
ICANN70 | Virtual Community Forum – GAC ICANN70 Communique Drafting (3 of 5)
Wednesday, March 24, 2021 – 16:30 to 17:30 EST

GULTEN TEPE: Over to you, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Gulden, and welcome back everybody. I hope you are all in the room this session is just one hour, and I'm really looking forward to wrap up the different parts we were discussing early yes so we are leave the communique in a good shape today, and have a relaxed discussion tomorrow just to fine tune whatever needed so let me know if there is any new text and, yeah, Fabian please give me the guidance.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So we highlighted on the screen the 3 main sections we had identified in prior discussions that -- on which text would be eventually shared, so I believe on each of those sections so you see number 5 issues of importance to the GAC the domain name restriction data and the 2 potential topics. [Indiscernible] rounds and new gTLDs and domain registration data in connection with the minority statement so I believe text is still being drafted on those, and we might want it seek an update on those.

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.

Otherwise, we have if we scroll down seeing the -- follow up, on previous advice I believe there may also be some more text coming I'm not sure, and otherwise I'll just point to one pending topic I believe in the issues of importance to the GAC.

Subsequent procedures for new gTLDs, there is -- this on sentence in the peak section that relates to DNS abuse and its relationship to new rounds that is I believe it left to be discussed at this point.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Fabian. So I see Olivier has a hand up, so any updates from the European Commission?

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thank you, Manal. Fabian, we didn't know if we could upload ourselves text so we have sent you text for section 4, 5 by e-mail. Maybe you can put it on the Google doc and we can discuss this part.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, will do. I want to confirm you should be able to put the text in it the communique F you can't let us know but I will take it from the e-mail, thank you.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Olivier. So let's deal with what we have on the screen right now, and the sentence reading it is -- it is necessary to consider whether the implementation of subsequent rounds of new gTLDs could be carried out before said issue is addressed by the ICANN community.

So we, we got stuck here between softening the language versus not sticking to what we have said before, and whether we need to be strictly consistent or adapt with the changing circumstances, so I hope we can arrive to a mutually-acceptable solution here.

Just reading Russia in the chat, plus one, to the added text to DNS abuse. So I think it was regarding changing the language, so the text is there. Whether we need to change the language or, yes, Russia, please if you would like to clarify.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yes, sorry, I planned to edit later on. As you remember I promised to add some sentence about DoH. DOT it's not a correction of language. I plan to discuss it with my colleagues, but as I see we won't do finalized communique now and I add a couple of new sentence. It's not only language changes.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you for flagging. So this is new language to the DNS abuse part. And also it looks like Kavouss is not in the room so let's leave the earlier sentence because he was of a different view and let's address this new text, and see if it is good to go.

The GAC members support implementation of new technologies for DNS abuse mitigation however some of these technologies, such as DNS over HTTPS and DoH or DNS over TLS, DoH challenge the public interests related to child on-line protection, blocking resources with illegal or harmful content, phishing sites, etcetera.

GAC members express their concerns regarding DoH, DOT implementation and to continue to study, analyze the threats and risks posed by DNS encryption technologies.

Any reactions to this new text? France, please go ahead.

FRANCE: Yes. Thank you, Manal. Just a short comment without the video, and purely in English. Not in French, I promise.

Thank you very much for your proposal, but I am afraid that this formulation is a bit too strong, and I think the GAC, as many other

stakeholder groups within ICANN is still at the beginning of its exploration of the subjects of DoH, DOT and other similar protocols, and I believe that the text that you have proposed is already taking us too much into one direction.

As I said earlier, during the DoH session, we in France, we are particularly aware of the dangers of such protocols, but -- and we, we plan, we aim to remain very prudent and careful about it, but at the same time, we believe that it may have some advantages especially for individual users, and if individual users safety is also part of global cybersecurity.

So, we would like -- we would definitely like to soften the language that you have proposed, and we can do this together or with other GAC members, but really right now I believe it is too strong. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Vincent. I see Olivier also. European Commission.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thank you, Manal. I would like to support the comment of France. I think the language would need to be softened and be many more exploratory and also more [indiscernible]. I mean it should recognize also the benefits of these new technologies in terms of increasing

security and increasing end user's privacy as it was explained to us during the session today on DNS abuse. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Olivier. I agree maybe the last sentence, for example, could be GAC members intend to continue to study analyze the advantages and disadvantages posed by DNS encryption technologies.

So not to preempt a GAC position on this, and just stressing on the point Russia mentioned regarding intentions to continue I haven't thought of a different formulation for the first sentence. Olivier, is this a new hand? It's not.

Okay. So can we try to work on a more balanced text, and I'm just reading the U.S. in the chat. The GAC has not discussed this issue -- I'm sorry, U.S. you already have your hand up so please go ahead.

UNITED STATES: Thank you, chair. Just, yes, to support the comments by France and the European Commission. We're not entirely sure also if this may fall within the ICANN remit, so I think it would be our preference to focus on the facts here, and to to indicate that we received a very informative briefing on the matter.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, U.S., and I'm just having heard them wondering whether it could go up in the section where we report on things we received during our meetings, but I'm flexible.

If GAC colleagues feel it belongs more here we can definitely leave it but let's work on the language. Maybe right away if there are any suggestions of GAC members. Support implementation of new technologies for DNS abuse mitigation, is this a fair assumption?

And I see U.S. in the chat supporting moving this to the briefing section. Is this okay Russia? Where we can say that we have received an informative presentation he will illustrating the benefits and despite the benefits certain challenges and that the GAC intends to continue to study analyze.

Does this work for you? I see Russia in the chat confirming? So can we do this. Fabian, please, your hand is up already go ahead.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Sorry I was distracted by your... pieces of text. Can you confirm where this would be moved? Is this for the PSWG briefing maybe.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, I think this is where we received -- yeah it was related to the DNS abuse session, and organized by the PSWG so I think this is a good place to put -- to move the text to.

Are we doing this right away or shall we look at something else? Okay.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: And, Manal, if I may I understand PSWG leaders are working on the texter for these sections so should I communicate back to them that they may want to consider this text as part of their --

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, please, so if we can have this either included or added as a separate paragraph to the PSWG it would be great.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So we will do that and I will report back when we have the final text for this section then.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay, so I was suggesting to start by saying that the GAC received an informative presentation by -- I'm not sure how to refer to experts, or the panel, but anyway it was an informed -- informative presentation on DNS over HTTPS highlighting, highlighting advantages in terms of

privacy and security.

Maybe full stop, and then however, and we try to formulate something regarding the risks and challenges and then indicate that maybe the last -- the last sentence the GAC intend to continue. GAC -- the GAC and then -- yeah we delete the GAC intends to continue to study and so does this work for everyone?

This is just initial thoughts on the framework to fill in. Vincent, please, France, go ahead.

FRANCE:

Yes, thank you very much, Manal. And thank you especially for these first change that is you have proposed. Developed very good ideas.

So it is changing quite quickly under our eyes. But yes, just one, one or two further comments. I don't think that we should include a list, or describing the possible public interest is that it could be in danger. I think as a -- in order to strike a balance between the threats and the advantages of these protocols we should not put a list of threats, and at the same time not putting a list of potential advantages, and well if we try to do both it could become quite complicated and long.

So I would be in favor of removing the examples that have been given by Russia which are perfectly relevant, but I think that for now, for

exploratory first comment on the issue we should try to remain rather general. And yes, that's pretty much it, yes that's all from me right now. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Vincent. I see U.S., and Russia, and so the proposal is to just maybe say however the GAC noted the risks and challenges accompanied by new technologies without listing of the risks and challenges. If I got you correctly. But, Susan, please go ahead.

UNITED STATES: Thank you, chair. Just following upon the comments from our colleague from France we would support them. And while I think that noting risks and challenges of new technologies in general, possibly we could allow for that, but I think that it would be our strong preference actually just to note that we received a briefing by a panel of experts.

Again, we're not entirely clear on whether this issue is even within the remit. It was an informative discussion, however we -- it would be our strong preference to just focus on the fact that we received a briefing on this topic. Thank you.

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

RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Maybe the sentence just before I want to say thank you to Vincent who support [inaudible] idea to mention this issue but I want to say yes maybe this sentence is not the best formulation.

It was a reason why first I say that might be better to add this text tomorrow because it was my plan to discuss it with my colleagues with technical specialist to prepare the best formulation. I agree that the least for -- the list of public interest areas, which can be impacted by DNS encryption technology such as child on-line protection, blocking resources with illegal content, even me I'm not comfortable with these because first of all it's not the complete list.

It can be added, and the reason why can I still included it in my sentence, because I want to show examples of such areas because generic words public interest mean nothing for people who is not deep understand the technologies and results of usage technologies. Maybe, maybe please [inaudible], we can remove the list.

As I said, it's not complete, and not balanced by mentioned public interest. Relate -- or public interest by DNS encryption technologies because I want to stress on focus what is a key threat, DNS encryption is a key threat. After implementation of DNS encryption request we will

have a serious problems with filtering these low enforcement, and so on and so forth with the [inaudible] related to states interest to governments and just ignore it, I don't think that we need to common with these statements.

Public interest was impacted maybe by DNS encryption. The something like this. But I'm not [inaudible] to remove these list. We can remove it but please clarify by other [inaudible] impacted by DNS encryption. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Russia. I see Laureen's hand up. Laureen, please.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I'm wondering if a possible way forward could be, and I think, I think perhaps Olivier may be amenable to this also -- is we're including I'm not sure if it's been -- made it to the communique but we have our typical update from if the PSWG and its activities under the working group, and we already refer to the fact that we gave a briefing on this.

I'm wondering if -- if that would suffice. Recording the general point that Russia is making, I think our discussions, our discussions on DNS abuse, and also the, the 2 sides of the coin on privacy protections for example, in masking domain name registration data.

It's a real parallel, and I think probably it requires some further thinking about the how that relates to this encryption technology. I'm just not sure it's quite right for a specific statement about it right now. I certainly take the point that every technology has its positives and negatives.

We know this just from, from various social media sites as well but I'm just thinking for the context here within ICANN, and within the GAC perhaps this issue needs some further discussion and consideration by the GAC, which we really haven't had a chance to do.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Lauren. So let me try -- let me try this formulation, and if not acceptable then I think we will need to move on.

So would it make sense to say that the GAC received an inform testify presentation by a panel of experts on DNS over HTTPS, and then full stop and then we go directly to the last sentence saying the GAC intends to continue to follow up emerging technologies with an eye on public interest for example? Does this address all points?

If not then I withdraw my proposal, and let's await the PSWG text and take it from there. Russia, please.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Not agree because I mentioned in the chat yes we have very informative presentation. Thank you very much but we have as well a discussion, and during the discussion we please stated our concern.

Maybe we can -- I understand that not all GAC members support our vision, or maybe not all GAC members see the threads in DoH. Just -- we can change GAC members to some GAC members, I put it GAC members only because I remember the discussion with Kavouss about a sentence GAC members for some, GAC members if in this case -- we can state as one body, as one group.

Let's change to some GAC members concerned stated concern something like this it was stated Russian Federation as minimum stated with concern, as I see it was supported with -- by some other members which mentioned risk as I remember it was Vincent. It was Nigel, it was a discussion. It wasn't only presentation.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. I don't think there is a problem referencing a discussion. I think the problem is stating views so you're proposing to say some -- and I see Susan's hand up so U.S., please go ahead.

UNITED STATES:

Thank you, chair. I just -- I might want to push back on the notion that there has been a GAC discussion on DoH. If we take a look at the agenda that has been published and that we have all participated in over the course of the past few days, discussion within the GAC has been dedicated to a bucket -- or a few buckets of issues, namely, DNS abuse, and subsequent procedures.

We did receive an informative briefing on DoH, there were -- there was some time for questions and answers, however, I am not of the view that the GAC has had a full discussion or even just a discussion in general on DoH, and would also like to question whether or not this is within the remit or a useful contribution in terms of other developments and emerging technologies, so while I appreciate the contribution from our colleague from Russia I might have to disagree. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Susan. So I see France. Please, go ahead.

FRANCE:

Thank you Manal. Vincent Guillard for France, for the record. I would like to say that I agree with what Susan has just said regarding the discussion. The GAC did not really have a discussion between ourselves. We did react immediately to the, to the very interesting briefing, and presentations but it was not really a GAC discussion, and

that is also why we have to remain cautious.

Right now we have only starting -- started to delve into this subject and we should not venture into a direction or another too soon, so I, I believe that our text on this issue should -- well, should remain quite factual and perhaps being 3 times. First, that we receive a briefing and presentations that were very positive and optimistic about DoH, but that in reaction some GAC members have proposed by Russia raised the potential threats posed by such protocols.

And that thirdly, as a result the GAC intend to follow up on this issue in a balanced way between potential threats and potential advantages. That's maybe a structure that could help us out, find a common text. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, France, for the constructive proposal. So U.S. and Russia would this work? Yes please, Russia.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION: In the spirit of compromise, yes, I fully agree with Vincent. It can work. If we will as stated 3 point. We receive informative presentation. It's already on screen. No problem. Agreed. In some reaction some member raised the concern. Agreed. And as a result... continuous study and allies threats and risk posed by DNS encryption technology. Yes.

Yes, it can work and for us it's acceptable.

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

UNITED STATES: Yes, thank you, chair. In terms of the formulation yes, we support France's constructive proposal. Merci Vincent. We would prefer the original proposal from the chair for the last third sentence which is that GAC intends to continue to follow up emerging technologies with an eye on the public interest. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So, final formulation on the screen. Any comments? Thank you, France, for the very helpful suggestion. I think we are good to delete the text that is in strike through, and we have a clean text. I see Russia's hand up. Russia please.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Only one question. Why in square brackets?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: No, we were just trying to find the right word I think. Please delete the square brackets Fabian. Thank you.

And we can also delete yeah the square brackets from, from the last sentence and delete the text that has been struck through, yeah. Excellent. And this is Chris and then Russia. Chris, please.

UNITED KINGDOM: A quick question on process from me, so this is very much an update from the GAC on an issue presented by PSWG and this is normally where it's a PSWG update. I wonder if this needs to move to issues of importance or somewhere else.

I'm not clear, but quite happy to work this into our update if you feel that's the right place. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So we just brought it up from from the issues of importance to the GAC. Again, we are trying to find where is the right place to insert this text. It was originally proposed by Russia to put it with the DNS abuse section of -- under issues of importance to the GAC, but then there was some agreement that maybe it makes more sense here, but again if there is a better place, please let us know, and I see Russia's hand up so Russia please you go first.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Just one comment. In reaction some members have raised concerns. From my point of view it's not how to say -- finished sentence.

Concerns, and it seems should be continuation of explanation what is the concerns? If it's acceptable for other members, maybe concerns related to these technologies, or in some softer language if you want, but we should clarify what is. -- what was these concerns -- what were these concerns?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So you're suggesting concerns. Related to this technology?

RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yes, if it's acceptable for other members related to technologies.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Is it.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Or implementation of technology.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Related to implementation.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Related to these technology.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So I think related to either this technology or implementation of this technology. Any preferences? Any reactions with this -- agreed? No objection from France?

So I think we have a final text here. The place remains to be seen. I see support from European Commission and United States to have it under the PSWG, so Chris I hope you're okay with this too? And we can try to see what other parts are pending.

We're running out of time. We have only -- just checking -- we have 20 minutes is it? Time is flying, so let's move to -- is he let's start by the GAC advice for the Board. Anything that we can finalize now? And is still pending? So this is -- domain registration data and GAC minority statement on EPDP phase to final report.

The text reads Phase 2 EPDP is a step forward but the GAC has serious concerns concerning certain recommendations and gaps in the final report of Phase 2 of the EPDP on gTLD registration data, as set forth in the GAC minority statement on 24 August 2020.

The GAC advises the Board to carefully consider the GAC minority statement, and available options to address the public policy concerns expressed there in. We also note the GAC maybe to be consistent back to what Jorge said -- the GAC also notes that the [indiscernible]DP can focus the Board on some of the practical implementation challenges especially those involving cost apportionment, and we are missing a full stop.

So can we replace we with the GAC, if okay with the drafters? And then the rationale in its GAC minority statement the GAC provides input on its public policy concerns regarding the ways that the recommendations contained in the final report of Phase 2 of the EPDP on gTLD registration data, one currently concludes with a fragmented rather than centralized disclosure system.

2, do not currently contain enforceable standards to review disclosure decisions.

3, do not sufficiently address consumer protection and consumer trust concerns,.

4, do not currently contain reliable mechanisms for the system for standardized assess disclosure SSAD to evolve in response to increased legal clarity .

And 5, may impose financial conditions that risk, a SSAD that calls for this district pros portion at costs for its users including those that detect and act on cybersecurity threats. The GAC is of the view that certain key recommendations and unaddressed topics in the final report of the Phase 2 of the EPDP on gTLD registration data require further work and that the Board should assess how best to address them.

The GAC looks forward to continued engagement with the Board and the community on these important issues. So I'll stop here, and let's see if there are any comments either on the advice language, or the rationale language. European Commission please, go ahead.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION:

Thank you, thank you, Manal, for going through the text. So the idea here is really to elevate the GAC minority statement that we should over the Summer through an advice, because this minority statement was sent to the GNSO.

The GNSO has taken it into account has decided on the final recommendation to be conveyed to the Board, and if we leave it like that the very important points that we have made in this minority

statement you know, will be -- I mean may not be taken into account in the next steps of the process.

So we would really like that these points -- and they are written down in the rationale, that they are taken into account in the next steps in the process, and the first next step is consideration by the Board. The -- this is really minimal. We advise to the Board to consider the -- carefully requester the minority statement, and the rationale is taken from the minority statement itself so I have -- we have not redrafted anything.

The five points it's strictly what is in the minority statement without the details of course. So that is the logic of the proposal. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So I'm sorry, Olivier, are you proposing to move the 5 points from the rationale to the advice?

FRANCE: No, no, not at all.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay, I'm sorry.

FRANCE: I was just mentioning that this has not been re-written. This is a copy paste these 5 points from the minority statement.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Excellent. Thank you. So any comments on the text as it stands on the screen? I see none. So I think we're good to go on this part. So Fabian, with your help if you can guide me.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yes, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, please go ahead.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: We do have also input from the commission and a group of drafters together on the issues of importance on the same -- not the same topic but the same area. Same area, same matters so this is here number 5. If you scroll down a little bit number 5. This is new text. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Fabian. So this new text under domain name registration data phase one implementation and accuracy. EPDP

Phase 2A EPDP Phase 2A discusses important issues relevant to a functioning domain name system.

For example, data suggests that only around 11.5% of domains may belong to natural persons who have subject to a GDPR. While content data from 57.3% of all domains was redacted. These data suggest that a much larger set of registration data was redacted as compared to what is required by relevant data protection laws.

The GAC reiterates in line with the San Francisco -- I'm sorry -- in line with the San Juan communique that the data of legal and natural persons should be distinguished from one another, and that public access to nonpersonal registration data of legal entities should be restored.

The GAC is of the view that this would help restoring the utility of the RDS by rendering accessible a larger set of nonpersonal registration data. Considering the above the GAC strongly supports the continuation of EPDP Phase 2A with a view in particular to address the issue of distinguish between natural and legal entities.

This is under EPDP Phase 2A then on accuracy the GAC remains concerned about the absence of any recommendations on the vital topic of accuracy in the EPDP Phase 2 final report, the GAC reiterates in line with the minority statement in line with the [indiscernible] data recommendations and the ICANN69 communique that the accuracy of

domain name registration data is fundamental to both the GDPR and the goal of maintaining a secure and resilient DNS.

The GDPR as well as other data protection regimes and ICANN's registrar accreditation agreement require data accuracy, and such accuracy is critical to ICANN's mandate of ensuring the security stability reliability and resilience of the DNS.

Can we scroll down please? Accuracy of registration data is also essential tool -- I think to mitigate -- I believe there's typo here -- mitigate DNS abuse. The recent SSR2 report recommendation monitoring the enforcement of registry and registrar contractual obligations to improve data accuracy.

The GAC notes the ICANN org briefing on accuracy issued on 26 February and looks forward to follow up by GNSO council. The GAC looks forward to contributing to the scoping work on accuracy which is essential to further consideration of the issue.

The GAC emphasizes that in the entire impending the launch of the scoping exercise and possible subsequent policy work ICANN contract compliance should ensure enforcement of the existing contract provisions relevant to the accuracy of domain name registration data.

And so we have more text under this section ever the policy implementation now is the new part and this reads the GAC notes its

prefer advice with the Montreal advice -- within the Montreal advice with regard to Phase 1, and the request for a detailed realistic schedule. The GAC observes that the Phase 1 IRT continues and without a current published schedule or milestones.

The GAC also notes the continued work amongst the different phases of this EPDP including the operational design phase, and as expressed during the meeting with the Board, requests that an updated and current schedule is created and published for those elements that are under ICANN org's control.

So with this quick reading let's go up again and ask if there are any comments for the first section under EPDP Phase 2A? Any comments? If not, then any comments on the paragraphs under accuracy? Again, seeing nothing, so let me also check the policy implementation.

Any comments on the text under policy implementation? So I just have one question regarding the text in blue, just I'm going to read it once more. It didn't read well with me so I'm just wondering if -- Nigel, please. You have your hand up. U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Yes, good evening, Manal. I do apologize on the policy implementation, the GAC notes its previous advice within the Montreal -- yes, doing something there is right. With regard to Phase 1 and the request after

detailed realistic schedule.

The GAC observes -- perhaps the GAC observes with concern or the GAC, the GAC has concerns -- that the Phase 1IRT continues without a published schedule. Rather than just observes because I think -- I think -- yeah, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I think the problem is with the word and maybe. If we just delete and? And I defer back to you to let me know in it reads well as a native speaker. So the GAC observes that the Phase 1IRT continues without the current published scheduled.

Was the intention here to -- I'm not sure who was the drafter. Was the intention here to flag 2 things? But it -- hasn't completed yet, and without a [inaudible] maybe, and Nigel, if you would like I see your hand is up.

UNITED KINGDOM: No, thank you but obviously it's up to the drafter but it's just I think it's -- it makes more sense -- it makes stronger to say observes with concern because I think that is -- that's the essence of this observation, that [indiscernible] thank you very much.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Nigel. Thank you. And in all cases I think we need to delete the end unless we want to make 2 points not one and I see Chris's hand up, so Chris go ahead.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Manal. I agree with Nigel's point. I think the concern does raise the bar see we accept this. And I think the point was that we had asked for a schedule and that this was completed as quickly as possible. So there is 2 points that but it does read a lot better without the and, so happy to remove the and.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. So Chris -- so the GAC observes with concern that the Phase 1IRT continues without a current published schedule or milestones. Any more new sections or new text.

So I'm just checking whether we can extend a little bit the beyond the schedule time, and let me check with colleagues as well. Are you good to stay a little bit beyond the scheduled time?

We just have 4 minutes for the scheduled time, and I think we have a few things that we need to finalize if okay with everybody.

Brian, I see your hand up. Probably something else but go ahead.

BRIAN BECKHAM: Brian Beckham, for the record. Just want since you asked the question about new text while work is going on and off other topics I have inserted the text that's there on the screen regarding IGO identifiers. Apologies for the late timing.

But we've been working off line across time zones with IGOs who are not actually present at the meeting here with us. So apologies for the late timing, but this was text that has been agreed, hopefully, hopefully it can be supported.

It's just a reminder of kind of the state of play as was discussed in in the briefing on Monday evening.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: And this is under follow-up on previous GAC advice?

BRIAN BECKHAM: Exactly.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So which advice are we reiterating? So let me read the text. While the GAC welcomes the [indiscernible] GNSO work track on curative rights it

notes issues faced by an overly narrow [indiscernible] and in the meantime recalls prior GAC advice and ICANN arrangement and moratorium for new reservations of IGO acronyms ahead of a final resolution of this issue.

So, again, is this -- I mean can redig the exact language and defer to this language in previous GAC advice? Or are we considering this new GAC advice, so meanwhile let me take Rob -- sorry you have your hand up, I believe on the extension.

ROBERT HOGGARTH:

Yes, Manal. Thank you. Assuming that your colleagues still have any energy left for those in your time zones, the interpretation staff and meetings technical support have graciously agreed to extend themselves for up to another 30 minutes so you have some flexibility tonight, and then of course the reminder that you all have scheduled 2 full hours of additional discussions tomorrow if needed. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Rob, and thank you very much for technical staff support and interpreters. I hope we don't use all the 30 minutes, just some flexibility to wrap.

So, back to IGO identifiers. I'm just reading the chat. Nigel, I think with the reference this is well worthwhile text and Switzerland agreeing. I

don't mind the section, I'm just -- I think we will be asked which advice are we reiterating.

This is being logged in in a system, and I mean, I'm just thinking from machine point of view so if there is a concrete reference to exact to previous advice it would be helpful that we did this and refer to it.

BRIAN BECKHAM:

Thank you. Sorry to butt in. I can go back. I have a kind of a document with the IGO advice and the communique, but off the top of my head I think Johannesburg and Panama would be probably the most 2 on point here but maybe overnight I can just confirm that that's the case.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

Okay, perfect. Thank you very much Brian. So let's scroll up, and try to see where we're missing text, and where we have pen holders and whom to -- I mean, just to fill in the gaps until tomorrow morning so we're missing text under subsequent rounds of new gTLDs, under GAC consensus advice, and this was supposed to be submitted by the U.S. right? Or is this something else? I'm sorry, Susan, please go ahead.

UNITED STATES: Thank you, chair. I think our primary point regarding subsequent rounds was taking note of the need for an assessment of costs and benefits understand analysis prior to a second round.

In light of the fact -- well, taking review of Fabian's -- the information sent by Fabian regarding the Helsinki and Kobe communiqes it may be the case that this could be followup advice, so we will consider adding text to that extent following the third bullet point in the follow-up advice section, and I realize that you would like to do this immediately, so I might just go ahead and submit that text now.

If it doesn't find the support of the GAC then we're very happy to just move the current third bullet point up to the SubPro section, if that is advisable.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Susan. I'm just trying to catch up with the chat and, Fabian, your hand is up so you go ahead.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Manal. Just to confirm that we would then delete the reference to [inaudible] will go gTLDs in the advice portion and I've added a section under previous advice with the same name. I want to confirm that is what we are doing right now. While we wait for the text, is that correct?

UNITED STATES: Yes. Thank you, Fabian.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: And I see also in the chat, Nigel, CTU regarding section 3 and GAC working groups I added a comment for text for PSWG consideration the GAC received an informative presentation by a panel of experts on DNS over HTTPS that highlighted advantages in terms of DNS security and privacy, some GAC members however noted possible public policy implications with use of this technology as a result the GAC intends to continue and the text scrolled up.

Anyway, thank you very much, Nigel. You will look into the text. I think it was already agreed, and I think it's already along the same lines, so thank you for the suggestion.

And I see Brian confirming that it's ICANN62 Panama, and he pasted the relevant advice in the chat. And ICANN 59 Johannesburg, so thank you for the references.

So can we have a quick look on everything from the beginning before we go. So this part we're -- we will have a final read tomorrow of course but now just to identify any missing parts so this is good to go if we can scroll down. Interconstituancy activities. Just reading the text in red.

Anything we need to resolve no, so good to go?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Manal, if I may.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Please, Fabian.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: I just want to note that we flagged here the there may need to be some adjustments to the text highlighted here. Some additional questions not discussed during the meeting have been provided to the ICANN Board in writing so we just this is a place holder for a discussion of how you want to represent the fact that the number of questions or topics were not discussed in session. Just wanted to flag that.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So let me sense the room quickly. Do we need to put this in the communique?

I mean, we already agreed to follow up on those later and we still need to revisit the questions. Do we want a place holder here? And if yes, is the language on the screen okay?

So any opposition to deleting this sentence? Yes, I think it's useful so U.K. thinks it's useful. If there are no objections then we can keep it, and remove the highlights so let's move on then meeting with the ALAC.

We have the agenda and then meeting with the GNSO also the agenda that was discussed cross-community, tomorrow's session. GAC membership, okay, reflecting new members, and then GAC leadership again straightforward regarding the terms outgoing vice-chairs and incoming vice-chairs.

The GAC working group, so we're still expecting text from the PSWG here right? Okay. And GAC human rights we already read the text and it was approved, right?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Correct, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So if we can scroll down please operational matters. Anything controversial with the operational matters? Introduction of modified communique drafting process, and developing a new GAC action decision radar, and retirement of 2 GAC working groups I think 3 is straightforward topics.

And now issues of importance to the GAC. I think the DNS abuse text

was agreed.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Correct.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Public interest commitments also agreed, and right protection mechanism.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Correct, this was agreed as well.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. And subsequent procedures right with the exception of -- I'm sorry, go ahead, Fabian.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: I didn't mean to interrupt. I wanted to flag that sentence that's left here that's highlighted if we can scroll down a little bit.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. With the -- with the exception of this sentence regarding DNS abuse, everything else was agreed.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Correct.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So two things pending text from PSWG and one sentence under topics of interest to the GAC in relation to the subsequent rounds, and has to do with DNS abuse. Fabian, please, your hand is up.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yes, sorry, I just want to highlight also 2 points that may [inaudible] confirmation in the discussion and those are the titles of section 5 of issues of importance, right now this was a title that we did not mean to be a title.

We just captured this notion when the topic was suggested so this deserves a confirmation of the title. And the same goes for the advice on number subsection 1. We also have a place holder here meant to convey the topic that was going to be addressed here but not a confirmed, title.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So two titles in relation to domain registration data needs to be finalized as well. Thank you for highlighting them and I think nothing

else under issues of importance to the GAC right Fabian? So we continue scrolling now. And under GAC consensus advice we have this title to resolve and we have the text I think below. Let's move on.

Okay, this is follow up on previous GAC advice. So this still needs some work, right?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Right, Manal. We have not discussed a finalized version of this text.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. So I'm sure everyone is quite exhausted and we still have two sessions tomorrow. I might be forced to miss the first session. I hope my vice chairs, my GAC leadership colleagues will be able to fill in for me in the morning, but if the communique was not finalized in the morning, we still have a very last session, but I really hope that we can finalize the communique during -- so I shouldn't refer to morning, but during the first session of the day tomorrow.

It would be good to finalize it during the first session, and release the last one for everyone's benefit. And thank you, Luisa, for confirming filling in for me during the first session.

So with this, if there are no other requests for the floor, we have

identified all the missing parts for the communique, I hope we come tomorrow in if a good shape to hopefully wrap up and thank you for your flexibility and for the discussions.

We will be reconvening tomorrow at 900 Cancun time. 1400UTC, again with the option of a daily update at 12:45UTC. So thank you very much everyone. Have a good rest of the day. The meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]