of the colleague of Iran. It's the system of the ITU. We are different. We are not the ITU. We are some more modern, we are some -- we are flexible, but if a majority of the delegates says okay, that could be an idea, then let's deal with that, but at one of the next meetings if we -- if we have time. I think we will find time. But for the time being, we have -- we have not the option. We have to stick to the operating principles. That's it.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Can we agree that we stop this discussion here as part of the communique? We will find some space to discuss this tomorrow, but we may not come to a decision on the bigger issue of how to deal with the issue much regions. And I would refer to the offer made by Brazil after this came up that they will offer us -- they will do some research on existing models on how to deal with regional diversity and how to operationalize regional diversity and representativity, because it's a little more complex to find something that may be workable for us here. If that's okay, I suggest that we stop the discussion on this here, and we spend more time on it tomorrow, particularly deciding a way forward on this issue, if that's okay.

I don't see any objections, so let's go back to the part which is now, I think, the GAC advice section; right?

So, Tom, thank you.

TOM DALE: Thank you, Thomas.

There was, I think, a minor change. I can't find what it is now. But anyway, what's on the screen concerning future gTLD policies and procedures, (indiscernible) the GAC advises the ICANN Board that it reiterates its advice contained in the

Helsinki communique concerning process and timing with regard to development of future gTLD policies and procedures.

In fact, I don't think there was a change to that.

And sorry; to add the rationale, the rationale for this advice is the same as that contained in the GAC Helsinki communique to which the GAC has not yet received any response from the Board.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Were there any changes? You think there were no changes to this so I don't think we have to spend time on it.

So we can move to the next one. Were there any changes to this one?

TOM DALE: There were some minor changes from the -- the Public Safety Working Group. So I'll read through it. The GAC advises the ICANN Board to provide written responses to the questions listed in annex one to this communique no later than five weeks before the ICANN 58 meeting in Copenhagen.

The rationale is that the GAC has previously endorsed law enforcement due diligence recommendations. While 23rd in RAA addressed most of these recommendations pertaining to

registrars, the GAC is now seeking more information on implementation of some of these RAA provisions. Thirdly, the GAC wishes to better understand how ICANN is using publicly available DNS abuse reporting resources and seeks specific information on recent industry developments and on ICANN's efforts in setting standards for abuse reporting and performance.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Any comments? Questions? Objections?

Okay. That does not seem to be the case.

Let's move to the next section.

So there have been some changes --

TOM DALE: Yes, Thomas. Thanks. Following the discussion, some changes were amended by me.

Are we on the section -- Sorry.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Are your interventions on this section coming up or on a previous one? On this one, let Tom finish first and then we'll

take your points. We're happy to take your points but give him a chance to --

TOM DALE: Thank you. I'll read out the revision.

The GAC advises the ICANN Board to, one, follow the advice provided in the GAC Helsinki communique with regard to two-character country/territory names at the second level, and, two, clearly indicate whether they have followed GAC advice in this matter.

The rationale has not changed from the earlier text.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. Comments on this one? Iran and then Palestine.

IRAN: Thank you. In the previous reading for other part, instead of "take into account" or "follow," European Commission proposed a word which is "apply." I suggest that replace "follow." "Apply" the advice provided.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: I have no strong feelings on this one. What is better, follow or apply? English natives and English non-natives? If there are nobody -- nobody has a problem, we'll leave -- there's a hand up. CTU, please, Nigel.

CTU: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair. If you are looking for a word you could consider "heed" the advice, but I have a question. Are we still advising the Board on a matter that they've pass add resolution on?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Well, since we have not had an answer, we can -- yeah, we can.
Palestine?

CTU: But the resolution makes advice from Helsinki -- GAC advice from Helsinki as well. So -- I don't know.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: I get your point.
So Palestine.

PALESTINE: Good evening, everyone. In all honesty, I do not have any objection on what's been written; however, I have a question to the Board.

The question is the Board of ICANN until now did not respond to the communique from Helsinki and at the same time, they took a decision as far as the two-character on the second-level domain. So what's the -- what's the answer why? Why are they doing this? Maybe they will do the same thing as far as the communique of Hyderabad. They will not respond to it and then we'll have another communique, and they still do not take any advice from us. So what do we do?

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Well, I think to try and be precise, in their reflection, they -- at least that's how I read the -- the resolution of today, they think they have taken into account the advice. The only thing is that they haven't told us and we didn't have a chance to tell them whether we agree that we think that they have taken our advice.

But in their perception, at least, they have taken into account and followed, I guess, GAC advice.

Yeah?

TOM DALE:

Sorry, Thomas. I was just going to add if it would help the interventioner from Palestine, the GAC will, of course, have the opportunity to -- to raise these questions with the Board in the call with the GAC that will be scheduled within four weeks of this meeting.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

So again, the question is what are we trying to say here? And I think what we are trying to say from what I read is that basically we note that the Board has taken a decision, and in their view they accept to take the advice into account but they haven't told us -- we have had no chance to comment, give our view on whether this -- this -- because we may not share the view that this has been properly taken into account, or at least some countries. So this is the feeling that we are trying to express.

And of course it's a little bit (indiscernible) to repeat that they should -- I'm not sure whether that applies, actually really the best word, but that's the detail.

And the second one is also like a reminder that we expect them to indicate whether the advice -- indicate to us, not a resolution

to anybody but actually give us a reply. I think that's probably the point that we're trying to make.

New Zealand, then Spain.

NEW ZEALAND:

We would just like to agree with your point there that we should note that we have previously provided advice, and then say clearly the Board should indicate whether they followed that advice, rather than reiterating that the Board should apply the advice, if that makes sense.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

So would that mean we would delete something like the first part and only elaborate on the second one? Is that your proposal? Just so I am clear on what you are saying or proposing.

NEW ZEALAND:

We were just proposing to sort of change the word "apply" to "note" in the first part of the --

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yeah, but that doesn't change anything because they say they not only noted but took it into account or accepted it, or whatever. In the resolution. If you know what I mean.

Spain and then Palestine, and then Jamaica.

SPAIN: Thank you. It -- It's a question of how far do we want to take this to. Personally, I can live with this text because my country doesn't have as important concerns as others, so I'm okay with this text, but I don't think that it reflects what other countries may want to say.

I agree with you, but I could do without the whole text. And to say what I think people want to say I could signal the different approach that the Board has taken with regard to our advice. Why we think that the Board has not actually accepted our advice.

And, secondly, I could request the Board to admit that it has not taken into account our advice and that it needs to be dealt with through the bylaws consultation procedure because it was consensus GAC advice. But with this, they would just reply with a letter and, yes, we have applied, and we are going to enforce it. As simple as this.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Spain.

Palestine.

PALESTINE: I agree with my colleague from Spain. And every country for sure has its specificity, and every country looks at it differently; however, I'm trying now to talk about two things. First of all, concerning this issue, I see that we should add a text so that this would not be the way they handle it in the future. The way that - - So we do not want to put a precedence for them to deal with our advice in the same way. And they should really heed and deal with our advice in the proper manner.

And the second point is this issue is -- has a lot of sensitivity because some countries have a very sensitive situation. And we have to try to clarify it and reflect it in a better way in this communique.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

So let's try and do it and find a formulation that reflects what -- what I think is getting clear in the sense, if that's shared by all.

So what is it -- Again, what is it that we are trying to say? Basically we are trying to say that we think the Board hasn't followed the procedures correctly and that we expect that not to happen anymore in the future. The question is if -- if this is what we want to say, then let's try and find a way to say it, maybe a little bit more directly than it is on -- on this.

So who has a proposal? Egypt?

EGYPT:

So having heard everyone, I think maybe we don't need the first bullet, and we can start with "advises the Board to clearly indicate the action taken with regards to GAC advice in this matter." And then add a bullet stating what you were currently saying that we'd rather this not happen again, but in some other form, I mean.

But I think the two messages is we want a clear indication of what happened. And we want to avoid this situation in the future, I mean, right?

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. If this is what we want to say, does everybody agree with what is now distilling out of the last three interventions,

that there are these two elements that we want to know how exactly the Board thinks it has duly processed our advice? One.

And, two, give a signal that we expect this -- this then the question is what? If they think that -- so what is the second thing? We are still not there yet. At least me, personally, I don't fully get it. If somebody has a formulation. So I have Jamaica, CTU, U.K. So let's try and -- and Egypt. And get this more clear so that we can put it into words. Jamaica. Please.

JAMAICA:

Okay. Just for clarity, is it that we're saying that, based on the resolution that the ICANN board has made and has now made public, that we do not think that they have followed the GAC's advice? Is that what we're saying? Okay.

Well, in that context, then one could remain.

But, with respect to calling them out on the approach that they took, maybe where we could deal with that is in the enhancement of mutual cooperation and understanding text where we're saying, you know, we need to work these things out. So maybe that would be a more appropriate section to deal with the issue. We aren't necessarily placing it under the two-character country code, even though this is clearly where it occurred.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Actually, I'm already happy, if we got the words for it and then we can, as a second step, we find a place for it. But you have a point there. We could also make that point under the other section. But let's try and find a formulation for it. And then see where we put it.

I have CTU, U.K., Egypt, and Iran.

CTU: Thank you, Chair. It seems to me, if we are talking about this topic of two-character country character codes, that we need to take note that the Board has passed this resolution. That it doesn't say right there to me that's how it should begin. The GAC took note that the Board passed the resolution on this matter.

And then we proceed to say what we want to say, whether it is -- whether we're asking them to specify how they took into account the advice that the GAC gave. But I think we need to record that the Board -- that the GAC has taken note of this resolution to begin the discussion.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I think that should be part of the rationale. Because that's not part of the advice. It's an element rationale for why we're giving another advice on this issue. Maybe we should say, "The GAC" -- we should follow the CTU's proposal. The GAC took note.

We have a proposal from Olivier that we may use as an element of what you're trying to say an advice. Always communicate its position regarding GAC advice before adopting measures directly related to such advice. That may be an element that we could use. Let's follow the order. U.K., Egypt, and then Iran.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thank you. While I think a statement ought to be made about serious concern here because the Board has taken a decision without providing a clear response to the GAC.

The GAC's advice from Helsinki.

So the GAC expresses serious concern that the Board has proceeded to take a decision without providing a response to the GAC advice in the Helsinki communique in this matter. And maybe refer to our established GAC board procedures.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Maybe. That may help. So we could say add this into the last phrase that is now new. In the rationale because that's a note of concern. That's not an advice. So maybe, Tom, if you create a new paragraph here. And then we started with what Mark said in the beginning. You said the GAC is concerned -- not in the beginning -- that the GAC.

UNITED KINGDOM: The GAC expresses serious concern. Not just concern.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Maybe you repeat your --

UNITED KINGDOM: The GAC expresses serious concern that the Board has proceeded to take a decision in this matter without responding to the GAC's advice provided in the Helsinki communique.

Stop. This is not in accordance with agreed GAC-board procedures. Stop. That's off the top of my head that last bit.

Maybe we need to work on that. This is not in accordance with the agreed GAC-board procedures. Stop.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Maybe, if we say, "In the view of the GAC, comma, this is not" -- to say this is our view.

And then we could actually use this last phrase as a rationale for something that we basically say the GAC advises the Board to, basically, stick to the agreed procedures, to put it bluntly, as a second element. Would that be -- do we think the rationale is now laying out the situation in a way that we see it? I'll quickly go through it again. The first part. "The rationale provided for advice in the Helsinki communique on this matter remains valid. With regard to timing and transparency, the Board had not responded to the Helsinki communique at the time of preparing the Hyderabad communique as this has not assisted resolution of outstanding" -- and this has not assisted resolution of outstanding issues. And then we go on to say, "The Board has passed a resolution on this --" maybe we should say we have taken note that the Board has passed. But it's not necessary.

"The Board has passed a resolution on this matter at its meeting of 8 November 2016.

Then GAC expresses serious concerns and so on.

And we think that this is not in accordance with agreed -- oh, I established rather than agreed. Because I established in the bylaws actually. Is that okay that we say established GAC-board

procedures? Does this rationale capture what the situation is?
Are we on the same page with this? Spain?

SPAIN:

I think it falls a little bit short of what some members want to say.

If I take the words from Jamaica that the GAC does not think that the Board has accepted their advice as they pretend they have done, the issue is not whether they have provided a response or whether the response was provided before they decided on the issue. The issue is that they say they have accepted, and we think they have not accepted.

So I think it goes far from this. But I'm not in a position to provide the wording. It's a very small comment why they would say that they have accepted our advice. It's because they have not taken the GAC communique of Helsinki in isolation. They have seen the whole series of communiqués on this issue and especially the Los Angeles communique in 2014 when the GAC said that the experience shows that there is no problem with the use of two-character codes at the second level. And they repeated twice or three times.

So we should be more consistent in our communiqués. Because, once we say something, they will say another thing.

And we give the opportunity to the Board to take the one that follows more closely what they want to approve. This is the situation. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

So, basically, you're saying they only take those elements of past GAC advices into account that they can basically use for their rationale. And they do not mention or highlight others that would be saying something different taking into account that otherwise has developed over the years on this issue? The question is: How do we -- if that's what we want to say, how do we put that in? What we could do is -- one element is there. The GAC expressed serious concerns that the Board has proceeded to take a decision without responding to GAC advice provided in the Helsinki communique.

What we may add there is, if they had communicated the decision to us, we would have had the chance to react. And maybe we could introduce after Helsinki communique and, thus, impeded the GAC from having a chance to react and engage and whatever. Blah, blah, blah.

So maybe that would be an element that brings us closer to what we're trying to say. Jamaica.

JAMAICA:

The additional rationale could be in terms of language does affect how it could be used. So we would be noting the resolution. And we would be going on to say that the GAC is unclear as to whether the resolution gives effect to the advice, which is what was issued by virtue of the Helsinki communique. Because I think that's what's happening here. There is a sense of uncertainty as to whether it fully captures the entire communique. So that in my mind could be rationale for why you want them to tell you whether or not they think they have applied. Because it's unclear to us whether, in fact, they have.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Yes, thank you. But, basically, this is not only something for exceptional cases. It's a standard thing that they have to tell us whether they accept or reject the advice.

And they haven't told us before issuing the resolution. So I think this is, basically, what the text proposed by Mark and expanded says. That our concern is that the Board has proceeded to take a decision without responding, maybe without prior responding to the GAC's advice provided in the Helsinki communicate.

So the logic of the sequence of events is that we give advice. The Board gives an answer, gives us a chance to comment on that answer. And only if we're in agreement that this is accepting the advice, then a decision can be taken. At least this is how I see

the logic. And I think we're trying to reflect this here. I have Egypt and then Iran on my list.

EGYPT: Thank you. I withdraw -- I was going to propose something along the lines that Olof has already proposed and even in a better formulation. So thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: This is already in the text. Iran.

IRAN: Thank you. I don't know whether I start with the advice or start with the rationale. Advice I am not in agreement with that. We should clearly mention apply our previous advice. Always communicate. But the first one said that please apply our previous advice. I don't know why it has been deleted immediately. I agree do not delete anything. Keep it as it was. This is correct.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Because some people felt that it doesn't make sense to ask them to apply something that they think they have applied. That was the reason why we deleted it.

IRAN: I am not among those. Clearly, please apply that. If they have not applied, that is their fault. What is the problem to maintain that?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: But then you would need to state that we think they have not applied the advice. Do we have an agreement that we think the Board has not applied the advice? Then we need to state this -- maybe let's go to the rationale first that we see -- consequence that is --

IRAN: Okay. Rationale, first, a small editorial. Instead of past -- either approved or -- approval adopted. The Board has approved or approved. Now, the first one is okay. 8 November 20 -- after that you have to connect these together to this effect or in this connection, the GAC expresses in the connection of that resolution. We should be clear. In this connection, comma, the GAC -- and the sentence is perfect. That's okay. Now, do you want to stop here? Or you want to say that in future before applying or adopting any resolution, please take into account the GAC advice.

There are two different things. We are just addressing the issue of the resolution or GAC with the 56 meeting. Do you want to say something about future or not?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: That would then be the advice part. That is an action that we ask the Board to take. So at least that's the logic that I see. But you're fine with the rationale the way it is now.

IRAN: I'm fine. I'm fine, yeah.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Let's stay with the rationale for a moment. Does this capture the shared feelings of the GAC, or is there something missing? Is it too weak, too strong, or is it fine? So let's try and get the rationale sorted out.

And then see what we want to say as action items in the advice part. Palestine.

PALESTINE: I think that this text is adequate the way it is. But I think in GAC I have a question here. Especially I have attended yesterday the working session. And I am asking whether ICANN board decided to take this resolution. What is the mechanism and how can

they develop the stakeholder -- multistakeholder model according to this resolution that got adopted. And where are we in the future from this resolution? Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I'm not sure I understand your question. So can you rephrase it and help me understand you. Thank you.

PALESTINE: Concerning this resolution that was adopted by ICANN Board this morning, I think ICANN Board had taken this decision or resolution without referring to any member of the board in GAC. Where do we stand here concerning this adoption of the resolution? What is our future in this respect?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I think that that may be two sides. If you read the resolution, there's a lot of references to the GAC and the GAC advice. So we cannot say they have not taken the GAC advice into account, because that obviously has been done. We may say we -- that two things we may say. One is the thing that is there, and I think that's clear. We say they have jumped the gun or whatever you call it in English by taking the decision before coming back to us and telling us that in their view, they have accepted it and this is how they have accepted it and this is how

they're planning to implement it, and then ask us is this okay for you? Do you agree with our interpretation or do you think we have actually not accepted or not implemented the advice?

And only after that they should take the decision.

So they have deprived us of that communication element in between that they validate with the GAC that we agree to their -- and reply to us.

This is what the existing red text is trying to capture if I get this right.

To what this means for the future cooperation and so on and so forth, everybody is free to interpret. But the feeling that I had is that in addition to the substance, we wanted to say we expect this not to happen again, in one way or another; that that would be the second element of the advice that we would give, and then we can discuss with Jamaica's idea whether we do this here or do this in the other section. But that is -- these are the two elements; that we think that the Board hasn't properly followed the process and that this -- that this means that we expect the Board to follow the process in the future, but, actually, also on this one. But this one is now -- is now decided.

I hope that answers your question.

Okay. Can we leave the rationale as it is and not -- Jamaica.

JAMAICA: My apologies, but is that first paragraph going to remain? Because we may just consider deleting that and just keeping the language that is now in red. Because the first paragraph doesn't seem to be applicable anymore.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yeah, that may make sense because of course it remains valid, but that's not the point anymore, if that's what you're trying to say.

So should we -- Basically the essence is -- I think Jamaica is right, the essence is the red new text; is that right? So do we delete the first one that is now blue? Any objections? No. Because that brings it to point.

So this is the rationale: We realize the Board approved something, did not follow the procedures, in our view.

Okay. Let's go back to the -- to this.

So what does that mean? What is the advice that we're giving to the Board based on the rationale that we have now formulated? What do we -- what do we want to say to the Board?

The first thing would read we indicate or we ask them to indicate the actions taken with regard to GAC advice. Maybe this is not yet as clear as we would like it to be.

Iran.

IRAN: Yes. We could say "clearly indicate whether a GAC advice in this regard has been duly taken into account in the approved resolutions."

We don't know whether they have taken.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: No, we do, because they say they did. They say that they took it into account. That's not the issue.

IRAN: We say to ensure that. To ensure that the GAC advice has been taken into account.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yeah, but they say we have done that. This is what they say.

We can say indicate to us whether you have formally -- for the sake of formality, indicate whether you have accepted it, but

that basically is already -- they say they have accepted it. That is there. So what are we trying to say? What are we trying to say?

We think they haven't followed the procedures. They haven't given us -- they have not implemented the advice the way we have expected it and we had no chance to say this. This is what I understand that we are trying to say.

So Hungary.

HUNGARY: Probably the word "how" would help. "Clearly indicate how the GAC advice has been taken into account," or "has been applied."

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Well, but the "how" is the resolution. The decision is this is how they -- and the rationale and the decision and -- Their idea of how is there, I think.

Spain and then CTU, and then Egypt.

SPAIN: Could that capture the idea, indicate the reasons why they think they have accepted GAC advice?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: CTU and then Egypt. Sorry.

CTU: Thank you. Clearly indicate whether the actions taken were in accordance with GAC advice in this matter.

That the actions taken were in accordance with GAC advice in this matter.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Egypt.

EGYPT: Thank you, Chair.

I think we're not converging quickly because we're not all on the same page regarding the resolution itself. The resolution mentioned in addition to resol- -- to the GAC communique of Los Angeles and others, "whereas in the GAC's Helsinki communique, 30 June 2016, the GAC advised the Board to," and then in quotation, from the GAC communique, "the advice was incorporated in the proposed measures to avoid confusion."

So as per the Board, they have taken the GAC advice into account, and they have taken it into account by incorporating whatever the GAC asked for in the measures that has been approved.

Whether this is satisfactory to the GAC or not, I don't know, but at least this is a quotation from the resolution.

So bearing this in mind, we can then -- at least my opinion is we're not happy that they took the decision before replying or responding to the GAC communique. I think this is the issue now, but not that whether they followed or how. I mean....

So. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

So if I follow the logic and the information that has been given to us by Egypt, as a consequence of the rationale, what we should be saying is that, in the rationale, we note that they haven't followed the procedures properly, basically. What we should be trying to say is then we advise the Board to follow the procedures properly.

Iran.

IRAN:

Chair, can I request you kindly please do not interrupt me. I was saying something. You all of a sudden interrupted me and said your views.

Allow me to complete my --

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Point taken.

IRAN: Please, please. Even if I am wrong, please allow me to finish.

The sentence proposed was correct. Clearly indicate whether the action taken by the Board, as referred to in resolution adopted of 8 November, is consistent with the GAC advice given in Helsinki communique.

Do you want that I repeat? Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yes, sorry if I -- I thought you were finished. So if you can repeat that, we can put this down on paper.

Thank you.

IRAN: Clearly indicate whether actions or the -- I don't know. I don't think the action. Actions taken by the Board as reflected or as referred to in resolution adopted at 8 November -- on 8 November 2016 is fully consistent with the GAC advice given in Helsinki communique.

Consistent with the GAC advice given in the Helsinki communique. You want to put the date, put the date. That's

enough. The first paragraph, okay. Second paragraph, always communicate its --

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Wait a second, please, before Thomas is there.

Okay. Please go on, Iran.

IRAN: The second paragraph is always communicate -- say always communicate in future its position or the position of the Board. Instead of it's the position of the Board. It should be made clear, the position of the Board regarding GAC advice before adopting any measure directly related to that advice. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Iran.

Comments? Reactions?

Does this capture what we have been trying to say?

Can I take this silence as agreement?

Spain.

SPAIN: Just a little question is "are fully consistent."

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. Objections?

Singapore.

SINGAPORE:

I think for the Roman II, we should ask the Board to indicate how, in future, you will ensure that you will communicate with the -- with -- communicate GAC before adopting any measure. I think we should ask them to tell us how you will ensure that you will communicate the position of Board to GAC, rather than telling them that you always have to communicate.

I mean, we put the -- we put the point to tell us how you will ensure you will communicate GAC before adopting the -- before you take action on GAC's advice.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Singapore. That may make it more operational in the sense that instead of just answer yes, we will, that we get an explanation of how they want to ensure.

Do we want to add to this that we do not just want to be informed, like one day before, but to express the idea that we want to have a chance to react before the decision is taken? Because I think that's the key. It's not just about being informed. It's about having the chance to react and say we do not agree with the implementation. Or is that not necessary?

Spain.

SPAIN: I think it's -- It is necessary. We should do it, because it is in the rationale, but it's not in the up-front part.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So if you would want to add an element in there, it would maybe mean always communicate in future the position of the Board regarding GAC advice in due time before adopting any measure. And we could add, if you want, something, "which would allow the GAC to react before the decision is taken" or something like that. And then indicate how this is supposed to be done.

Iran.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Chairman. I think the last part is not necessary, "and indicate how this will be done." It's not necessary.

You told them what you have to tell them before.

Palestine.

PALESTINE:

From my short experience, in my short experience with two characters in the second-level domain, I suggest that we add, even if it's a small part on the three-letter domains as well so that, you know, we can prevent and preempt what might happen again in the future.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. I see people shaking their heads and trying to move on.

I think we shouldn't single out -- that's a general expectation. That goes for everything, I think. So I don't think there's -- from what I read from people's faces, I don't think we should single out the particular case. It goes without saying that that would apply to every case. It's okay.

Can we live with this or is this something we need to amend still?

Spain and then European Commission.

SPAIN: Just picking up what you have just said, could we say that the Roman II is applicable to advice on any matter? Not just on the two-letter code issue?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Do you have a text proposal that we could ask Tom to type?

SPAIN: "In any matter" or "on any matter," yeah.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay.
European Commission.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Yes, thank you very much. I think this is very good, and I don't want to delay the discussion on this point, but I do think it's useful in this -- either here, and this is perhaps now that we have a nice new text, this is perhaps now the point to add it, and that relates to what I understood to be a commitment from the chairman of the board at our discussion with him on opening up or more transparency on Board resolutions.

So one possibility, and I leave it, of course, entirely to everyone to decide whether it's better here to put a small 3 to add

something about more transparency in advance on Board resolutions for the whole community, or we put it somewhere else. I leave it entirely. I don't want to have a long discussion that's going to create problems but I think we should put it somewhere.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, European Commission. If we pick that request up, it comes in the section about mutual understanding and expectations and communication. So that element is there. So I suggest we look at it then, and if you think it's better here, we can still move it.

Can we live with this? Is it good enough for the hour?

Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Still, I believe the last part "and indicate how this will be done" is not necessary.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Should we delete that, this element, or do you want to retain it?

Any opposition to deletion?

If there's no objection to deleting it, is then we delete it and we make a point of the advice.

Okay.

All right. Can we move on? Thank you.

TOM DALE:

Thank you, Thomas.

The next section deals with protection of IGO names is acronyms. At the break, which seems like a long time ago now, the GAC agreed to a small drafting group involving, as I recall, WIPO, the European Commission, I think the U.K. and several other members. Anyway, they were over there, in any event. And this was the text that was provided to me from that -- from that group. So that's where it comes from. It was communicated via the representative of WIPO.

It reads: The GAC advises the ICANN Board to engage with the GAC and GNSO in a timely process and in a transparent, good-faith dialogue to resolve outstanding differences with regard to protection of IGO acronyms and to report on progress at ICANN 58.

A starting basis for resolution of differences between GAC advice and existing GNSO recommendations is the small group

compromise proposal set out in the October 4, 2016, letter from the ICANN Board chair to the GNSO; namely, that ICANN would establish with respect to IGO acronyms at the second level a procedure to notify IGOs of third-party registration of their acronyms; a dispute resolution mechanism modeled on, but separate from the UDRP, which provides in particular for appeal to an arbitral tribunal instead of national courts in conformity with relevant principles of international law; and an emergency relief -- for example, 24 to 48 hours -- domain name suspension mechanism to combat risk of imminent harm.

In this context regarding curative protections, the GAC urges the ongoing GNSO working group to take the small group proposal into account.

Until such measures are implemented, IGO acronyms on the GAC provided list remain reserved in two languages. The rationale is as follows: IGOs undertake global public service missions and protecting their names and acronyms in the DNS is in the global public interest.

IGOs are unique treaty-based institutions created by governments under international law.

The small group compromise strikes a reasonable balance between rights and concerns of both IGOs and legitimate third parties. And ICANN's bylaws and core values indicate that the

concerns and interests of entities most affected, here IGOs, should be taken into account in policy development processes.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

France.

FRANCE: Thank you, Chairman. I'm a bit confused about the process that was used to build the communique after the first reading and after the comments that were made by several countries. I circulated a proposal on the GAC list that was supported by many countries or some countries at least. And it's not in the communique. It's not even put as an alternative. So that's on the process part.

On the substance, however, I think the text is good overall, except for the first paragraph. I think the language still too weak. So I would like to replace it with the paragraph I sent to Tom which is more precise and advises the Board to take action. Because, as you know, the issue is that for the past four years there's been board inaction so could you please put it as alternative for the first paragraph thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. While Thomas is adding this -- I apologize if there had been confusion about the process. I thought I had encouraged, after the first reading those delegations, that were interested in formulating another proposal to get together and do this together. But maybe that wasn't expressed clear enough. So -- WIPO, you want to react on the general level mor should we wait until we see the proposal? WIPO.

WIPO: Yes. Thank you, Chair. I think it's -- and I do apologize if some of the procedure for bringing this together wasn't followed appropriately. We looked at both the helpful proposal from France that was sent to the list and what's on the screen. I think, practically speaking, most of it is a matter of wordsmithing. And, if you take the existing text and where it says "to engage with the GAC and GNSO," you could add -- sorry, Tom. I know you're typing now. You could add the words take action and" after the first two. I think that may bridge the gap between the two texts.

And apologies for, one, proposal for some of the our colleagues who are following the meeting from afar. I have a proposal for just addition of three words in the following paragraph where it says, "Namely that" at the end of the third line.

The paragraph --

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Go ahead.

WIPO: Just to add the three words "as a package."

And, again, that was a suggestion from colleagues following the meeting from afar.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. Before we discuss the two alternatives, is this generally, as a whole, more -- does this more or less reflect the idea what we're trying to say. Before we go into every single paragraph, are we on the same page with what this is trying to say? If nobody says the opposite, I take that as agreed. And we go through it paragraph by paragraph. Iran.

IRAN: Yes, I agree with you. We should go paragraph by paragraph. Make addition, deletion in that paragraph but not going bottom to up. I have no problem with the first paragraph in red. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So we have -- these are -- let's wait until it's fully written. Is it now? Okay. So we have two alternatives. The read one and the first black one there. Alternatives. Your views. Which one is the one you prefer? We heard Iran. Do you share Iran's view, WIPO?

WIPO: Just to state we have no preference. The second paragraph was an attempt at brevity.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: United Kingdom?

UNITED KINGDOM: I prefer the second one. It seems more strong in terms of resolution of outstanding differences. That's my preference. Thank you.

Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. We have discussed yesterday. We asked the Board to facilitate and the first paragraph is facilitate. You cannot make it stronger and stronger. Look at what they have said and in the public comment period and everywhere. So there's paragraph in the red or red paragraph is reflecting that views to dialogue, to facilitate. I mean, in order to facilitate

through transparency. First paragraph not more strong than that. It is sufficiently strong.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So I see we have a wish to have the word "facilitate" as the same time we have the word: "Outstanding differences" instead of consistencies. France.

FRANCE: Just for the purposes of clarity, I don't think that the second paragraph -- of course, if you know the issue, the second paragraph is clear. But it says to resolve outstanding differences without specifying what you're talking about. The appropriate word is inconsistencies between GAC advice and GNSO recommendations. That's what we're talking about.

In the second paragraph it's not clear enough. That's why I would prefer the first one. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Since we have small preferences for the second one and strong preferences for the first one, I would ask can everybody live with the first one? Is that okay? No objections. All right. So, Tom, please delete -- is there an objection? I'm sorry. Do speak up. Don't hesitate.

United States?

UNITED STATES: We just wanted to mention that perhaps a reference to previous GAC advice might be taking things back way too far. Because there's been a lot of history with respect to what the GAC advice has been. So I just wanted to mention that that we might be actually bringing things back to where -- it's not going to be completely clear for the board. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So, if you say between GAC advice and GNSO recommendations, delete the word "previous" so it doesn't look like so much of reference to history, would that alleviate the concerns of the U.S.? United States.

UNITED STATES: I think the issue is that the GAC advice here could be interpreted as more than what's currently in the small group proposal.

And much of what we're trying to identify is articulated later in the text here.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So what are you suggesting? To take the second -- the one that we'll delete -- no, we haven't deleted it. There's the black or the

red. You using the red or the black? I'm sorry. We made concentrated like --

UNITED STATES: We prefer the back. We're happy with amending it as appropriate to capture some of the points that are being talked here. But, again, our concern here is just broadly referencing past GAC advice. I don't think it's adding any clarity and if anything it's adding potentially confusion.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. WIPO.

WIPO: Thank you. Perhaps as a way to bring that together you could say between the present GAC advice ...

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: What is the present GAC advice? This one here.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This is communique.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: France.

FRANCE: Just a question for clarification to the U.S. So, if you think the second paragraph, what do you mean when you say extending differences? What are you referring to? What he's implied is the inconsistencies between previous GAC advice and against recommendations. That's what it is. So you should know that precise actually outstanding differences is more confusing. It could refer to anything.

Actually, the solutions proposed by the small group is precisely to bridge those inconsistencies. So we make reruns. And I think, if we stick to the second paragraph, it's going to be even less clear. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, United States and then Iran. United States, go ahead, thank you.

UNITED STATES: Okay. The differences are explained in the text below. But the compromise offered by WIPO with respect to current GAC advice resolves our concern. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Would that be an amendment to the first or to the second? To the first. Iran.

IRAN: Yes, Chairman. I understand the difference is vague. The problem was discussed -- GAC advice and GNSO recommendation. We have to clearly mention what is the problem. But not understanding differences. Our preference is for the first paragraph.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: With previous, with current, or with no precision to GAC advice. Iran, if you could clarify, thank you.

IRAN: I think we should tell them previous or present -- GAC advice.

If everybody wants to put present, I have no problem. But what needs present? Which one?

GAC advice already given in that one cause the problem that has not been solved or GNSO recommendation causes problem. I don't think we should prefer to present, previous, future, just GAC advice in regard with that issue. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. United States.

UNITED STATES: Thank you. And, again, just to clarify, we're happy with the text in red now, the first paragraph with the insertion of current. And to try and further clarify, the GAC has evolved over the years. And it would be quite confusing to refer to all GAC advice. So, again, we'd like to maintain current GAC advice. Thank you. Thank you. And say yes to the red one? Iran and then France.

IRAN: Chairman, I would be happy if the United States said what does it mean current civil rights. Current is this one or at giving. What do you mean current? It's still here giving ambiguous wording. What does it mean current? Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.
United States?

UNITED STATES: Current meaning the small group proposal.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: France.

FRANCE: Look, it doesn't make sense. The reason why the small group was convened was precisely to resolve the inconsistencies between make advice and GNSO recommendation. This is the purpose of the small group.

I'd be happy with just saying with GAC advice and GNSO recommendations, but to see current GAC advice doesn't make sense. Because current GAC advice means this advice. So it's not clear at all. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. United States.

UNITED STATES: Perhaps it will help us understand better if it could be articulated what it is that needs to be captured here outside of the current GAC advice? Are there components to the past GAC advice that need to be reflected here? Because, in our mind, the current GAC advice is the current small group proposal.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: I think we may have an inconsistency here. But, if we imply that the small group proposal is our starting position to engage in a

process with an unchanged GNSO set of recommendations, then this is what the use of "current" implies.

If we have the feeling that the advice that has been given so far that has developed has been the starting point compared to the GNSO recommendations that have been starting point and the elements of the small group proposal would be elements for the compromise but not for the starting point.

I think -- what I feel is that is the difference that we're struggling with. So I should have a shared understanding in this regard.

Iran.

IRAN:

Thank you, Chairman. Both are here from the United States. They say that the output of a small group is GAC advice. It is not. It is not GAC advice.

It is proposal for some compromise that is not GAC advice. So I don't agree to put the word "current." Because understanding of current is different for different people. Delete the current and talk about GAC advice. Otherwise you have difficulty. The small group output is not GAC advice. It is the proposal of a small group to resolve the issue.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. France.

FRANCE: Thank you, Chair. I agree with our colleague from Japan and New Zealand that you should take the previous GAC advice which was to put IGOs, acronyms, on reserve list. And now proposal of a small group is a compromise solution between previous advice and the GNSO recommendations. You're right. If we say our starting point is recognition for the small group, it doesn't make sense. We have to show that it was a compromise solution and the GAC tried to remove the compromise. We should underline that. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Maybe, if that helps in the discussions of the Board, they refer to inconsistencies between GAC advice and GNSO recommendations. Could we use the same language? Would that be acceptable at all? That we don't specify it. Would that be acceptable that we say GAC advice and GNSO recommendations.? I see the U.S. is nodding. I see others are nodding, too. The red one would then replace the first black paragraph. Okay. Thank you.

Let's go to the next fun part. The following bullet points will be the starting basis. So it signals that this is not yet necessarily the

end, but it's a starting basis. So I think that shows the flexibility so that maybe something that could give a positive signal. Your comments on the next paragraph pair plus the bullets that follow after that? Any comments? Questions? Iran.

IRAN: Chairman, can we replace east by would. Would be the small group compromise. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Can you accept that? It makes us a little more flexible. You would read a small group. Second line.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'm sorry.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Here. Is that okay? Can we -- give them one more second. Maybe that went really quickly.

So I'm asking you about the umbrella at paragraph here plus the three bullet points. Is there anything -- questions, comments? Iran.

IRAN: Chairman, what does it mean as a package. Package deal. You want to take all the possibilities, latitude, and so on and so forth package. Do we need package really as a package? I suggest it be deleted. >> The reason for this language is that, if you recall originally, the GAC advised ICANN's Board that the notification would go both to the registrant prior to action notification and to the IGO in perpetuity. And, in drawing a compromise on that, it was important that, because we were moving on the preventive side, that there be the curative aspect, which is the second bullet point. The dispute recollection mechanisms. So, in other words, we compromised on the notification portion, the first bullet. And it's necessary to bolster that with the second bullet point, the dispute resolution mechanism post registration.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I think that -- if I get this right, this is to signal that there is a give and take in this and what we would propose to be the starting point. Can we accept this, Iran?

IRAN: Chair, when we say as a package, that means we do not put any element of flexibility, negotiations, and so on and so forth. We say this is package, if you change it. A small thing as that we can't agree. It is in contradiction with the first part as a starting

point. And the third thing we should not be a package. It's a starting appointment. So still I believe we don't need as a package. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: We have views. Other views.

An alternative would be, instead of as a package, namely that ICANN would establish all of the following with respect to IGO acronyms at the second level. Would that be better? It sounds a little bit less closed maybe. Let's give it a try. Would establish all of the following. Can we live with this? And go to the section that says "in these contexts regarding curative protections." Okay. Thank you.

Yes, Peru.

PERU: I would like to go back to the paragraph -- I'm sorry -- I was wondering the GAC advice can urge the GNSO working group to do something. I thought that we were doing --

I thought they were supposed to give advice to the Board, not to the GNSO. No?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Basically, yes. But, I mean, on the other hand, we can say the GNSO urged us to be flexible with the structures. So we can see how they react if you talk to them here. But you have a point.

But you have a point. It's not 100% to the ancient established idea that the GAC gives advice to the Board and only that. Or we could say we encourage the Board urge the GNSO. Then it would be consistent with that logic, if we want.

France.

FRANCE: I share the concerns of Peru. I think it's an advice to the Board. The resolution, Mr. Chairman, is a good one. We could advise the Board to -- or encourages the Board to urge ongoing -- to urge -- to urge the GNSO to -- you know, et cetera.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So we channel it through the Board. So we advise the -- What do we do? Do we advise the Board to urge the ongoing GNSO working group to, blah, blah, blah. Iran.

IRAN: Chairman, we cannot advise the Board to urge GNSO. Board cannot urge anybody.

We should be conscious of what we are saying.

Board has approved the recommendations, and they cannot urge the GNSO unless start triggering that recommendations incorrect. So we have to avoid to putting that. And we are not in a position to the Board urging GNSO. Is impossible.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: European Commission.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Yeah, excuse me, but perhaps WIPO will explain even better, or someone else, but this particular aspect is not specifically advice to the Board. It's in this context that -- and, in fact, Switzerland knows this case even better. But that particular, it was to put this issue in the context of the advice -- the specific advice to the Board, and it relates. But that particular part, so it shouldn't "advise the Board to." Sorry.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Switzerland.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Chair. I think that for once we perhaps should be as efficient as possible, because as you know, or as you might know, the GNSO working group working on curative protections is about to release an interim report for public consultation. So

it would be most efficient for us to, on these curative protections that are mentioned in the small group proposal, to give them specific backing from the GAC so that the GNSO PDP Working Group is aware directly with the intermediaries who might react in six months that we are really supporting those elements as part of the curative protections.

Perhaps this is a question of where we place this text. We could take it to another place in the communique, like we've done other times, and say in the context of what is said under advice to the Board regarding the IGO protections, we also urge the GNSO, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah.

But from a purely textual point of view, it would make sense to leave it here.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: With or without the addition in red?

Without.

Iran.

IRAN: Chairman, do we expect the ICANN Board urges GAC to do something?

Now, do you expect that GNSO ask the Board to urges GAC to do something? No.

So I suggest to put the following. Put in a passive voice. Advises that the small group proposal be taken into account, without referring to GNSO. Put in pass a passive voice.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: By the Board. By the Board. Let's put the text on.

Thank you. Reactions on the proposal by Iran.

France, Switzerland.

FRANCE: I agree with what Switzerland said. If the GNSO urges GAC to do things, then GAC should be able to urge GNSO to do things as well. Maybe a compromise solution would be to put it somewhere else, not in the advice part.

But I think on the substance, we agree with Switzerland. It's very important in this GNSO working group takes into account this proposal. On the substance, we totally agree. Then the only issue is how do we formulate it, where do we put it in the communique. But on the substance, it's very important that we keep the GNSO working group on curative rights.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Switzerland.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Chair. I very much agree with what France just said. I think that if we take this bit without the new additions and we specify that we are -- we are referring to the context of the advice mentioned under the advice section regarding IGO protections, we could use the same language and put it under other issues, for instance, and, well, we send a copy, perhaps, to the GNSO PDP Working Group.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Something that we have to keep in mind, that, as we know, the GNSO is reading our advice as well. They are commenting to the board with what they think -- how they understand the advice, what they think they are doing or is feasible or not feasible.

So the GNSO is actively, from their side, also, to some extent, has become a recipient of advice. I think this is fair to say.

-- -- so what do we do?

First of all, do we -- Let's maybe start with do we want to retain this urge to the GNSO in our communique, Northern? And if yes,

the question would then be where and how? But let us have the first.

Iran.

IRAN: Chairman, we cannot urge the GNSO for the reason that we do not expect GNSO urge GAC.

They are two independent. We cannot send anything to the group because group is open to everybody. We could not exclude everybody.

So either put it elsewhere, but it is not an advice. To asking Board to urge GNSO. Otherwise, in future, they do the same thing. They ask the Board to urge the GAC to do something. Do we want to accept such urge? I don't think it's correct.

So put it elsewhere but not in the advice.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: My question is do you want to retain the idea in the document? That was my question. But now you say put it elsewhere but not here.

I was asking do you want to retain this in the document?

IRAN: I would say no.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. Should we delete, take this off completely?

European Commission.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Well, perhaps another compromise.

Perhaps, then, if we move it somewhere else we could say, "And regarding curative rights, we have addressed this in another part," so at least we don't lose that aspect from here.

It's very complicated to see and read the GAC communique. So that's just another idea.

I'm not objecting to moving it out, but let's refer back to it, at least, if we do that.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: What if we try to, for the sake of complexity, if we leave it here but we don't say "urge" but we say "invite." In this context, the GAC invites the GNSO. Would that make things simpler or does it not change anything at all?

Iran.

IRAN: Chairman, invite is not advice. Put it elsewhere with invite, I agree with that. We could invite everybody in a polite manner, request or invite, but not in the advice part. Elsewhere. Regarding this and this, GAC invites GNSO to take into account all the group. But we could not put it in the advice part, because invitation is different from advice.

Advice has a very clear meaning. Very clear connotations.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

So do you agree with Iran? Should we move it elsewhere?

France.

FRANCE: Just a question. If there is already agreed language for the GAC to use the word "urge" in its previous communique, then we can keep We should just know is it agreed language or not in previous communiques? If it was already used in previous communiques, then we could use it for this one.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: From what I understand, we are now discussing where to move it or whether to leave it here. Iran would request that this is not retained here but removed -- moved elsewhere.

But -- So that we would move it -- and I guess that would mean we would move it under other matters, for instance.

We have to somehow close the circle because otherwise we'll be here until tomorrow, which is I don't think our intention.

Switzerland.

SWITZERLAND: Yes, let's move it, other matters. Let's do it.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: WIPO.

WIPO: Yes, thank you, Chair. Just by way of what's been done in the past, in the Los Angeles communique, for example, the GAC did advise the Board and the GNSO to develop concrete solutions to implement longstanding GAC advice. That's the text from the communique so this isn't unprecedented.

And just to sort of recap where we are and the rationale for this, in a sense we are in somewhat uncharted territory. We have

only fairly recently had the notion of a GAC-GNSO liaison. We had the notion of early engagement by the GAC in the GNSO process. So this really is an attempt to meet these ideas that have been raised in the community.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: We seem to have a formal discussion about -- about this. Should we leave this in brackets for the time being and try to move on and see if this is the only thing that's left?

Okay? All right. So let's give had a little bit of air and then we hope to resolve it later.

So I think the last one is "Until such measures are implemented, IGO acronyms on the GAC provided list remain reserved in two languages."

That's probably -- "Should remain reserved" or "remain reserved"?

WIPO.

WIPO: It's, in a sense -- Sorry. It's more a factual statement, so that the Board has resolved that they remain reserved. So it's not -- I think "should" is not necessary.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. So this is referring to a resolution from the Board.

Okay. Can we go to the rationale?

Any comments on the first two?

These four bullets before Paris, are they okay?

I don't see any objections or comments, so I take that this is fine.

All right. So let's move to the next one.

Have there been any changes on this one? No. So I guess that we can move on to the one after.

Underserved regions. Have we made changes to this one? So Tom, please go ahead.

TOM DALE: Thank you, Thomas. There was some -- some minor changes to that, I think submitted from the Underserved Regions Working Group. So it currently reads: The GAC advises the ICANN Board to take required action to enable implementation of GAC underserved regions activities, which includes but is not limited to -- but is not limited to capacity building and participation in ICANN policy processes. The rationale remains unchanged.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Any questions? Comments? Objections, mainly? Concerns?

If that's not the case, then I think we can move on to the next one. String similarity review. Have there been any changes to this one?

TOM DALE:

Only to -- to remove the reference to this will have no affect on stability, security, and so on, of the DNS. That was removed. I think that was the only change.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

So that phrase was deleted.

European Commission.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION:

Yes. I suggested earlier that in the interest of reducing these very long communiques that we just stop it where it says "guidelines," and take out all the in particulars. Because that's all in the GAC chair's letter so I'm not sure it's necessary to repeat it.

That was just in the interest of efficiency and -- and fewer things to argue about as well.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I think nobody would object to this.

Okay.

Next.

Now, this is a new -- or this is a fundamentally revised attempt to capture the discussion that we had, and this was about trying to avoid that we say problems or differences in the perception of roles but, rather, to put it positively forward looking, and the proposal is this: That we will call this enhancement of mutual cooperation and understanding. And it would read: The GAC advises the Board to engage in enhanced and more regular communication with the GAC and supporting organizations with a view to fostering better mutual understanding of each other's roles and procedures in the ICANN framework.

The second one would -- That will be general with everybody, and the second would be bilateral relationship between the GAC and the Board. Engage and enhance in more regular communication with the GAC with a view to foster mutual understanding of the nature and purposes of GAC advice on issue of public policy and related to international and national law, and also with a view to better understand the GAC's expectations and the Board's deliberations related to the implementation of GAC advice. This way it also refers to the

challenges that we've had with the implementation of the two-letter character issue.

And then a third one makes a specific proposal that make it -- that we discussed in the meeting with the Board. Make it a regular practice to schedule a Board-GAC call within -- within four weeks of a communique being issued to ensure mutual understanding of its provisions.

And the second one is the one that has been brought in by the EU, by European Commission earlier, which would be: Consider publicly posting draft resolutions in advance of board meetings.

The rationale to this, at the first post communique -- The first element is the same. At the first post communique conference call between the Board and the GAC on 20 July 2016, the GAC realized that such interaction contributes to a shared understanding of the provisions of the advice issued. Such enhanced interactions seemed to assist the Board in better understand -- or understanding the GAC's intentions and expectations when issuing advice and help the GAC to better understand the Board's deliberations when analyzing and processing GAC advice.

In addition, and in the interest of transparency, the GAC has the view that it may be useful for effective interaction between

stakeholders if the content of the Board's draft resolutions were made available before their adoption.

So there are these two elements. One is being increased and regularized communication and interaction between the Board and the GAC, but also the other SOs and ACs. And the other one is increased transparency through making the draft resolutions of the board available before their meetings.

So let's go back to the advice -- to the four elements of the advice. New Zealand.

NEW ZEALAND:

Thank you, Chair. We support the advice and look further to working with the Board as we think there's a lot we can do to have better communication.

My comment to regard to Roman III. This isn't a specific text proposal, but I'm happy to bring one forward if it's useful. We wanted to note that the Board teleconference often present challenges, particularly in the Asia Pacific time zone. Because of this, we continue to support the discussion of the communique with the Board through a face-to-face meeting following the issuing of the communique while we're still in the ICANN meetings. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: That point is well-taken. Why don't we offer both alternatives. So to say make it a regular practice to schedule a GAC/board meeting. Either physically -- something blah, blah, blah while we're still here, basically, or through a call. So that -- we may also have that call once at a moment where it's more convenient for you. So it's not -- although, of course, the pressure is always high to go for the majority that lies in the middle.

And -- but, so just to at least, from my side, we also do not have the leadership calls always the same time although if -- yeah. So that we rotate the burden. Can we -- and so in the meantime, Thomas already came up with something. Make it regular practice to schedule a board-GAC meeting either at the relevant ICANN meeting or in a call within four weeks of a communique being issued to ensure the mutual understanding of its provisions. That does not help. Egypt and then Iran. Egypt, first. Thank you.

EGYPT: Thank you. And I think, if we don't have a fixed time for the call, then maybe we can consider rotation as well just to share the unfairness. I was just wondering. And I don't have a strong position here.

But the first two bullets -- would those fit more in a rationale rather than advice? I mean, I agree to all what's written in them.

But I cannot see a concrete advice or a concrete suggestion like Roman III and IV. But I leave it to you. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Egypt. I think I see your point. The thing is, given that the rationale is not even intensively read and this a fundamental issue, my advice to you would be to leave it here.

But, of course, you decide.

If you don't have a problem with what it says. Because that's -- the other one is one concrete proposal, but it's in an advice that is more general. Iran.

IRAN: Thank you. No problem with that. But I think when we put all that is one replacing the other. Perhaps that is something that is not only either this or that, depending on the circumstances. If we have physical meeting, we do physical meeting. Between the meeting we do the conference call. So it is not or. Either and/or, but it is not or, because one is not replacing the other.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: I thought it was either/or. Because either we meet physically after the issuing of the advice. And, if we don't meet, then we have to have a phone call. Egypt.

EGYPT: So just to make sure that we don't repeat the confusion that happened on the mailing list again, there is a face-to-face meeting that normally takes place at the ICANN meeting with the Board. And I think it is on, and this is not subject to our discussion. The proposal here has to do with the post communique. So post communique we can either have another face-to-face meeting or a call. Right?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: I think that's the challenge. You're right. New Zealand.

NEW ZEALAND: Yes, I think our colleague from Egypt has identified exactly what the problem is. Perhaps we can say yes, a post communique meeting or a meeting to discuss the communique to make this clear.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So, as Tom has said, is this clear enough? Or maybe if you take the time to ensure mutual understanding of its provisions to after post committee -- communique meeting and then, comma, at the relevant ICANN meeting or -- does that make it even more clear? So that we move the end this one to ensure that you

move this here? So we have the whole idea at once. And we say this can be done either at the meeting itself or within four weeks. Is that clear enough for everyone? Okay. Any other bullets on the advice? If not, let's go to the rationale? Any comments, suggestions? If that is not the case, then we have gone through. Iran.

IRAN: Chairman, I have a proposal with the part we put in brackets. Perhaps you can try that. May facilitate.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Just a second. Just to be clear the bracket is the only thing we have left. The rest is agreed, or is there something else that we're missing? Which of the three of you will go first. Argentina.

ARGENTINA: Just one addition to the text about the NomCom statement. That it was agreed that this would be analyzed in the GAC. Only that.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. Which section is that?

ARGENTINA: It's first internal.

Where we internalize on a way in. And no participation in the NomCom.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: One second, Olga. So which one do we do first?

That -- the hope that this one will be resolved quickly. Let's give this one minute because we have the other one before. Tell us exactly where you would want to put it.

ARGENTINA: It says GAC participation in the NomCom. And then it says independent yet.

These internal matters.

There. After the -- there. It was agreed that this request will be analyzed within the --

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Slower, please.

ARGENTINA: Will be analyzed or reviewed within the GAC, consider -- yeah, considered within the GAC.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: That's it.

ARGENTINA: That's it. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: What do you think? Is this acceptable? I think that's what was agreed, if not I'm not getting this wrong. Okay. Can we accept this? New Zealand?

NEW ZEALAND: Just a procedural question. Are we saying that we've closed the section on working groups? Because I don't believe we've read that. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Sorry. I missed because of the noise gearing up behind us. I can also try to read what you said on the screen.

Why don't we close the section on working groups? I thought we had no more comments. But others also come back on issues that we thought we had closed. Before the whole communique is closes, if somebody realizes that something has been missing.

So does the -- do you agree on the substance? Is this what was agreed, and do you want to see it reflected or not? I think that's the question. Argentina.

ARGENTINA: This is about the sentence. It's not about would. It's will. It was agreed that this text will be considered. This can be reviewed in the transcript. We agreed that.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: We are considering it. Is that okay? Okay.

Thank you.

So let's go to the proposal of Iran in the hope that that would help us get rid of the last -- Canada.

CANADA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I just had a comment regarding the IANA stewardship transition section. I wasn't sure if we intend to go back to the beginning.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: If you want us to go back, then we will go back.

CANADA: I wasn't aware that we'd gone through it. We seemed to skip around.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: We're trying to figure out what are the outstanding elements. If there's something we forgot -- now this is the challenge of not working with a paper, I must say. For me personally, I was born in the 20th century. But I tend have to have a better overview if I have at some time a paper and pencil in front of me.

CANADA: Thank you very much. It's a minor tweak and we raised this point earlier. And I believe it was acknowledged by you, Mr. Chairman. That, in addition to developing procedures, we also need to develop criteria around GAC engagement consistent with the Marrakech communicate. So we were proposing adding the word "criteria" after procedures. Or before. Either way. So procedures and criteria. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Any problems with this? France?

FRANCE: Just a suggestion to stick to the agreed language from Marrakech communique. Was it criteria or was it conditions? So, if it's ccNSO, we should put conditions. Just stick to the agreed language. Okay.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Is that okay. No objections? All right.

Thank you for bringing this up. Yes, you can say something.

ARGENTINA: I forgot to tell you we have support from Uruguay also from our proposal.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. We add -- I suggest that once we try to resolve the brackets, we make a break and print it and then hope that that's going to be it. So let's hold on. United States.

UNITED STATES: I'm sorry. I don't mean to draw this out any longer than it needs to be. But, again, it wasn't clear if we've gone through the working group section. Is this an appropriate time to raise a few edits with respect to the human rights working group, or should I wait?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: We haven't gone through the working group section or have we?
We haven't. Then let's do it.

TOM DALE: Okay. I've been asked to go through it. Starting with the Public Safety Working Group.

The Public Safety Working Group continued its engagement with various ICANN community initiatives. Members of the PSWG participated in meetings in the competition consumer trust and consumer choice, CCT review. Registration directory services PDP working group, privacy and proxy services, accreditation, and the implementation review team, and the security framework drafting team. The PSWG will develop recommendations to the GAC in the area of sensitive strings and child protection online. Continue discussing the working group's operating guidelines, continue to engage in outreach and capacity building activities and hold biweekly, meetings to facilitate outgoing work.

I'm going to pause there.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So that's the text on the Public Safety Working Group. Any comments on this one? Okay. Let's go to the next.

TOM DALE: Okay. Text from the working group on human rights and international law.

The working group was updated by the rapporteur of the CCW subgroup for development of framework of interpretation of human rights core including bylaws that ended into November 2016.

The working group plans to prepare a public consultation draft planned for next February. The group has participation by GAC members and observers in this cross-community effort. Finally, the working group agreed to endorse the efforts by the working group cochairs to help the CCW subgroup rapporteur in liaising with the working group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises. In order to seek their opinion on the application of the guiding principles and human rights in ICANN.

Information was provided by the United Kingdom on the Council of Europe report. Applications to ICANN for community-based new gTLDs, opportunities and challenges from a human rights perspective. This follows up the GAC's discussions in

Marrakech and previously considering the apparent failure of the ICANN processes in the current round, to ensure effective prioritization of community-based applications which had been an important aspect to the GNSO as an original vision for the round.

The Council of Europe will submit the report to the new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP working group and to the CCT review team for their active consideration. The GAC will be requested to comment on endorsing the reports recommendations with a view of submitting advice to the Board at the next meeting in Copenhagen. The group was updated on the work of the cross community working party on corporate and social responsibility to respect human rights. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Comments on this part. United States.

UNITED STATES: Thank you. Largely, in an attempt to condense this text. But the U.S. recommends -- and the paragraph starting with information. It's the second to last paragraph. We recommend after that URL that is listed, striking that sentence that starts with "as follows."

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: The sentence "until further round."

UNITED STATES: Yes, please. And also to strike the last sentence of this paragraph.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Can we accept the proposal by the U.S.? Any objections? I see no -- U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM: Take the one behind you offered by France.

FRANCE: Merci beaucoup.

UNITED KINGDOM: Well, is the reason solely for reducing the volume to the U.S.? Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: United States.

UNITED STATES: For the first sentence reference after the URL, yes. Almost exclusively. For the second sentence, yes, but also with some concerns about referencing endorsing their port' recommendations.

I think, from our perspective, we're fine with considering our recommendation, but not necessarily endorsing the report. So there is with respect to how that's phrased. But, again, I'm not sure how critical it to have this sentence here if it's something more forward looking. But I'm happy to consider all conservatives.

IRAN: Thank you. The paragraph which is now highlighted GAC will be requested. We don't need to say it now. In future such a request will considered. We don't need to anticipate anything will be requested. So I don't think we could be engaged in that in particular formal advice. We don't need to have formal advice or non-formal advice. So I suggest deletions. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Can we accept the deletion of the taking into account given that the text is a rather long and it's a future action that will happen in the future anyway. It will come, and

then we'll discuss it. Is that okay? All right. The U.K. is nodding. So that's deleted. Is it? Can we accept the text as is. Okay. Iran.

IRAN: For following up in square bracket, would you allow me to propose a text?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Wait a second. I thought we'd gone through the whole text. But, apparently, that doesn't seem to be the case. I don't have any paper to take off. So this first time we're reading this. Is that right? So let's read through this. And at the end we have to come up with brackets. Because we have to have one reading of every part of the text. Please, next element, Tom.

TOM DALE: The report from the GAC working group on underserved regions held an Asia Pacific capacity building session at ICANN 57 with the current participation of the ICANN Board, CEO, GSE, GAC chair, and GAC members. The GAC is our host and reconvened an in HIT session on underserved regions.

The co-chairs of the working group welcomed the suggestions made by the community regarding the work plan and in

particular the need to understand challenges and capacity needs of members from underserved regions.

Community members agree that there is a need to allocate necessary resources to enable diversity and meaningful participation of underserved regions stakeholders.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Comments?

I don't see any comments, so we take this as agreed.

Grievance working group?

TOM DALE:

Thank you. Geographic Names Working Group. The working group on protection of geographic names in new rounds of gTLDs met during ICANN 57. The working group discussed a new text for best practices which includes the proposal of creating a repository of names, reference to a due diligence process, and associated procedures for applicants and other parts involved in the process.

The working group received comments and will share a new version with the GAC before the next ICANN meeting.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: New Zealand.

NEW ZEALAND: Thank you. This is probably editorial, and I'll leave it in Tom's hands to adjust, but both the Geographic Names Working Group and the NomCom Working Group, we'd ask that the working groups reflect their full names, which is the Working Group to Examine the Protection of Geographic Names in Any Future Expansion of gTLDs, and the Working Group to Examine GAC's Participation in NomCom.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I don't think there's any objection to that proposal.

Tom will be happy to do that.

(Laughing).

Okay. Thank you. Just mark an asterisk or something that we don't forget it.

All right.

Next one is the NomCom working group.

TOM DALE: Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: United States.

UNITED STATES: My apologies. Before we move on, a few recommended edits to the Geographic Names Working Group.

With respect to the last sentence of the section, the working group received comments, we would like to make some additions to this sentence. So it would read: The working group received comments and will accept additional comments, comma, with the objective of sharing a new version with the working group before the next ICANN meeting.

The intention here being that it's our understanding that the working group participants will have another chance to provide comments, and it's also our understanding that a new version will be shared with the working group prior to going to the full GAC.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Is that okay?

Okay.

Thank you.

Iran.

IRAN: Could we replace "accept" by "welcome"?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yes, we can, I think.

Thank you.

Then we should say "welcomes," not "will welcome."

IRAN: "Will accept comments." "And welcome additional comments."
Not "will accept." Instead of "will accept," "and welcome
additional comments."

Don't need "will." "And welcome additional comments."

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. Any further comments on this one?

Okay.

So have we gone through all the text? No. Do we have to -- the GAC participation and the independent secretariat, have we had that before?

Okay. All right.

TOM DALE:

There's one working group reporting to through, Thomas. The NomCom working group, appropriately titled as requested by New Zealand, met during the ICANN 57 meeting. The working group has entered the new text for the GAC criteria for the NomCom to be considered when selecting candidates for ICANN leadership positions. GAC members suggested changes to the text. The working group will share with the GAC a new version of these criteria before the next ICANN meeting.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Argentina.

ARGENTINA:

Thank you. Maybe we can use the same language that United States suggested for this last sentence, that we will welcome comments, and then we will share with. I think it is the same.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So can we copy/paste? We're just realizing that we're not having a text from the working group on operating principles in the communique, but maybe it's a little late now to come up with something.

So have we now gone through the whole of the text and the only thing remaining is the brackets that Iran would like to give us a proposal?

So let's hear that and then we see whether we can close it.

Iran, please go ahead.

IRAN: Yes, in this part, all the advice, there are bullet points. Yes, you have all of them. And then at the end, I suggested that instead of this bracket we would say that "to facilitate the implementation of the above advice, or advices, GAC invites GNSO, and then say what they have invited them. So it is independent of advice. It is an invitation, but for the implementation of this advice.

So connecting these together. We don't advice ICANN Board to do something, to urge GNSO, but we invite GNSO to take action. So we take -- To facilitate the implementation of the above advice, GAC will invite GNSO, and put part of that, to take the small group proposal into account.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So is that the proposal? And then if yes, is that the solution?
France.

FRANCE: Thank you. It's acceptable for us. Maybe we should be more precise. It's not the GNSO. It's the GNSO working group on curative rights; right?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Is that acceptable to all?
Any objections?
Okay. So if we have not missed anything, that will be it. Now the question is are you comfortable with this or do you want to have it in a proper form before we sign it off? I'm in your hands.
It would take half an hour to print. Am I right?
Or would you want to have it as an electronic proper document all in one with no track changes and that would be fine. That would take less time, I guess.
WIPO.

WIPO: Yeah, I do apologize if we came to this already. The section that referenced the letter from the United Nations Secretary-General, I had just one or two very small clarifications if we're moving to a next version.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Is that under -- Ah, yeah, okay.

Go ahead.

WIPO: So one is just a grammatical point. Where it says "to this respect," it should say "in this respect."

And then where we say "the GAC takes note of," I would propose deleting "communications exchanged between," and replacing that with "letter from." After "nations," delete the "and."

Letter, singular.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: But are we referring to only one letter or is it one letter each? Then it would be two letters.

WIPO: Well, I'll get there.

So after "nations," delete "and."

And we could say, "to ministers regarding policy development at."

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. I think that's a clarification.

Iran.

IRAN: Sorry for my ignorance. Which ministers? You're talking of letters sent to the ICANN? The --

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: No. The U.N. Secretary-General did not send the letter to ICANN. It actually sent the letter to, I guess, all ministers -- all foreign affairs ministers of the members of the U.N. The letter was not sent to ICANN.

There was a response from the CEO of ICANN to the U.N. Secretary-General, but the letter is from the Secretary-General were sent to the ministers. That's a fact -- that's a factual correction in that sense.

Okay.

Can we live with that?

New Zealand.

NEW ZEALAND:

I'm sorry I missed this before. I'm a little bit nervous at this stage preempting the decisions of my foreign minister. So I would prefer it if we said in this respect, GAC reiterates its concern regarding the issues set forth by Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, and we had the full stop there.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Can we accept the proposal of New Zealand?

Any objections?

Okay. Then let's -- Iran.

IRAN:

Chairman, with respect to the subsequent, do you want to work tonight?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Excuse me?

IRAN: You want to work tonight for the continuation of this communique? Or tomorrow?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: No, I don't think that we want to continue tomorrow. I think we want to close it tonight.

IRAN: Why we need to have a printed copy? To do what?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: That was a question. Do you want one?

IRAN: No.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: You don't want one?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. It was a question to you zoo you open, we come another editorial?

Let's finish this. Let's stay calm, finish with this, and then -- All right.

So okay. Other elements for modifications before we discuss the paper thing or not?

Is that it?

Okay.

Is that -- Does that mean that you have -- we have agreed the communique or do you want to see it again before you say we have agreed in whatever form?

My question to you.

It's agreed. You don't want to see it. It's as it is and that's it. I'm in your hands.

Okay. Thank you very much, and that's it. And we will put it in a nice form and blah, blah, blah, and so on and so forth.

[Applause]

And thank you all very much.

Well, if then like this, sorry, or like this (indicating), even better. You know what it says. We are not supposed to make political jokes, I heard, so you haven't seen what is on.

Okay. Thank you very much. Thanks to the interpreters for their patience and great job that they do.

[Applause]

And staff and everybody. This is not yet the end of the meeting. It's just the end of today, by the way, but I think we can thank each other for today.

All right.

Have fun in the evening, and see you tomorrow, I think at 9:00.

Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]