

---

JOHANNESBURG – GAC Communique Drafting Session  
Wednesday, June 28, 2017 – 13:30 to 15:00 JNB  
ICANN59 | Johannesburg, South Africa

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: We are supposed to start that I see not too many people are in the room. So let's sit down, those that are here, and hope that the others will come soon. But I think we actually should get started. Thank you.

Thank you. We are having a little bit of a technical issue so that the screen is not yet connected to Tom's computer as it should be.

The other thing is that we are just now receiving texts -- proposed texts for the communique, which is -- makes Tom need some time to actually work that into the communique.

And to maybe quickly present to you how we plan to have this afternoon structured, as you know, this is a little bit of a special situation for various reasons. One being that this is the so-called policy forum. That is a short meeting that gives us, let's say, reduced time to exchange and to discuss issues. And we are basically drafting the communique after only two and a half days of meeting. And we really need to -- and we only have

---

*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.*

---

limited time this afternoon to work on it. So we need to think what are the messages or what is the advice, to be more precise, that we really want to give to the board at this stage. What are other messages that we want to give to other parts of the community, what is maybe something that we can work on later at a stage where we have more time so we would, I think, need your flexibility in order to come up with -- or come to a conclusion on the communique in a reasonable time today.

We have time from now till 3:00 as a first session. Then we have a break of 15 minutes that we can take or should take probably. Then we have another 90 minutes to continue. Then at 5:00, there's a session, a cross-community session, that I will actually start as the GAC chair and you're all invited and encouraged to participate. That will go until half past 6:00. And then we could - in case that we haven't been able to finalize the communique before, we could add another session, open-ended as long as we would need to. I hope that will not be very late. So this is how the afternoon looks like as you can see on our schedule.

So while we are still waiting for technology to be sorted out, Tom has a few issues to add to what I just told you.

TOM DALE:

Thank you, Thomas. While we're waiting for the on-screen arrangements to be fixed -- while we're doing that, there are at

---

the moment two elements of text for draft GAC advice to the board in the communique, just two. There are headings for some other things, but there are only two sets of text. One I think Olga -- one that Olga Cavalli on behalf of a number of members have just circulated concerning a short text on advice to the board concerning two-character country codes at the second level.

And the second concerns a short text, which is in the version that I just emailed to you ten minutes ago. And that concerns advice to the board on funding of activities of the underserved regions working group. Those are the two matters of substance in text form in the part of the communique dealing with GAC advice to the board at the moment. The rest of the draft communique covers the usual range of other issues, including meetings and internal GAC matters. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Tom.

Questions? Yes, Argentina.

ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. Thank you, Tom.

---

A question about the text related with the working groups, I personally prepared a very brief text. I thought that was the idea. I would like clarification on that.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. Yes, I think we discussed it in the leadership team, if I'm not mistaken, or was it in the whole GAC. Oh, yeah, you're not...

Still think of you as part of the leadership team.

We had a discussion about what to do with reference to working groups. And my proposal is that we should have a short text to be put in the communique, not as piece of advice but as important information about every working group and what they have done or what they plan to do and, if possible, or if wished with a link to the page on the ICANN Web site -- or the GAC Web site where further information about the work of particular working group is placed. So, yes, you are right that we would like to have a short text about what the working groups have done.

There's another thing that we discussed actually because some of the work -- one working group will have its meeting tomorrow. There's also some other sessions will be held tomorrow. Obviously we can't put in the communique what

---

they will have done tomorrow today. So there are two ways to address this. One is depending on the urgency of the advice or the messages that we will have in the communique, we could think about finalizing it, whatever we have done so far, and then trusting the leadership and the secretariat that they will add uncontroversial descriptive elements about what we did tomorrow to the communique and then release it only tomorrow. That will be one option.

Another option would be to finalize it today and add some references of what we intend to do tomorrow in the communique. Maybe there's even a third option that we haven't thought about. So this is something that we need to know what we want. But we can decide this at the later stage. But maybe you also spend some time thinking about what you think is the appropriate way. It's probably easier to decide once we will have the text about the advice, then we will know whether this is necessary to be communicated today or whether tomorrow would be fine still.

Iran.

IRAN:

Thank you, Thomas. I think the most important issue is we deal with the communique part which is related to the GAC advice while everyone is here in session.

---

With respect to the remaining part, meeting with X, Y, Z, so on and so forth, either way we could agree depending on the decisions. If we can do it today, why not. If not, tomorrow. But advice should be completed today. Everybody's here and finalized. And we should not add anything to that at all. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. I think we have an agreement on what you just said.

Okay. Tom, where are we? Are you ready?

So this is what we've received so far. The headings are issues where we may have or get some advice. Again, this is, of course, up to the GAC as a whole to decide whether or not you want to have advice on the headings or whether there's other elements of advice where we haven't -- that we haven't thought of that would then need to be added. Of course, this is your decision. This is just an attempt to prepare things and to the extent it's predictable from us.

I see Denmark.

DENMARK:

Thank you. Sorry to be late. But are we going to comment on the proposal now or on the two-character code?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: We're going to through this one by one.

DENMARK: Okay.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Trying to get a sense of, first, do you want to have some advice on each of the headings? Yes or no? Then if yes, what should that be in terms of substance? Then we would need to have somebody who would write some draft text, that we would designate to write this in the course of this first round. And once we've gone through all of this, we will wait to get additional text, if we decided to get additional text; then have a second round where this additional text will be put in. And then go into the details of the substance. That's what I propose.

Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. We should be very careful not to have multiple advice on a subject. We have given our advice before. The only thing we should even -- not even, only talk about follow-up action but not in the sort of advice, just sort of invitation, request, or so on. Advice already given. What advice

---

we have to give again? Because then we contradict what we have said.

We have made a lot of time last time to have an advice which was consensus advice. And why we have to change that? I don't think that.

The only thing we have to see what happen between that time and now and one or two paragraphs as a sort of follow-up action without under the title of "advice." Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. Your point is well-taken. Of course, in the end, this is a decision of the whole of the GAC that we will have to sort out. But your point is well-taken.

Argentina.

ARGENTINA:

Thank you. And thank you, Iran, for the comment. We don't think that this text contradicts the GAC advice on the matter. And we think it emphasizes the desire of having this space of dialogue.

And it was also mentioned by the CEO of that ICANN saying that they would be okay. So we think this reinforces what has been discussed.



---

And we don't think it contradicts the GAC advice. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Please we are not yet discussing substance. I was proposing to you a way to work with this, and if you have any comments on this, please make them. Otherwise, let's start looking at each heading and decide, again, first do we want to see advice on this, yes or no, what would it be in terms of substance, like it's a broad idea, and then go to the next level of detail.

I see Olof has his hand up. Thank you.

OLOF NORDLING: Thank you, Chair.

And just on this particular piece, I just want as a point of clarification whether Argentina means that this is advice to the board, meaning that the board is advised to create a task force. The board is going to do that. Is -- well, if so, I mean, it should be made clear what we ask for the board to do.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Please do not make comments now on the substance of the two-character code advice. We are not there yet.

---

Otherwise, we'll stay here until midnight, if we don't stick to some discipline, please.

Manal, is your question on -- okay.

So can we go through the elements, just getting a sense advice, yes or no, and what would that more or less be if it was yes?

Okay. Thank you.

First one, I'll let Tom do this nice job to go through it. Thank you.

TOM DALE:

Thank you, Thomas.

Well, the heading which was included in the draft that I sent around early this morning is "Protections of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Designations and Identifiers." It was included by myself as a potential heading and it was done so yesterday as well.

You may remember in the session nobody said "Take it out," and there has been some discussion of the issue. However, I did than have sufficient guidance from the discussions that the GAC has had, including today with the board and with the GNSO, to either take it in or leave it out as a heading. I certainly do not have sufficient guidance to draft any text of advice at the moment. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Tom.

So the question to all of you is: Does anybody think we should have advice on this? And if so, what would be the proposed content for such advice?

Thank you.

U.K.?

UNITED KINGDOM: Yeah. Thanks.

I don't think it's a matter for advice. It's a matter of just noting, with a positive reaction, that the PDP on Red Cross and Red Crescent designations has been reconvened. Just that.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

So that would not be text that would be part of the "Advice" section but it would be part of another section in the communique where we would note -- maybe add that we are willing to participate in that work or something.

In case that is accepted, would you be willing to come up with a short text that -- proposal?

---

Okay. So any opposition to the proposal by the U.K. on this particular issue?

Iran.

IRAN:

Chairman, not opposition, but to have something within what specifically Argentina and what -- developed by Olof and myself. Perhaps we should create a new title in the communique "Follow-Up Action on Previous Advice" and then we give our comments.

For instance, with respect to the two-country code, "GAC supported or satisfied with the decision of the board to create a task force to deal with this matter," so on and so forth, but not advice, not full advice, not full consensus advice. Just create "Follow-Up on Previous GAC Advice" and give whatever you want to say under that. Satisfaction, not satisfaction, addition, not addition. Unless we come to change the advice. We don't want to come back for those advice again. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. And thank you for this comment. We had a similar discussion in the lunch preparatory meeting in the leadership team.

---

Up to now, we had everything that was not advice but communication to the board or to the community under "Other Issues."

Maybe we could find a more clear or inviting title to that. So let's take this and keep this in mind. Once we have the text elements, we can spend some time on maybe giving these elements a title that would fit for not just this one, but a number of them.

So we take note. Let's not discuss the title now, but let's -- let's take note that we'll look at this at a later stage, once we have the elements that would be in that section that we used to call "Other Issues," if that's okay.

So I see no objection to having some text on Red Cross and Red Crescent designations as proposed by the U.K. Is that -- am I correct? I seem to be correct.

Okay. Thank you.

So next one is IGO protections. Any proposals to have some text in the communique, either as part of the advice or as a communication message to whoever?

That does not seem to be the case, so we will not have a reference to this.

---

Okay. Then we'll get to the two-character code issue. Question: Would you want to see advice or a communication? And if so, what would be the content of what you would like to have communicated?

Iran and then Argentina.

IRAN:

Thank you, Thomas.

If we have a good title but not "Others" -- I don't want to put "Others." This is not "Others." This is a main theme. But we have a good title "Follow-Up Action on Previous Advice," I have no problem to have a text. But go to the new advice, it may contradict. You add one word, one comma, up, down, you may create something.

I have seen some board members saying that, "No, no, no, we need this -- we need a comma, have different meaning," but "Follow-Up Action," whatever with you want to say, you are satisfied, you emphasize, you reiterate in the communication -- not in the communication -- in the communication text. I have no problem. But have a good title but not under "Others." "Others" means something substantively.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. And we already have a draft title for this. Argentina?

ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair, and thank you, Iran, for the comments.

The thing is of relevance for the board. What is not consensus advice means something different for the board. So we would have -- we would like a title that would reflect the relevance of the issue for the GAC. That would be important for us. Whether - - we would prefer it under "Advice" because we think it doesn't contradict the previous advice, but never under "Others," as our colleague from Iran said. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. So my learning curve is, we have to first discuss the potential substance that you would see and then we are -- will be able to find out where the best place would be.

So those who want to see text reflected, what is the substance, the idea at least, of the text that you want reflected, so that we see that we may have consensus on an idea and then formulate it into text.

I see the United States and then Argentina.

---

UNITED STATES: Thank you. And I apologize for potentially taking us off track now, but I just wanted -- I was waiting for WIPO to propose text for the IGO issue. He's not in the room but I just wanted you to be aware that he's -- we understand he's working on text.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Oh, thank you very much. So we'll -- we'll come back to that. Thank you for putting this in.

So there will be proposed text on IGOs. We'll see whether that is supposed to be advice or maybe, like with the Red Cross, it will be something like a follow action on previous advice.

Well, we'll put the title back in, as Tom has already done. Thank you, U.S.

Argentina?

ARGENTINA: This is about the two-character codes. We see the value in the dialogue space that was opened in the two calls with the board and with the GAC, and we see this task force, working group, whatever we want to call it, as a continuation of this space of dialogue. So we see value in having this concept in the text.

Responding to the question from Olof about if we are advising the board or not, this -- this open dialogue was made by the



---

board, so it was a suggestion from the board after the communique we had in the last meeting. So maybe we can suggest them to create the task force or we are able -- we are okay accepting other suggestions, if you have. Of course you are very knowledgeable of the organization. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. So the proposal from Argentina is that we would give advice to the board to create a structure that would continue to work on this. That's basically what I think I -- I get.

So let me hear your views.

Olof, maybe, first, as he may gave us some additional explanations, and then I see Iran and Denmark.

OLOF NORDLING:

Just a follow-up question/comment.

I mean, at this stage where this dialogue is, the board has ordered the ICANN org -- meaning the CEO -- to have continued contact.

So do we advise the board to advise the CEO to create such a board or something like that.

I mean, just -- just in order to be as precise as possible.

---

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Well, Olof, I don't think that the board advises the CEO. It tells the CEO what to do because it's his superior organ. That's at least how I understand it.

Okay. Iran and then Denmark.

IRAN: Thank you, Thomas.

It depends what we put under the title, if we have a good title. One text should be that "GAC fully supports the decision of the board giving mandate to the CEO to create a task force," so on and so forth. That's it. Provided that we would not try to divide ourselves, "No, we don't agree with that, we agree with that." If we have something like this, we don't need to have advice.

I have some concern that maybe some interpretation change our previous advice, but at least we have worked on that and we want to maintain and retain that. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. By the way, something that just comes to my mind, whatever advice we give, we are supposed to also formulate a rationale, just in case that every -- anybody else on top of me has forgotten about this. Let's -- so Denmark, and then Hungary.

DENMARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Yes, that was one of my things was the rationale.

The other thing is that I'm not totally clear what this task force should do because during the discussion we had whether to work in details with individual countries on -- on this subject or, if I remember right, Brazil suggested a more forward-looking approach.

So I think from -- from our point, we should be clear about the work and the scope of -- of the group, and I don't know if -- if the text is there, but be mindful that not all countries have concerns about the use of two-letter codes.

So there's some phrasing there.

We might be concerned with the process but not the use of two-letter codes. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Hungary and then Brazil.

HUNGARY: Thank you, Chair. I just heard that we are going to give -- give advice to the board instructing the CEO what to do. I don't think

---

this is the right way to do things. We are not going to micromanage. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Brazil?

BRAZIL: Thank you.

In regard to the point that was raised by Denmark, I think it's very pertinent. I -- we have expressed many times our preference to address this issue not on an individual case-by-case basis but as something organic that could relate to the GAC as a whole.

We understand there is not a monolithic position in regard to the substance, but we would like to address it from the policy perspective because we understand there was some policy in place that addressed the various positions, so we -- I think it would be fair that this task force would address the issue as a whole from the policy level and then each country would adjust and seek its own particular case to be addressed under this general way forward. That's the way we see it. I don't -- I'm not sure if this should go into that language, if we should -- as Peter has said, if we should give that kind of detail here, but at least to

---

state what is the understanding at least on the part of my delegation. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I think the more general we have it, the more free we -- or flexible this structure could be in terms of developing in its function.

On the other hand, the more confusion or different expectations such a thing could raise.

So we may have to consider these two pros and cons between being specific, binding it to something precise, or having it open, which gives you more flexibility but may also lead to misunderstandings and confusion and different expectations.

The United States is next.

UNITED STATES: Thank you.

I just wanted to largely agree with Denmark and Brazil. While I do appreciate the need for flexibility at times, what I'm mostly concerned about here is that the GAC is committing to something that we don't necessarily fully understand and appreciate yet at this time.

---

From the U.S. perspective, again, while we don't have a substantive issue with respect to this, two-character codes at the second level, we do have concerns with what this task force is. I'm just wanting to understand what it is. Is it affiliated with the GAC or is it not affiliated with the GAC? Also, what are the issues that are going to be discussed? Because as I noted the other day, there are some issues that I think are much more appropriate for a full GAC conversation and not for a task force. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. So you are requesting more precision on the purpose and on the membership and on the functioning and the objectives of this task force.

Is that right?

UNITED STATES: More precision or not referencing it as GAC advice at all. The task force.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. Thank you. Iran?

---

IRAN:

Thank you, Chair. I think if in the -- under the good title we express that we support the creation of the task force or concept of a task force, the mandate, working method, and so on and so forth yet to be decided between the CEO and say between GAC, GAC leadership in consultation with GAC, I think that is something that should work.

We should not spend the whole afternoon on the task force because it is really a difficult thing. You agree with the substance but the details should be worked out and we give it to either the CEO and the leadership of the GAC in consultation with GAC between now and some time but we cannot start to say that we need task force, we don't need task force. Some people I heard that they said they don't need task force. So -- but they should join the others, because our consensus, full consensus advice was that this issue should be addressed, but now it's going to be addressed and task force is one of them. We just say that we agree with the task force. The details should be worked out. That's all.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. So trying to sense where the -- where the understanding -- common understanding could lie.

So we want to communicate that we --

---

Then the question is: Has this -- has this already been agreed? Because the way the text is now, this implies that it hasn't been decided, but I hear from some that it has already been decided by the CEO or by the board that this will be done.

In case that had already been decided, we could probably welcome it and signal our participation. In case it has not been decided, a text along these lines may be the right one. So I would seek for clarification from those who know. Point 1.

Point 2 is whether we welcome it or request for it, but there's a consensus that we will mention this task force in a positive way as a step to mitigate, or whatever, to work on this. That is what I sense, that nobody's fundamentally opposing this. The question is then is it advice or not. Some say they would be fine with this if it is not under the "Advice" section but under a "Follow-Up of Advice" type of heading, while others would prefer it to be advice. At least that's what I heard so far. So please try and help me -- or us getting closer to each other, and clear about what -- where and what the text should be. Thank you.

Brazil?

BRAZIL:

Yes, Thomas. I think it's important to have the exact understanding. I don't have the recollection of the terms that



---

were used by the board members and the CEO in that regard, but in case it has been indicated that the decision is already there, that the mandate to the CEO is already there, I think it would be appropriate for us to welcome the decision to endorse or to -- to, as I have said, express ourselves positively in that regard. That -- so we don't need these to be drafted in the form of an advice. So the language provided by Kavouss, I think, would make the trick and we could go -- but we need to make sure this is the situation.

In regard to the way this task force should work, I would argue that maybe it's not appropriate to indicate that we want it to be restricted to the GAC because I -- as I understand, the problem was created exactly because the board relied on the opinion one -- of one part of the -- the community.

I think if we indicate we want to address it by the GAC with the board without including others, we are, in a way, replicating the problematic way. I think maybe the task force -- and we should maybe leave the flexibility for the ICANN CEO to address it in terms of composition, but I think to be beneficial to the -- to this exercise to include other views, to make sure that any decision or any way forward is based on a sound -- let's say on a solid -- more solid basis of consensus, something that will not also lead to yet another round of criticism. That's -- so maybe, again, this

---

is not something we should be so prescriptive. Just indicate that we are welcoming the idea and endorsing the proposal.

But we need to have clarity on exactly what was said.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Brazil. So who can give us clarity on whether this decision has been taken or not? Argentina, do you know?

ARGENTINA: I don't know. But what I heard from the CEO is that he thought it was a good idea and he would be willing to.

And I participated in the two calls, and I had the feeling that there is an open dialogue in between the GAC and the board about this issue and ICANN org.

Why we think it's important as an advice? I don't think it would be a problem writing a rationale. We could offer a text for that.

It's the relevance. What means for the board an advice or not? We won't like this issue to just be lost in the several -- in one of the things we are dealing with. This is why we think it's important to be an advice.

We could live with the idea of welcoming if we find the right text for the GAC to agree with.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So what we could say is if it was a proposal but not necessarily a clear decision, we could say we -- the GAC welcomes the proposal of the CEO to do this and we either advise it to start very soon or something like that or to -- if that's an advice or if it's not an advice, then "we look forward to participating" in this type of language.

So let us try and -- so, I think we, more or less, solved the problem whether or not it has been decided. We welcome the proposal and imply that this is going to happen.

The question is then: What is the message? Is it an advice? And if so, what would be the element of advice that we would give? Or is it just signaling of willingness of us to use that structure to achieve progress?

I see Iran and then U.S.

IRAN: Thank you, Chair. I think at some point in time we need to start to type something because we are discussing and discussing. I suggest that having a title such as "Follow-up action on the GAC previous advice," whether advice or advises depending how many items we have. And then one item would be, "With respect to two-character" and so on and so forth, "GAC endorsed

---

the decision of the board entrusting the issue to the CEO to find ways and means to resolve the matter' and then continuing that, "And the initiative taken by the CEO to create a task force, detail of which need to be further considered and decided upon." That is the only thing we could say. Task force being created, is not yet created, being created. It is on the way. And we heard from the CEO. It is in the transcript. He said that he has told that and now he continued to say that, task force. That means "protection" in French.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

I thought we were not sure about that. But I agree we could turn into concrete text. But I think it's useful to have a little bit of a clear understanding about what that text should mean before we go drafting it.

Let me give the floor to the U.S. briefly and Peru and then we will ask for a volunteer group, if you want, to come up with a draft text until the next round.

U.S. and then Peru.

UNITED STATES:

I will go ahead and reserve my comments until I see more fleshed-out text.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Peru.

PERU: I wanted to agree with Olga and with Kavouss. And, on the other hand, I wanted to let you know that I have sent a paragraph for the -- to be added in the part of the communique for advice. Thomas just putting it in. Thank you.

The paragraph I have proposed, it is related to the work that Tom did regarding other communiques where we have stated our position on geographic names and letter codes. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I think we would need to see the text. So that is an additional text, if I understand, about existing GAC advice and making reference to that.

Who would be willing to formulate based on this red part that we are already having, try to update it as a follow-up of the discussion and then present it? I see Olga from Argentina. Feel free to join her, if you want, so you can send it around bi-, tri-, or multilaterally in a smaller group. So Olga will lead and Iran is wanting to be part of it and Rwanda as well. Okay.

---

So we hope -- probably since we don't have too many issues, it will be fairly quickly at the next round. So if you could start with this now, I think that would be very useful.

Okay. And we will put the text -- I don't think we should discuss this here now because people will want to see the proposed additional text by Peru first. So maybe circulate it to the whole GAC so that people can make up their minds. If you could send -- ah, you sent it. I haven't received it yet on the GAC list. So sometimes it takes a little bit of time. And then we'll see what people think of this.

So I think we are more or less fine for the next step on the CC as the two-character codes. Let's move on to additional elements, if there are any. So there's -- we have a text from the underserved regions and public safety working group. But that's not meant to be advice, or is it meant to be advice? Is that a proposal?

If this could be clarified.

TOM DALE:

It was requested -- if somebody from the working group could confirm that. In the email, I believe to me it was requested as being advice.

---

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:           Who sent it?

TOM DALE:                    It was sent by Julia from the chairs, co-chairs of the working group, I believe.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:           Can we connect the screen back to Tom's computer so that we see the text? That would also be good.

So Iran and then maybe I would like to ask Pua Hunter and then Iran.

IRAN:                         May I request our distinguished colleague from Brazil to join us from the very beginning of the initiative to have this text but not at the end. So it would be good that Argentine, Brazil, and whoever wants would get together to have a text from the beginning but not exchange because so many email is very tiring. I don't have the time. We work together. It's easy.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:           So, Benedicto, you are requested to be part of this from the beginning. He's doing the thumbs up thing so that's a yes.

Okay. Yes, Cook Islands, please, go ahead.

COOK ISLANDS: Thank you, Chair. Just wanted to confirm that we wanted to put that in the advice part of the communique.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So maybe, Tom, if you could quickly read this. Have you sent it to the whole GAC yet or just to Tom, so is this the first time people see this?

COOK ISLANDS: I think it was sent to Tom.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. So, Tom, please, if I could ask you to read it out loud so people can make note and start thinking about the proposal.

TOM DALE: Thank you. The heading is, "Underserved regions and public safety working groups capacity development workshops." And the proposed text reads, "The GAC requests ICANN to continue providing necessary resources for additional targeted capacity development programs with regional, national, and thematic focus."



---

The working group has developed a tentative calendar of future capacity development initiatives for the next two years." And there's a request for a hyperlink there, to a time line document. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. So there's a request -- yes, Cook Islands.

COOK ISLANDS: Thank you, Chair.

We also wanted to add to the text to acknowledge the support from ICANN, if we can add it now or wait for other comments.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: I think we should first get a sense of whether people support the idea of having such a message as advice. Then we would need to have a rationale under a title of "Rationale." So let us sense the temperature here with regard to whether you support the idea. And then if there's support, let's go into the wording.

Argentina.

ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. And thank you to Cook Islands for the text.

---

As maybe -- as I can remember, this advice was included in the Helsinki communique about the support for these activities in developing workshops and these training activities. So we are not against the text but not as an advice. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Argentina.

Iran.

IRAN: Exactly the same thing. My concern is that. I have no problem with any advice, but advice on a topic that we have already provided advice may create difficulty if we are not quite careful of the text, the language, wording come out very good, patati et patata. Let us avoid that. So if you want to advise, we should have full consensus advice. We should have the rationale. If we have already done that, just ask the follow-up action, reiterate its position and under the follow-up actions but not under the advice because advice will be full consensus advice or normal advice and various views. And I want to avoid having such a division. So we have already given advice on that. We just follow-up actions and not changing the word of that advice. Thank you.

---

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Cook Islands.

COOK ISLANDS: Thank you, Iran.

We can concede to that and leave it -- move it to the main part of the communique as an update and follow-up action. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Would there be consensus on not having this message as a piece of advice but having it in the same section or having it as a follow-up item to previous advice? I don't see any opposition to this. So let's take this as a general frame.

Now, let's go into -- not into wordsmithing but whether you think the elements in the text are right ones or some other ideas should be in there, some ideas should be changed.

Yes, is the message the right one that we want to give or would that need to be changed? Brazil.

BRAZIL: Thank you, Thomas. I must admit I have not been following this track so carefully. However, I have attended one of the sessions on this and listened to the report on the capacity-building

---

initiatives that were taken. One thing that concerned me was that statement that at least in one of these capacity-building forum there was an expression that a way to circumvent the difficulty of bringing people to the meeting was to provide more information, to allow for more tools or participation for those participants in those workshops.

So I think this is something that concerns me because I think part of what would be seen as initiative towards underserved region would be to provide tools for more participation here in the meetings, in the presidential meetings. So I'm not sure if that's something that has been entertained to some extent. But maybe we could also flag that additionally to the capacity development program. Or in the context of the capacity development, we would maybe reinforce a call for more participation to be enabled at the presidential meetings. I don't know if that would be appropriate, if this is something that has been entertained. I would like to see clarification on those that have been following this more closely whether this would be appropriate or not.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Brazil.

So you're raising the issue with asking for resources for this particular part of the whole set of measures that is meant to

---

enforce and strengthen participation and not for others at the same time may be problematic, if this is what I get from Brazil's intervention.

Actually, I'm trying to find an advice in the Helsinki communique. I don't see an advice of this sort. So maybe if you could indicate if this is past advice, where we find this advice so that we can understand what that actually said. Thank you.

Argentina.

ARGENTINA: I will try to find the communique. I think it was Helsinki, if I'm not mistaken. No? Okay. You know that better. It was your idea.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So if you know it, tell us, please, Alice.

AFRICAN UNION COMMISSION: Thank you. I think it was Copenhagen.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. So maybe we have a quick look at Copenhagen.

Any further reactions? Brazil.

BRAZIL: Maybe a quick addition, just to make clear what I mean. So when we say, "The GAC requests ICANN to continue providing necessary resources for additional targeted capacity-building, capacity-development programs with regional, international, and thematic focus," I would maybe suggest to add "including with a view to allow more presidential participation at ICANN meetings," if that makes sense.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Iran.

IRAN: Yes, if it is not under the advice, under the follow-up action advice means the same thing as advice; so we should not put word "request." "Emphasize," "reiterate," but not "request," not "invitation" because follow-up action of previous advice. Advice is higher level. It's not request. I request is a thank you very much. I don't reply to that. But then I advise, "Advise" with capital A, has some meaning in the bylaw and some process. So we should use the word as appropriate. But not saying that request or invite or we have to use something that follow-up action on that matter. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Further views? So, first of all, we have -- Sorry? Cook Islands.  
Sorry.

COOK ISLANDS: Just a quick question, Chair. Are we wordsmithing now or we making changes to the text? Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: No, I'm actually still trying to find the piece of advice that this is referring to. So give me 15 seconds. I'm in the Copenhagen communique.

I can also not find it in the Copenhagen communique. Maybe please indicate to us where this is come from. Because if we make reference to something, we should know where and what this is. Thank you.

So, okay, we...

Well, let's wait to see if we have more clarity and maybe move on with other elements of the communique text in the meantime. Thank you.

---

So these elements seem to be all that we have so far in terms of advice, not in terms of our advice or follow up to previous advice. Of course, there are other elements of the text but I see Olof is wanting to tell us something.

OLOF NORDLING: Well, it's between Helsinki and Copenhagen, meaning in Hyderabad advice, Number 6, "Underserved regions. The GAC advises the ICANN board to take required action to enable implementation of GAC underserved regions' activities including but not limited to capacity-building and participation in ICANN policy processes."

ARGENTINA: What are we going to do without you, Olof? Oh, my God.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: We will still have his mobile number.

OLOF NORDLING: Use the phone.

[ Laughter ]



---

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Which maybe won't work anymore if it's an ICANN number. We will see. We will find it.

Okay. Let's have a quick look. Advice Item Number 6 in the Hyderabad communique. Hold on. I'm getting there. Well, it doesn't talk about resources. We would need -- it says take required action to enable implementation of activities. So, yeah, maybe -- let's note for the time being -- invite everybody to have a look at this and then when we go to a second reading, think about what you want to say, whether this is -- how you want to create the link to the existing advice, what is the value added of what you want to say.

If we can leave it at this for the time being, so it's piece of advice Number 6 in the Hyderabad communique.

South Africa.

SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you, chairperson. I just want a bit of clarity because I'm looking at that Copenhagen communique. I just want understanding, what you're saying because I think there's an element -- new element that was mentioned during the meeting with the board which is that the resources and also the issue of languages and so forth.

---

Are we saying now because the -- the advice from the previous meeting did not incorporate that, so we -- we will not have particular language which is actually addressing that issue? Because I think it's an issue of concern.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Okay. No. I'm just trying to get us all to a clear understanding what the existing advice says and what we want to communicate in addition to it.

And listening -- or remembering what Brazil has said, there are several ways to support inclusion. One is organizing meetings on the local level. The other one is giving more resources to translation of documents into different languages. The other one is travel funding. So there's a whole package of things that I think we agree should need -- should be done, and just to reflect what Brazil has said, that we should maybe be mindful of thinking about the whole package and be aware of what we are asking for and what consequences that this may have on other elements of the package, to be sure that this is like a holistic request.

Iran and then Alice.

IRAN:

Thank you, Thomas.

---

I think it is not difficult to do that. We first reiterate the follow-up action and the previous advice and we add another sentence, "To this effect or in this connection, GAC wish to indicate," and then we indicate what is it. It's more or less a complementary modality how to implement that advice as the option that is possible. I think I have done a lot of things before. I know how to do it. So if Cook Islands come to us, we will try to work today. And Argentina. Anyone else. Our distinguished colleague from Brazil. We could add a sentence, to this effect, "In this connection," and we add something to that. I don't think that that is harmful at all. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Wait. African Union Commission is first. Thank you.

AFRICAN UNION COMMISSION: I was just going to offer to -- that perhaps the working group can go back and provide another photograph, taking into consideration the Hyderabad advice, the second reading, working with colleagues from Iran and Brazil.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: And maybe make an explicit reference to the particular advice.

---

AFRICAN UNION COMMISSION: To the specific advice, yes.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Argentina, are you okay with that?

ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. One comment. If there's advice -- and it's my understanding that concrete actions have been taken in this regard in Africa. Is there a fear that ICANN will not continue providing necessary? So what's the rationale behind this comment? Maybe there is something that we don't know.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Let's stop here. I think that's a relevant question to ask, so think about what you are trying to say, which is, we all know how to do this but it's a challenge every time, so I think, yeah, get together and look at the text, make an explicit reference to the Hyderabad communique, and then we are waiting for a new proposal or revised proposal that will hopefully be clear -- make a clear reference and give a clear way forward, signal a clear message to -- to the board or to whoever.

With this, we have like 15, 16 minutes left of this first 90 minutes. I think it would be maybe useful to quickly go through the elements, the other elements that we have in the communique,

---

so maybe let Tom go through them, titles and placeholders or actual text, if we have it, so just that we have an idea of what would be part of this. Thank you.

TOM DALE:

Thank you, Thomas.

The -- and I'll scroll this through on the screen.

The first section is the introduction the GAC usually includes. It references updated numbers for GAC members and observers, and in accordance with usual text, indicates that all plenary and working group sessions were conducted as open meetings.

I'll assume that's okay.

The next section deals with inter-constituency activities and community engagement.

"Meeting with the ICANN Board" reads as follows: "The GAC met with the ICANN board and discussed two-character country and territory codes at the second level; the board's response to GAC advice on IGO protections; recent dialogue between the GAC, the GAC public safety working group, and the ICANN CEO on mitigating domain name abuse; improvements to ICANN document handling; the desirability of earlier board responses to GAC advice; changes in board and ICANN organization

---

procedures for processing GAC advice; and options for GAC adding value to the annual GDD summit; and finally, opportunities for the GAC to contribute to ICANN work on the interaction between the European general data privacy regulation and registration directory services."

I'll pause there.

Okay?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Any comments?

Yes. Cathrin.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yes. Thank you, Thomas. Just to say for the reference to the GDPR, it should read "the E.U. general data protection regulation," just to be correct on the language. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: "Protection" instead of "privacy."

TOM DALE: Oh, sorry. Okay. I'll move on.

---

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:           Okay.

TOM DALE:                    Okay. I'm sorry. My apologies.

"Meeting with the GNSO." This was the meeting the GAC had --  
I'm sorry.

CTU:                            Yes. Nigel Cassimire. If you could go back up to the list, I don't  
understand the "desirability of earlier board responses to GAC  
advice." Is it the desirability of receiving earlier board  
responses?

TOM DALE:                    It absolutely is. The -- and, yes, that should be made clear. Do  
you have a suggestion you would want me to try?

CTU:                            "Receiving? "The desirability of receiving earlier board advice" -  
- "earlier board responses." Yeah. Okay.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:           Or "receiving board response to GAC advice earlier."

---

TOM DALE: Yeah.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Maybe that makes it clearer. Thank you for raising this.

TOM DALE: Yes, thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Iran?

IRAN: Thank you, Thomas. I don't think we need the word "desirability." It was good for discussion but it is no more a desire. It's more or less something that they want, not desirability.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So should we say, "we request"?

TOM DALE: Or just "receiving." How's that?

IRAN: "Receiving board response." Not request but not "desirability."



CHAIR SCHNEIDER:            Okay. Like what Tom has put now. Okay? All right. Thank you.  
So let's move on.

TOM DALE:                      Thank you.

"Meeting with the GNSO. The GAC met with members of the GNSO Council and discussed procedural aspects of Red Cross/Red Crescent and IGO protections, enhanced GAC engagement with PDPs, implementation of recommendations of the GAC/GNSO consultation group, and the regular review of the GAC communique."

Unless there are comments, I'll move on. Thank you.

"Meeting with the ccNSO. The GAC met with the ccNSO and discussed the ccNSO PDP on a retirement and review mechanism for ccTLDs, the cross-community working group on use of country and territory names as TLDs, and next steps with geographic names policy development, and support for the GAC working group on underserved regions with regard to ccTLD issues."

I see no comments on that, so I'll continue.

---

"Meeting with ALAC. The GAC met with ALAC and discussed ALAC/GAC cooperation on policy development work of mutual interest and in underserved regions, community workload challenges, and the cross-community sessions on geographic names scheduled for this meeting."

No comments? Okay.

"Cross-community discussions. GAC members actively participated in relevant cross-community sessions scheduled as part of ICANN 59."

Okay.

Sorry. Yes, Iran.

IRAN:

Yes. I don't understand what you mean by "cross-community discussions." We are talking of the forum? We are talking of what? Because "cross-community" now has many, many meanings, many, many branches. What cross-community discussions? Discussion on what are the subjects? We are talking of the forum? We are talking of cross-community accountability? Cross-community auction? Cross-community -- so on and so forth, so we have to have it specified, so thank you.

---

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Kavouss. And maybe we just -- in the text it says "cross-community session," so if we just use "session" also in the title.

That brings me to the question: Would you want to see a reflection of the fact that the GAC participated in the first community forum as a decisional participant?

All right. So it's coming. Okay.

Argentina.

ARGENTINA: I would suggest just to copy/paste the name of the session and then I would delete the word "actively" because I wanted to take the floor more than once and I couldn't.

And we are okay with having that.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Well, I wouldn't single out that particular session because we are having another one today that we have not yet participated in and we had -- so people know what they were, so trying to avoid unnecessary terms.

So CTU?

---

ARGENTINA: But delete "actively."

CTU: The -- the last part of the sentence, "scheduled as part of ICANN 59," I think it's a better way of saying what was said at the end of the previous little section, if you could just go back slightly.

We said, "Among the things we discussed with the ALAC was the cross-community sessions on geographic names." Instead of saying "scheduled for this meeting," "scheduled as part of ICANN 59," because "this meeting" is -- could be a little confusing as to which meeting.

TOM DALE: Thank you. Moving on to internal matters, new members, "The GAC welcomed St. Kitts and Nevis as a new member and the regional technical commissioner of telecommunications, comtelco, as a new observer. This brings GAC membership to 172 members and 36 observers."

Oopsie-daisy.

Now, we now have reports from GAC working groups, "GAC working group updates as reported to the GAC," and these are as received from the working groups up until about half an hour ago.

---

"The GAC public safety working group briefed the GAC on progress with the ICANN organization and stakeholders of the ICANN community on important public safety policy areas.

Regarding DNS abuse mitigation, members of the PSWG attended presentations on the domain abuse activity reporting project, DAP" -- DAP, I think it is anyway -- "and the intermediate report on abuse of the DNS for the CCT review team, both of which provide useful data to enable assessment of measures to prevent abuse.

On this basis and building on exchanges with the ICANN board and ICANN CEO since the ICANN 57 meeting, the PSWG will seek the establishment of regular public reporting by ICANN on a set of actionable metrics. To this extent, the PSWG will further its involvement in various initiatives led by the ICANN organization, including the DAR project, the identified technology health index, the DNS marketplace health index, and the envisioned ad hoc group on consumer safeguards.

Regarding the different work streams related to registration directory service, RDS, PSWG representatives on the RDS review team reported progress on the definition of the review's scope. The GAC was briefed on progress on the privacy and proxy services accreditation implementation review team, IRT. The PSWG also proposed a draft GAC reply to the request from ICANN

---

organization to contribute data protection expertise to the review of the ICANN procedure for handling WHOIS conflicts with privacy laws.

This draft will be open for GAC comments and endorsements until 6 July, 2017."

I'm sorry. Yes, Brazil.

BRAZIL:

Thank you. I think it's important to reflect in the report, the communique, those -- the report coming from these working groups in a detailed form. I'm not against it.

But I find that in the overall document, it is not presented in a balanced way in regard to some important issues that were discussed here, so it's not -- I'm not commenting on this section particularly, but to say that we need to insert a delay in the report, like in the previous section. I apologize for having been slow to react. I think we need to insert some important discussions we had here, especially the concern in regard to the way that the GAC input is provided in the overall system.

I think this was mentioned by many member -- GAC members and I don't see -- I was just looking at the -- to the end. I don't see any reference to it.

---

So I think we could give the impression that we -- if we look to the length of the issues, that we have four -- three or four paragraphs referring to the PSWG, which is important, but we don't have any paragraph referring to that I think very foundational issue.

So I think when we look at the whole document, we'll certainly come up with language addressing this and filling some gaps we see at the moment. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Brazil.

I think we agreed that we would have a short text about the working groups and then there would be the option of putting a link into the text to a longer, more explicit, text or report on our Web site, so maybe we can ask the Public Safety Working Group to condense their text into the essentials and then make reference to more details that can be found on the GAC Web site.

That's one thing.

The other thing that Brazil brought up is the question whether you would see, as proposed by Brazil, a reflection of the discussions that we had with several -- on several occasions about the -- let me call it challenging situation for governments to interact in the system, whether you want to see something

---

reflected on this. We will have a session on priorities this afternoon that will also touch on this.

If you feel that you would like to see this somehow reflected, then the question again would be: What would be the message? Would that be a piece of advice to do something or would it be under another part of the communique, a message that we would share?

Maybe, Brazil, if you could clarify and then we'll ask for -- for reactions from other members. Thank you.

BRAZIL:

I don't think the discussion is mature enough to lead to any kind of advice at this point, but at least I think this should be -- it should be documented that there was a concern, as you have said, that was aired in the meeting with the board, with the GNSO, with the ALAC, I think with all -- with the other groups, as far as I can remember. And I think in -- when we refer to the topics that were discussed with the board and the other groups, maybe we can have one paragraph just stating that in those meetings, one issue that was addressed with some emphasis was the concern about, as you have said, the challenges related to the positive interaction in the context of the organization's work, something like that.



---

I don't have wording, but I think it should be maybe documented in such way. But not as an advice. I don't think we have elements for that at the moment. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Tom is offering to -- to draft a text that would reflect this concern, not as an advice but as an information under the "Other Matters" or whatever, wherever it's going to be, and we can of course support him. Is that -- is that something that you've -- I see people nodding, so we will include a message about this concern in the text.

I had a few others that were requesting the floor. Was that on the public safety working group text? U.K., yes.

And Iran as well? Or was it on something previous or --

So U.K. first and then -- and then Iran. Thank you.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Yes. Thanks. I would like the PSWG report to note that -- the meeting that they had afforded the opportunity to meet the newly appointed consumer safeguards director, and I think we expressed our willingness to support his work. I think it's important for us to have it recorded somewhere that we had this

---

meeting and it's a critical element of mitigating abuse. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. So Cathrin is nodding. So she will come up with a new shorter version, condensed version and try to at the same time add some additional content to short --

MARK CARVELL: My apologies.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: She's a very intelligent person so she will somehow manage to do that. Okay. Thank you.

Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Chair. Perhaps, in the middle of the paragraph, "The PSWG will seek establishment," we don't need to seek it. We propose. We ask and will seek when we will do that.

And then it is an actionable metric. I don't understand. I have not participated. For me it's a strange word. Do you mean "actionable metrics"?

---

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I think also the PSWG has noted your statement and they will come up with a shorter, larger-in-content, and easier-to-understand version of the text. Nothing easier than this.

Other comments on the PSWG text that we'll see in the next version, in the next version of the communique? If that's not the case, I think then we can move on and try to have a coffee break very soon. I think we're close to getting there.

What is missing?

TOM DALE: Thank you. The next section of text deals with the report provided by the chair of the working group on protection of geographic names in new rounds of new gTLDs. The group met during ICANN59. The working group has participated in the Webinars organized last May by the GNSO in relation with the use of geographic names at the top level and the recent working group meeting was focused in the revision on the straw person document prepared by the GNSO based on the inputs received in the Webinars which was used at the basis for interaction during the cross-community discussion on the geographic names at the top level organized at ICANN59. That's it.

I think Iran and United States.

---

IRAN:

Tom, please put straw man or straw person in inverted comma. Whether straw horse, a straw man, a straw person, I don't want to change that. But I think something is forgotten. Various concerns have been expressed with the text containing this straw person, straw man, straw horse, whatever you call them, which interfere with the authority and sovereignty of the government asking protection of geographic names. I want to protect Isfahan, and when asked why you want to protect Isfahan, it's not business of the people to ask me. First of all, I want to protect (indiscernible), 5,000 years of history. Why they have been asked is it international law? Is it your culture? It's not their business.

Concerns have been expressed or serious concerns have been expressed with respect to the conditions or criteria put in this straw man or straw horse or straw something. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. Iran. Maybe we ask the chair of the working group to adapt the text accordingly, if there's no opposition on this, until the next round.

Let us maybe hear from the U.S. what they are wanting to say. Then we see -- Thank you.

---

UNITED STATES: Thank you. I just want to propose a small edit, but it's important at least for the United States. That same line where "straw person" sits, if we could please change the word "revision" to something along the lines of "focused into consideration" because we didn't actually revise the document. We certainly didn't have an agreed GAC revision. So I'd be more than satisfied with just changing that word. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I see people nodding. So that's done.

ARGENTINA: English is not my native language. Sorry for that.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. Next time you can actually formulate it in Spanish and Tom will translate it.

U.K. and then Denmark and then Iran.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thanks. The point I would make with regard to this is it was a document. It wasn't a proposal. So I don't think we need to go into argument about the relative merits or demerits of what's contained in the document. We don't need to do that in this communique. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Other question is: Do we want to reflect somewhere in this document that there were concerns? We could also reflect it in where we said we participated in that session and be more explicit about what the views expressed by GAC members were or here or not at all. So this is up to the GAC.

Denmark.

DENMARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to note that the working group haven't met yet. So it is said here that the recent working group meeting was focused on this. And I don't know whether we will focus on that. That will probably be tomorrow. So I don't know -- I hope we will come back to the text.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I think you are confusing this. Tomorrow is the NomCom working group. The geo names working group has met yesterday. We are describing history and not a projection of history. Thank you.

All right. Iran.

IRAN: Just perhaps replacing "focus" by something else. Thank you.

---

---

Chair, I would say the group would consider that but not "focus" and so on and so forth.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Please look at the screen. Thomas already tried to incorporate your proposal and simplified the text. Is that okay?

I don't see you behind -- yes. Jamaica. Thank you.

JAMAICA: Just following on, on the point that was previously made, if the working group to which -- the second reference to the working group, if that is a working group of the GNSO, then it needs to be a little bit clearer because the working group -- I assume the very first reference to the working group is speaking to the GAC working group, right? And then there's a second reference to a working group. So I take the point from my colleague that it might be unclear which working group you're talking about because they haven't met yet is what I'm hearing.

So if it is the GAC working group that has participated in Webinars, then fine. If the working group that you're referring to when it says "the recent working group meeting," then it needs to be clearer to whom you are referring.

---

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you for this. I guess what you're trying to say is that the working group met during this meeting and discussed or looked at the straw person, which is not really clear, as Jamaica rightly points out.

Olga, are you trying to say that the working group met during this meeting? Or is the recent working group meeting another working group meeting? That's my -- I think that's Jamaica's question, if I get this right.

ARGENTINA: I'm totally lost. I'm so sorry.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Let's not spend too much time on this. Please have a look at it again. I think we need a coffee break.

Mark, very quickly. Thank you.

MARK CARVELL: Well, I just suggest having two sentences and then you can say in the second sentence, "The working group considered." Thank you.



---

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. Let's move on. I think we should go for a break because I don't know whether there will be coffee after the official coffee break, and I don't think we should miss that. So I'm trying to push us through and have our first reading and then have a coffee break, if you don't mind.

Iran, very, very --

IRAN: Yes, very, very brief. Last April -- "recent" is vague. April 2017, meeting and date. Recent meeting, last meeting, previous meeting, previous speakers, it's not good things.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. Noted. Thank you.

Can we move on to the next section? Well, I suggest we invite everybody to read this yourselves because we will have time -- we will need time to prepare the next one.

Do people have this version of the text? That particular part on the underserved regions, do they have it electronically?

TOM DALE: I believe so. I just need to check, Thomas.

---

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: If you are fine with me, let's not go for this now in detail. We will time at the next round. And I don't think there will be too many controversial items in it. Let's see what the next part, which ones are the ones that are missing.

Accountability, so let's maybe quickly read out this part.

TOM DALE: Thank you. This is a section dealing with enhancing ICANN accountability. It reads, "The GAC agreed to adopt interim arrangements for GAC participation in the Empowered Community pending further intersessional work.

"The GAC participated in the community forum on proposed changes to fundamental bylaws and will consider its response within the framework provided for in the bylaws.

"And the GAC was briefed by one of the co-chairs of the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2 on the current position of the group's work."

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Without going into wordsmithing, is there something missing? Is there a wrong message that we are sending? Iran.

---

IRAN: It is an important element missing that we agreed temporarily chair of the GAC would participate or represent. It's not there. That is important element. It's is there or -- I have not seen that. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: That is part of the interim arrangements as a package.

IRAN: We should mention that, what we have decided.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. So we'll include it for the next version.  
  
Denmark.

DENMARK: Just to note that we have only discussed the chairman's participating in the meeting. We are not discussing the other parts. That discussion was terminated because of lack of time. I think we will have it tomorrow.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: While we agreed on -- at interim on the principles and some of the elements that allow the participation of us in the community forum. But you're right, we haven't agreed on the things that

---

follow after. And we haven't discussed properly the advice part so we may -- well, maybe we say -- we have agreed on interim arrangements for participation in the community forum. This is what we have agreed.

DENMARK: Yeah.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: And the Empowered Community Administration. Does it make better for you, Denmark?

DENMARK: Yes, because I didn't have the possibility to comment on the criteria, which I hope I will have the possibility tomorrow. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. Okay. I think -- obviously if we have participated in the community forum, we must probably have agreed.

Is the text here more or less okay for you, Iran and Russia?

IRAN: This last paragraph should be amended, saying that "Concerns are expressed with respect to the progress of the work and

---

working methods of the jurisdiction." Because five delegations expressed their concerns, and there's nothing there.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Could you quickly --

IRAN: "Concerns were expressed regarding the work of the subgroup" or "jurisdiction subgroup in relation with its" --

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Slower, please. "Subgroup on jurisdiction in relation" --

IRAN: "In relation to actions to be taken to resolve problems already mentioned during a discussion in the subworking group or in that group." At least it was mentioned that some of the issue -- maybe some other people want to further complement that, but concerns should be mentioned. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Let's not in length discuss this. Let's take note of this, circulate it, so we have time during the coffee break because otherwise, we will never, ever make it to the coffee break and I would actually need one.

---

Russia, please.

RUSSIA: Thank you. And thank you, Iran, because it was also our idea to address the issue of jurisdictions here. And we actually already send the text with proposal. So we'll see it after the break.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Did you send it to the whole GAC, your text? Okay. So everybody has it. Because we will have at least half an hour break to allow Tom and everybody that is now supposed to deliver text. So then we can go through all of these elements then.

Okay. Can we -- Brazil.

BRAZIL: No, it's a different point. In the first part, we should say, "The GAC was briefed by one of the co-chairs on the current position of the work of each subgroup." That's what he did.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. Let's amend that. That makes it more precise.

IRAN: There are nine subgroups.

---

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: We got the idea. We'll figure out the actual wording later. Thank you.

Can we move on? Olga?

ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. There is another working group meeting tomorrow morning. We would like it to be reflected somehow. We cannot talk about what happened because it will be before. But at least we would say -- we should say that it met. Okay.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: I alluded to this in the beginning. Once we got through it, we need to see whether we issue the communique today and make allusions to what is happening tomorrow or whether we wait with it or whether we say this communique will be complemented with additional information tomorrow. So let's keep that in mind. But we can't discuss it.

The message to the community, is this something new? Or have we gone through this already?

TOM DALE: The next section was submitted by the public safety working group. It reads, "GAC members" -- sorry. It reads, "Registration

---

directory services, RDS, and data protection rules. GAC members attended the cross-community sessions dedicated to discussion of the next-generation RDS policy development process, PDP, and the E.U. general data protection regulation, GDPR. The GAC supports any efforts by the ICANN board, organization, and community to, one, define the purpose of collection and use of RDS data elements with input from relevant experts including from the GAC.

"Two, explore solutions including guidance and technical implementation to address data protection requirements.

"And, three, to align deliveries of the next-generation RDS PDP with the timing of changing regulations across the world."

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

I think we should avoid overlap between this text to keep in mind and the report from the working group. That may go for the next comments as well.

Any comments, not going into detail, but on the message that is given? Any fundamental problems with the message? We can still go into details in the second round. I don't see a fundamental problem here. We'll have the time to look at this during the break.

So next one is geographic names.



TOM DALE: Thank you. The next session -- section dealing with geographic names is text drafted by me in an attempt to capture the discussions yesterday.

"GAC members welcomed and participated in the cross-community sessions held at ICANN59" -- that would be. We are getting ahead of ourselves here, not tomorrow, but, in fact, in November -- "ICANN59 on geographic names at the top level. The GAC supports any further process of policy review and development that, A, allows all stakeholder groups to participate equally; B, takes into account the history and rationale of the arrangements currently in place; and, C, applies an evidence-based policy approach to any proposals for future arrangements."

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Brazil.

BRAZIL: Thank you. I would argue that the second part of "the GAC support any further process," that would -- is not correct. I think many members have expressed the understanding that the

---

process itself is not necessary. So -- but there will be a willingness and a very goodwill, of course, and constructive approach in case the process would follow such and such.

I think it should read, "The GAC considers that any further process should," because otherwise there is an impression that any process that fulfills these conditions is accepted and fully endorsed and that's not the case. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. Then the whole rest of the text would need to be adapted accordingly.

Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Chair. I don't understand the real application or implementation of A about "allow all the stakeholder groups to participate equally." They're not allowed to participate. How is it equally? How we divide this equally? Equal with ccNS- -- GNSO? I don't understand this.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: I think the reference means that was not a session that was co-organized by all relevant constituencies but that was something that was led by the GNSO and the GNSO had much more time to

---

give their views than others had. I think that is trying to reflect this sentiment that was communicated during yesterday's session.

IRAN: We need to amend that. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Let's take note.

But the general direction is something that is more or less okay for you? Okay.

U.S.

UNITED STATES: Thank you. I'm just a little bit confused about the premise here. As I noted earlier, I also have my concerns with how some of these community sessions are organized; but I'm not aware that this is a policy development group. This was an opportunity to have cross-community dialogue. So I just -- it sounds somewhat accusatory as IF somehow a process was adhered to and there is really no process that I'm aware of associated with these community forums.

---

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. So we will have to discuss this more extensively after the coffee break that we will hopefully have soon. But your point is noted.

ICANN priorities.

TOM DALE: That's the session coming up this afternoon.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Competition, Consumer Trust.

TOM DALE: Yeah, Competition -- the CCT review team. "The GAC was briefed on the work of the CCT review team by members of the team. GAC members will continue to follow the work of the team as it finalizes its recommendations."

No?

You can almost smell the coffee from here, can't you?

[ Laughter ]

And the next -- the next section reads, "New gTLDs Policy Issues. The GAC reviewed the range of issues with public policy implications that are being considered by the PDP working group on subsequent procedures for new gTLDs, options for

---

better mapping of issues, and feedback on GAC inputs" -- that should be -- "will be explored with the working group."

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Iran?

IRAN: Perhaps if you'd also mention the GAC expressed concerns with the challenges to participate or being able to participate in the activity of all of these groups. Clearly a big challenge, and we have to mention that. Thank you.

There are so many subgroups, so many PDPs, and so many meetings, that it is sometimes almost impossible, even if you have resources, to participate. So we have to mention our concerns.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. If I understand the intervention of Brazil of some earlier time, that is part of the message that should be given, that we struggle for various reasons and we have concerns for various reasons about inclusive and meaningful participation. So that will be part of the draft that you will receive on that message.

---

TOM DALE: Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. So that means we are through with the first reading. Maybe -- I don't know, Tom, whether it would be valuable to send whatever you have now as-is out to everybody, knowing that this is not the text that we'll look at in the next round but it contains many of the elements that you haven't actually seen in writing, but there will be new text coming in at the end of the break that we'll then look at, but that at least you have the latest existing version in writing, where a lot of elements that we touched now on only briefly, you will have the chance to look during our well-deserved coffee break.

And looking at the time, trying to plan ahead, so at 5:00, we will need to -- is the community session again in this room or is it in another room? Will we have to free the room?

So at 5:00, people will be -- 5:00. 5:15 or 5:00? No.

We actually have to stop at 1645 because at 1700 this room will start -- in this room, the community session will start, so that means we have --

---

OLOF NORDLING: We stay here for this one after -- so this is -- we're still in this room. The others are the Gallagher room.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yeah. For the coming period, obviously as the -- until then, we will be in this room and the parallel session will be in the Gallagher room outside.

So how much time -- let me ask Tom: How much time will we need to incorporate all the elements that we'll have --

TOM DALE: Depending on how the draft goes.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Depending on when we receive it, so let's say like -- don't go away too far. We hope that it will not take more than, let's say, 30 minutes until we get all the pieces together.

That would mean like 10 to 4:00 -- towards 4:00. That would give us 45 minutes to try and finalize whatever we have then. If we don't get there, we will continue after 1830 with finalizing it.

Okay? Thank you.

[ Break ]