EN

ICANN71 | Virtual Policy Forum - GAC Communique Drafting (2 of 4)
Wednesday, June 16, 2021 - 14:30 to 16:00 CEST

GULTEN TEPE: Welcome to this ICANN71 GAC session, Communique Drafting(b), on Wednesday the 16th of June at 12:30 UTC. With respect to time, I would like to leave the floor to GAC Chair, Manal Ismail.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, and thank you everyone for being back. I hope my connection will remain stable until the end of our discussions today. Apologies for dropping off frequently. We have the communique on the screen. Can I please be notified of any new texts that needs to be read out loud?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Manal, we can possibly scroll all the way down to previous follow-up previous advice where we have a new text on CCT review recommendations and then work our way (indiscernible)

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay, perfect. And I will try to do this with video off, maybe it could enhance my connectivity and make my audio better. Apologies for this as well.   So under CCT Review

recommendations, the text, and this is now under follow-up on previous advice, the text now reads: In light of the constructive discussions with took place with the Board and the wider ICANN community at ICANN71, the GAC advised from ICANN70, namely in paragraph 1 of section 6 and the scorecard dated 12th May 2021, the GAC would seek the following: Discussions with Board, org, and community colleagues on establishment of an interactive tracker tool before ICANN 72 which notes the ongoing status of the CCT recommendations specified in the ICANN70 GAC advice, to specifically work with ICANN org and the SO/AC's to ensure the full implementation of the recommendations with existing gTLDs and gTLDs introduced through any subsequent application process.

And there is a list of the referenced recommendations, 5, collection of secondary market data, 9, costs of defensive registration, 14, [reading] incentives to adopt proactive anti-abuse measures, 15, prevent systemic use of specific registrars or registries for DNS security abuse, 17, chain of parties responsible for gTLD domain name registrations, 26, regular studies of costs required to protect trademarks in gTLDs, and a pro bono assistance program. Nigel please, go ahead.

UNITED KINGDOM: Good afternoon, thank you. Yes, Manal, sorry, just trying to get back. I'm still working on this text. I want to add in a couple of explanatory paragraphs at the end just so it's clear where these recommendations come from. So if you can give me another half hour or something, I will try and do it. It's a bit difficult to do everything at the same time, but yeah, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Nigel, I fully understand you as far as following up the session and reading up the draft. Reading it now, we're now asking to have discussions with the Board, org, and community colleagues on establishment of an interactive tracking tool before ICANN 72. I'm not sure this is exactly what we asked whether, what we asked for in our prior advice. I'm sorry to keep going back and forth on this, but I know they parsed whatever is there under advice to the Board and follow-up advice to the Board, and it's put in this action request register which tracks all requests or advice that the Board receives.

And I'm just looking from the other side of the table, whether this would squarely fit as a reiteration. Sorry to -- I'm happy to hear other thoughts from GAC colleagues who are also familiar, experienced with this -- or support staff, if this would be an exact reiteration of the previous GAC advice. Anyway, happy to wait

until the text is final but I'm just flagging this for now. And Fabien, if we can scroll to other parts that were modified.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: I believe that would be maybe we can go back to issues of importance. We have a new subsection, accuracy, 3, new text we haven't considered yet and then subsequent rounds and new gTLDs as well.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. So having the accuracy on the screen, we can start by accuracy. And thank you, Gulten, I will be slower, and apologies to our interpreters. Under accuracy, the text reads: The GAC would like to reiterate that maintaining accurate and complete domain name registration data is an important element in the prevention and mitigation of DNS abuse. The GAC gives therefore particular importance to the verification and validation of administration data by registries and registrars in line with their contractual obligation and supports rigorous monitoring and enforcement of such contractual obligations by ICANN. The GAC will continue to contribute actively to the work on accuracy within the ICANN community in an attempt to address [reading]

In this context, the GAC supports the prompt launch of the accuracy scoping exercise by the GNSO and would request to take

part in it, together with other interested constituencies to bring in the different perspectives on the issues. We support the view that the scope of the work should be broader than compliance with GDPR and relevant data protection regimes and encompass a broader change of issues pertaining to the accuracy of registration data.

And thank you [indiscernible] for the note that you are adjusting -- I'm sorry, let's keep the text on the screen, I see Susan asking for some time to review, and I see Olivier's hand, please.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thank you, Manal. Since we're looking at the section on accuracy, [indiscernible] DNS abuse.

SPEAKER: Subsection 1, issues of importance to the GAC.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Yes, exactly, section 1, sorry. A suggestion, we put the sentence highlighted and don't refer necessarily to [indiscernible] so it could read the GAC acknowledged the importance of registries and registrars comply with ICANN contractual obligations, and we could stop here without starting another paragraph, continuing with the next sentence, at the same time -- continuing -- it's a

suggestion. Or we could repeat twice the importance of accuracy. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Olivier, for the suggestion. And I will seek Japan's confirmation. I think this text came from Japan, so I hope it's okay. And the deletion should be complemented by the text in the following paragraph. So if it is okay, I think we can move on. Fabien, please.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Manal, if I may, for clarity should we consider maybe switching section numbers and maybe have gTLDs section 1, DNS abuse section 2, and then accuracy and the rest of it with the same number so maybe the topics closer together? That's just a suggestion for readability.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Sure, sure, let's do this.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So Manal, just to wait until we confirm -- because if we move the text -- [indiscernible]

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Sorry, I couldn't hear everything well.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: I was just suggesting we make the reordering once the text is confirmed just for clarity [indiscernible]

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: And until we receive confirmation from Japan, maybe we can leave the strike-through. So anything else that needs to be read? I think there was a part under subsequent rounds? And this reads the GAC observed challenges in tracking the implementation of those CCT recommendations that the Board had passed on to parts of the community including the GNSO and welcome the proposal from the GNSO Council GAC liaison to request a briefing with GNSO to discuss exactly how they have addressed the CCT RT recommendations. Comments? So apart from the part on CCT recommendations, anything else pending?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Manal, on the EPDP Phase 2 ODP, number 4 here, there is a quote in the text of this section, and so we were just wondering whether there should be a source that should be quoted here or intentional that it isn't. Just for clarification, I believe the highlighted quote here is coming from the GAC plenary statement, I believe, so just a comment that we should [indiscernible]

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you for flagging this, Fabien. Can we have a response from our penholders? And in all cases, I think it would be good to confirm the source, and I see Laureen confirming in the chat that this is a quote, indeed, from the minority statement.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, so we can add the footnote maybe, and we will provide that reference in the text if that's appropriate.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, please do. I keep nodding with the video switched off, sorry [chuckling].

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So then I think in addition to the confirmation under DNS abuse section we have a [indiscernible] to confirm internal matters, one is in the future GAC meetings. I believe there was an edit of the section here by the UK.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Uh-huh. I can't find the beginning of the sentence so maybe from the beginning, GAC members discussed ICANN planning for a return to in-person meetings including the option of conducting a hybrid meeting, combining in-person and virtual participation

at ICANN 72. ICANN org staff reported on the preliminary results of recent survey of various ICANN public meeting attendees --

GULTEN TEPE: Manal, so sorry to interrupt you but we have been receiving complaints from the interpreters, so may I ask you to read a little bit slower, please.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I'm sorry, sure. So ICANN staff reported on the preliminary results of a recent survey of previous ICANN public meeting attendees regarding the possibilities of and the conditions under which a hybrid ICANN 72 meeting could be conducted. While there appears to be substantial interest in a return to in-person meetings, GAC members expressed the need to assure that any transition back to in-person meetings ensures -- instead of assure -- a level of fairness for attendees from all around the globe and that considerations be made to assure robust virtual participation capabilities. It was considered that the virtual pandemic experience has forged positive meeting innovations and that all future ICANN public meetings will essentially be hybrid rather than purely physical gatherings.

ICANN|71
VIRTUAL POLICY FORUM

So I think it's a sensible addition, a sensible correction as well. Any comments? I see none. Then again back to you, Fabien, for anything else that is pending apart from CCT Review.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Sorry, I was noting future GAC meetings, so the next section, the section we discussed -- we need to confirm the edit on the screen here is appropriate, and also I want to flag that we have proposed this itemization or listing of this section just for clarity of reading. It used to be in line in the paragraph 1, 2, 3, so we have suggested this format to make it easier to read.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Fabien, for flagging. Yes, this is exactly where I got disconnected. So thank you for flagging. I thought we were going to insert the title of the survey as is? Have we agreed differently? I'm sorry. I missed this part.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Manal, maybe before Laureen or [indiscernible] comes online for this -- an edit was suggested by Laureen; I believe we're expecting confirmation on this part.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So I'm just trying to make sure we're reflecting this accurately. Because I thought when we did the exact title it was different. I'm scrolling up in the chat. So the title -- so is this the title of the -- it reads ICANN, GDPR, and WHOIS, a user's survey three years later.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Manal, just want to flag that Laureen is --

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Sorry, Laureen, please go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN: No worries, hard to keep track of everything. This was just a proposed solution to the concerns raised by our colleagues in the European Commission. To be clear, it isn't the exact title of the paper, but I do think it accurately reflects the content of the presentation and the study which did focus on the impact of the temporary specification on access to data. So this was a response to meet the concerns expressed by the European Commission, so this is the proposal to meet their concern. If you think it creates a mis-reflection, then we can discuss it further, but I think it reflects the content of the actual discussion and the actual survey.

ICANN|71
VIRTUAL POLICY FORUM

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Laureen, for the clarification. So if this is an accurate reflection to what was in the survey but not necessarily the exact title, then I think we can leave it. Sorry, just reading also in the chat, Japan: I would like to [indiscernible] on DNS abuse and accuracy. So sure, we will get back to the DNS abuse and accuracy. Thank you, Japan. So if nothing else here, maybe we can move to DNS abuse.

JAPAN: Thank you, Chair. If I may, I appreciate the suggestion from Olivier to [indiscernible] the sentence from DNS abuse for accuracy, and I understand that the intention about presentation is included in this text, and I would like to add some words to the sentence of accuracy. So can I go to the section with accuracy? Yes, thank you. And I would like to add that second [indiscernible] of the first paragraph, I would like for to sentence of the first paragraph, I would like this to be: GAC gives therefore particular importance to the correction and verification and validation of registration data by registries and registrars, including phone number. I would like to reflect a proposal in this section on DNS abuse: Registries and registrars, including phone number. So we propose to correcting and verifying phone numbers of the registrants. So I would like to leave the words in this part.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Sorry, I'm not clear. So first it's insertion of the word correction?

JAPAN: Corrections to --

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, we have it on the screen. And you are proposing including phone numbers after registries and registrars?

JAPAN: Yes, I would like to add as an example of what registrars should verify or correct.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I think this is a little bit detailed, but I'm in the hands of everyone, if everyone is okay. And I think even if we're going to include it, maybe after registration data and not after registries and registrars, if this is what you mean? If there is agreement -- I see Denmark agreeing it's too detailed, and I see Chris' hand up. Please.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Chris Lewis-Evans, for the record. Yeah, I think maybe it is too detailed, but maybe to address some of the concerns, we can say validation of all registration data? Rather than just registration data. I don't know if that helps.

JAPAN: This is Tomoya Ouchi. I understand the expression including phone numbers is too detailed, so we can delete that expression. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Japan, for your flexibility, and thank you, Chris, for the suggestion. Any further comments? I think for now we're pending -- Olivier and then Susan.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thanks. Just one small suggestion would be to put correction after verification and validation. Logically to me you verify, and then you correct. A small suggestion.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Olivier, makes sense. Susan, United States?

UNITED STATES: Yes, thank you, Chair. We just wanted to draw attention to the last sentence in the accuracy paragraph. It seems -- so we support the view that the scope of work should be broader than compliance with GDPR and relevant data protection regimes and encompass a broader range of issues pertaining to the accuracy of registration data. Just a question for the European Commission on this point. So the language suggests that the scope of work should be broader, but it does not specify what that work should cover. So it would be helpful if we could hear more from the commission on what that scope of work would be. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Susan. European Commission?

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thanks, Manal, and Susan for the comments. I think this is the result of a discussion that took place with the GNSO. Whether the scoping exercise should be narrowed to the question of compliance with GDPR and possibly other protection regimes or whether we should have a broader discussion. And I think this broader discussion -- I mean this discussion on accuracy as we discussed this morning existed before the GDPR. So it's not only linked to the GDPR.

But to give examples of things which could be covered, I think for example it should cover the question of accuracy of non-personal date which are not covered by the GDPR. If you speak compliance with the GDPR, then you speak about personal data which is the scope of data protection laws. Then maybe there is also the possibility to discuss more in general the question of why it is important to have accuracy of registration data for legitimate [indiscernible] seekers for the purpose of defending cyber security, for law enforcement, defending intellectual property rights. So that would be two elements that I think will be covered also in the scope, non-personal data but also why it is important that accuracy is ensured for the different users that request access to registration data. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thanks, Olivier. So Susan, does this address your concern; this answers your question?

UNITED STATES: Yes. Thank you, Olivier, and thank you, Manal. I think the concern is that as worded it could be read to be a bit over broad perhaps. Would it be simpler perhaps to emphasize that all registration data should just -- should be accurate?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Olivier?   Any objection to keeping this as all registration data being accurate?

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Sorry, I didn't understand the suggestion in that paragraph.

Sorry, it's me but I didn't get it.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So Susan, yeah, please, go ahead.

UNITED STATES: Perhaps it might be useful if we take some time to suggest some red lines, if that would be okay if we could revisit this, in the event that we could turn to another yet unresolved portion of the text. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thanks, Susan, noted. So we will be expecting a red line from the US on this part. Any other comments? I'm assuming that the hands raised are previous hands. Okay. And back again to you, Fabien, if there is anything else we should address.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: At this point we're expecting finalization of the CCT Review recommendation's text. Otherwise, I could maybe point to one suggestion we made as GAC support staff in section 5 of the issues of importance, EPDP Phase 2a, where we have added the EPDP acronym just to provide a clarification in the first sentence of the title, the title of the section, and also it reads: Acknowledges the efforts of the policy team participants' leadership and staff in developing these recommendations. And our understanding is that the participants and leadership are those of the PDP and the staff is the policy teams, so I just want to make sure that the understanding is correct.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thanks for the factual proposals. Any objections to this? I see none. And Nigel, UK, saying looks good in the chat. Thank you, Nigel, for confirming.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So Manal, I believe that -- well, Nigel is in the chat indicating that he has completed the CCT Review text for reading.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. Then I will pause for a minute or so until -- it's already there? Okay. Okay, then let's go through the new text. The

reviewed text under CCT Review recommendations. The text now reads: As a further follow-up advice to the ICANN GAC -- sorry. Again. As a further follow-up advice to the GAC ICANN67 Montreal consensus advice on CCT Review and subsequent rounds of new gTLDs section 5.1.a, and in light of constructive discussions which took place with the Board and the wider ICANN community at ICANN71 as well as the GAC follow-up advice from ICANN70, namely in paragraph 1 of section 6, and considering the Board scorecard there dated 12th of May 2021, the GAC requests the Board to undertake the following.

Thank you, Vincent. France in the chat indicating that ICANN Montreal was ICANN 66, not 67, which is right. Thank you for recognizing this. The GAC requests the Board to undertake the following: That the Board facilitates before ICANN 72 discussions with ICANN org, GNSO, and GAC and other interested ACs and SOs on the establishment of a comprehensive and interactive tracking tool which would include the ongoing status of the CCT recommendations specified in the ICANN70 GAC follow-up advice.

Two, that the Board facilitates work between the Board, ICANN org, GNSO, GAC, and other interested SO/AC's so ensure the full implementation of the following recommendations with respect existing gTLDs and gTLDs introduced through any subsequent

application process. Collection of second [indiscernible] data, costs of defensive registration, cost incentives regarding new gTLDs for good actors, contractual changes -- to adopt proactive measures, preventing systemic use of specific registrars or registries for DNS security abuse, identification of chain of parties responsible for gTLD domain name registration [reading], and I'm not sure, is this the last one? Can we scroll down?

And the last one is pro bono assistance program. Concerning the above recommendations, number 5 and number 17 and number 31 are currently under consideration by org, while number 9 and 12 were addressed to the GNSO in light of the SubPro PDP. And I see Jorge's hands up. Please.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Manal. Jorge Cancio, for the record. I am sorry because I was looking into the text, so I assume you have finalized reading?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I'm sorry, I didn't see the part on the following page. So I will finish it and we can continue. So any scorecard, number 5, 14 and 15 are identified as pending with the following explanations. Number 5, the Board understands that ICANN org is continuing with preparatory implementation planning for number 5, along

with other data collection recommendations. Numbers 14 and 15, the aboard had directed ICANN org to facilitate community efforts to develop a definition of abuse to inform further action on this recommendation. The Board has continued to follow the community's discussions on this and other aspects of DNS abuse mitigation, including the recommendations from the SSR 2 review team and the recent issues advice from SSAC.

I will stop here and back to you, Jorge. Sorry, go ahead.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you so much, Manal. Jorge Cancio again, for the record. I just wanted to mention, because I'm not sure whether this was visible to everyone, that I've been tweaking a bit the language proposed by Nigel, I see he understands this was a friendly amendment and those tweaks were noted to be as precise as possible, although Vincent has already caught the typo with the number of the Montreal meeting. So that is the first thing.

The second one is on the wording full implementation which I put in brackets, and I made a comment because in Montreal we talked about complete implementation, and Manal, as you know very well, this led to a lot of questions and back and forth with the Board and with the CEO. So maybe we want to reflect on that and in fact maybe we want to put somewhere that with the

implementation and ensuring implementation what we mean is that best efforts are reasonable and feasible efforts are made before the new round really starts. So that is the second comment.

And the third comment is regarding the language starting with concerning the above recommendations, number 5 and 17, et cetera. At least to my eyes, my impression is that this is more of an informational nature, sort of making a snapshot of where we are, our understanding of where we are, and maybe we don't need this in the text itself. It could go into a footnote, but maybe Nigel has a different intention about this text about the status of the recommendations that merits keeping in the follow-up advice language, so I will defer to his judgment on this.

Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jorge. And just reading Luisa, Canada, in the chat. Thank you, Nigel, for the updates to the text and Jorge as well. Wanted to support Jorge's constructive suggestion on updating the text with something along the lines of implementation to the extent feasible and with reasonable efforts. And I see Nigel confirming that it makes sense and raising his hand. So Nigel, please go ahead.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thank you very much, and thanks, Jorge, Luisa, and other colleagues. Yes, I think this additional language makes sense, of course one can only do what is practical. The wording that I have added that starts concerning the above recommendation is of course an explanatory text which I think is useful. I mean, I don't mind where it goes obviously, so to speak, but I think it's useful in the sense that someone reading the GAC communique -- and it could go in a footnote and I leave it to our -- yeah, it could go in a footnote, but I think it's useful to have because it underscores the fact that the Board gave consideration and came back with these paragraphs after our, ICANN70 -- and this was really in contrast [indiscernible] with some of the comments that were made yesterday. So I think useful to have this written out.

Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jorge, Nigel, and Luisa. So first I think the suggested edit makes perfect sense to me, although Finn is questioning whether we need and with reasonable efforts. So isn't it enough to say implementation to the extent feasible? Which also makes sense. So I will await confirmation. And regarding the additional text -- and thank you, Jorge, for flagging that it could go into a footnote, and Nigel for the clarification.

Frankly, I was thinking this goes far beyond a reiteration of -- I mean, if we -- when we follow up on previous GAC advice, we just reference the advice we are reiterating. And although all of this makes sense to me, I'm just wondering whether this is a reiteration of previous GAC advice. That said, I'm just wondering whether we can have on follow-up on previous GAC advice, we explicitly referenced the advice we are reiterating, and maybe any additional text we can put under issues of importance to the GAC which also causes a discussion with the Board, although it doesn't trigger the bylaws, of course. But I mean, the Board reads this part and discusses it with us normally. So just a suggestion. I don't know what everyone thinks. Please share your thoughts.

So I'm not excluding the idea of having something under follow-up to previous GAC advice, but maybe a minimal text of referencing the advice we are reiterating, but then I think the additional text may go under issues of importance to the GAC. Again, it's just a suggestion. I will pause here and see if there are any reactions to this while also reading the chat. Jorge: Feasible and reasonable efforts or best efforts a bit more flexible.

Thank you for the clarification. And please go ahead.

SWITZERLAND:	Yes. Thank you, Manal. Jorge Cancio, for the record. First of all, on this feasibility or efforts, I think if we had some legal experts here with legal language, they would tell us that yeah, feasible could be almost everything. The question is whether the efforts needed to make something feasible are reasonable or can be expected. So that's a little bit the reasoning behind adding reasonable efforts or best efforts or something in that direction. So to show to the Board in the line of what we discussed many times and the last time yesterday with Becky, that we are not so much into the nitty-gritty of each and every recommendation, but we understand that some recommendations can be implemented to a certain extent and others to a different extent depending on the nature of the recommendation. So that's the logic behind that.
	The other thing, I think it's really a pity that the conversations with the Board -- and I think we have been quite clear, and we have been repeating the message about this tracking tool, about having this information on the implementation -- it's a pity that we don't get a positive reaction. And my fear is that if we don't have this under a more actionable line of our communique, it might get lost somewhere in the dialogue. So that's a bit my fear, the concern I have with moving too much to issues of importance. So I don't know, but probably I don't have a solution ready.

ICANN|71
VIRTUAL POLICY FORUM

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jorge. Let's take them one point at a time. First regarding implementation to the extent feasible, I see Finn proposing what about to the extent possible? Does this... so can we keep it as this? Is this okay with everyone? And while you are thinking, I'm just -- again, I stand to be corrected, but I feel if we are following up on previous GAC advice -- and I'm talking technically speaking here. If we're following up on previous GAC advice, then, I mean this should be a point of two of previous GAC advice. So if they don't even read the text here, they should be able to follow what we are asking for. But I see this far beyond a reiteration, and again, I know we want it highlighted and underscored, and that's why I was suggesting to keep something on follow-up on previous GAC advice to maintain the underlining we want to highlight, but to minimize confusion maybe any additional text can be moved to issues of importance to the GAC.

Again, I'm reading the chat... in the end we are specifying Montreal advice, CCT, and follow-up tracker. Indeed. But we're now asking for a Board-facilitated discussion, and we're asking for it to take place before ICANN72. I mean, all these are new asks, if I'm not mistaken. And I see Susan in the chat, US, agreeing that this goes beyond follow-up.

So between -- I'm not arguing against following up, I'm just -- technically speaking here, I'm just thinking we could split the text. But Jorge and Nigel, assuming both of you are penholders on this, whether this is okay. And as Jorge mentioned and I think Nigel as well, the text at the end, I feel it's more of something to us and not directed to the Board. But should we move this to issues of importance to the GAC? It would be highlighted easily. But again, I don't see it fitting here.

Nigel, please go ahead.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thank you, Manal. Yes, procedurally, the reason we thought it's important here is it's a follow-up. I agree it's not a blanket follow-up, but it doesn't, if you like, introduce anything new. It is different in that we explain it a bit further how we would like this tracking tool to be brought forward in light of the discussions we had this week, and it does highlight some specific recommendations. But those recommendations are of course included within the Montreal advice, I mean they're not new recommendations, so that's why we thought it was follow-up.

But no, quite happy to go with the majority here and have something in the follow-up if you like that references what we

have in the issues of importance. But others will have views. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Nigel. And I agree with you, the essence is the same. But again, out of experience, as I said, they take the text, parse it against what was submitted before, and then I receive clarification requests of whether this is a new advice or something else or -- so procedurally I know this will cause confusion, that's why. But I fully understand that, generally speaking, it's same essence. But when we take it literally, it's not.

So Jorge, would this be okay? I see Luisa in the chat agreeing that procedurally perhaps we can shorten the text -- if Nigel agrees, we can move end text to issues of importance to the GAC to make this section even more clear. Thanks, Luisa. So Jorge, is it okay? Do we need more time? Okay, I see you nodding. So can we do this maybe during the break if possible, and we can take an early break and have a longer break -- I mean, we can have a longer break so that those who need to review, or draft can have a little bit more time. And thank you for confirming, Luisa, for offering to work with Nigel and Jorge if there is a little bit more time.

So thanks, and back to support. Anything else that we need to attend to or shall we take a long break for those who are going to draft?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Manal, maybe a confirmation on the status of the accuracy text? In the issues of importance of the GAC, subsection 3 currently, just to make sure that we have edits in the first paragraph. And I understand we're expecting input on the third paragraph, so maybe we can finalize the first paragraph if we're still waiting?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, indeed, I think we can finalize the first paragraph, thanks to Japan's flexibility. I heard the confirmation, so we're good to go with those last edits. And regarding the last paragraph, I understand we will receive a red line text from the US, I hope after the break. Just reading Susan in the chat: Fabien, we have suggested alternative text to the third paragraph in the Google Doc. So Fabien, are we good with the --

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Sorry, it's in the comments, so let me bring that to the actual text. So this is, I understand, a replacement that will bracket the initial third paragraph and place the new paragraph [indiscernible] and then Manal, I think we will [speaker away from microphone]

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you for the text. It now reads: We support the view that the scope of work should focus on the accuracy of all domain name registration data, not just data protected under the GDPR which generally focuses only on personal information. Thank you, Susan, and just looking at the queue for any reactions to this. Olivier, please. Go ahead.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thanks, Manal. I think we're missing the first sentence, which is explaining that we support the launch of the scoping exercise and we want to be part of it, which has nothing to do with the scope. So I understand that the sentence provided by our US government colleagues points to the fact that you would look at personal and non-personal data. Our point was simply initially that the scope shouldn't be too narrow. And then of course it's a scoping exercise so they will define what is the scope, but from the start they should not limit it too much, okay, here we open up -- yeah, we open up only to both personal and non-personal data.

So let me think a bit, if you will give me a bit more time to react to this proposal. But on the first point, I would really like to keep the first sentence which is about us being -- the GAC being a part of the scoping exercise.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Sure.   The sentence was not meant to replace the whole paragraph, and Susan already confirmed this in the chat as well, so apologies for the misunderstanding.   So we'll have the first sentence as is, and then the US proposed a sentence pending your confirmation, Olivier.   And meanwhile, I will pass the floor to Chris.   I see your hand is up.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Yes, thank you.   Chris Lewis-Evans, for the record.   Just maybe building upon what Olivier said, the goal is to have a little bit more time to look at it, but my concern with the new sentence is that maybe it's a little bit restrictive still.   Because we've also talked about in our advice before about how accuracy also applies to how the purposes for which the data is being processed as well. So yeah, I think maybe a little bit of time just to make sure we're not overly restricting ourselves would be helpful.   Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Chris.   Any comments?   Okay.   Then I suggest we start the break now if there is nothing more to look at, again, pending the review text under CCT Review and pending finalization of the last paragraph under accuracy subject to further confirmations. Anything else that needs to be confirmed, Fabien?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Nothing else, to my knowledge.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. Then 20 minutes additional to the break. I hope this would be enough for the colleagues who will be drafting and having a well-deserved break as well. So please, if you can be back in the Zoom room at 16:30 The Hague time, 14:30 UTC.   Thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]