
SINGAPORE – GAC Communique Overview
Wednesday, March 26th 2014 – 11:00 to 11:30
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Okay. So next on our schedule, we're running a bit behind this morning, but I think it's okay. I think we can make up for time. The next session was to have a discussion as needed on the issue of IGO protections and, in particular, outstanding issues related to a mechanism to deal with acronyms in the current round.

And just as a reminder, I can give you a bit of an update about the IGO acronyms, at least what I know. Then we can move into the next section where we will just take a stock about where we are on various issues, get clarity on what will go in the communique, how things get into the communique. And then we can reconvene in the afternoon to immediately begin finalizing the contents of our communique.

There will also be information coming out about tomorrow morning's schedule. We've made some adjustments in light of the various requests we've received in the week for how to run Thursday morning.

So there will be better clarity around the various sessions tomorrow morning as well coming to you today.

So let's start with item 1, which is the issue of IGO protections.

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.

So you will recall that in the Buenos Aires communique, the GAC advised that it is seeking a mechanism for protections of acronyms in the current round. And we are waiting for a reply or a decision to come from the New gTLD Program Committee in respond to that advice.

In the meantime, I understand from a briefing in a meeting we had the other afternoon that some members of the NGPC and some members from the IGOs were working together to try and come to better clarity or better understanding about what was the guidance for coming up with a specific implementation approach to a mechanism.

So we did have a draft circulated to the GAC. And this was, I guess, outlining the main guidance for that mechanism. So it's not a -- you know, it wasn't a formal document or one for negotiation exactly, but it was to allow all the parties to come together and discuss.

So I requested the meeting the other day, and the chair and vice chairs were there with representatives from the IGOs and the NGPC to discuss progress and to understand what I would be able to come back to you and report today.

And so we covered a few issues in that discussion, and it did seem like there is an end within sight and that there is adequate understanding that we should have a satisfactory mechanism put

in place. So we are waiting now for the NGPC to reply to us and make a decision.

One of the additional elements that is a consideration is that the Generic Names Supporting Organization also came out with a result that covers protections for IGOs. So there's that process and result that has been communicated to the Board. At the same time, as you know, the GAC has been working on things. So this may have caused some confusion and uncertainty about the result.

So that's just something to keep in mind. But as I say, my expectation is that the NGPC will make a decision and communicate it to us to be satisfactorily responsive to the guidance we gave them in our last bit of advice on the details of a mechanism.

So, European Commission, please.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thank you very much, Chair. We welcome the cooperation that has been already carried out between the NGPC and the IGO coalition. So that has been very, very good. And as you referred to, there was GAC advice given in Buenos Aires, but also in Toronto meeting and Durban, how to ensure the adequate levels of protection and guarantees against third-party abuse, so IGO names and acronyms. And these measures should be of a

preventive nature, we feel. And the IGO and INGO identifier protection recommendations adopted by the GNSO Council are, in our view, not fair in this sense, because it accepts a protection of the full IGO INGO names, but not for their acronyms. This distinction we certainly feel is not well founded, and it disregards the fact that the vast majority of IGOs are known by their acronyms and not their full names. I mean, we all know this. This is common knowledge.

So it's a bit surprising, this proposal.

And IGOs are a completely different category of stakeholders, notably due to their mission to further the public interest, their immunities, the fact that they are created by governments under public international law, and the fact that the cost of participating in the DNS implies the use of public funds. So, you know, taxpayers' money.

Their special nature should carry special or enhanced protection for the names and the acronyms in the IGOs, we feel.

Thank you for your attention.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you. Okay.

So I would hope that we can conclude on this matter very quickly. And for the purposes of the communique, it may be a matter of

restating our earlier advice. If that additional emphasis is useful in light of the comments coming from -- or the result that came from the GNSO. But I think that that should address what we need to do here on the topic this week.

So this takes us nicely, I think, into our preparations for the communique finalization this afternoon. And just to outline the way that we can move forward on this, remember that our exercise this afternoon is related specifically to the communique. We do have other tools to capture discussion. We have the transcripts; we have the recordings; and also, we will have minutes. So the communique is the tool we have to communicate in particular with the community and to the board, certainly the board, our main discussion topics and especially where we have GAC advice. And so the communique is really meant to capture discussions and decisions we have taken earlier in the week. This afternoon is not really the time to suddenly decide to test whether we can come to agreement on something. Ideally, we will have already addressed that either in plenary or in the corridors, and now we simply seek to capture it in this afternoon's finalization process.

So this means that we want to minimize last-minute proposals, especially if they're controversial. And if I find that it is making sense for us to give some consideration to a topic where we either did not have a clear outcome or that is a new addition to

the list, if it is controversial and we cannot quickly address it, then this means it cannot go in the communique. I do want us to finish at 6:00. I don't want us to be going late. And we have important meetings tomorrow morning as well. So let's keep tomorrow morning's schedule doing what it needs to do.

All right. So let's go through the process of just identifying what are some of the main topics and items, and then at the end, I believe we have a draft communique that we can circulate to you, so it will be available to you over the lunch period. And then hard copies will be available when we reconvene in the afternoon. And so, like I say, most of the draft communique is there, and it is up to secretariat support to be drafting that.

Where we have leads, then the leads should be working with support staff. But the aim is to capture the outcomes, summarize the discussion that we've had. It's not to keep reopening or advance a particular view. This is now when we're really working hard at the consensus process. And remember who has the pen. So please avoid triggering exchanges on e-mail back and forth. We can't accommodate those. This is the drafting process that I have outlined for you. Okay?

So with that, I have a few topics that we might benefit from highlighting a bit more in our discussion. So just with respect to generic top-level domains and some of the issues that we raised there, we spent most of our time, I think, on safeguards and

seeking some clarifications via questions. And so what will come to you for review and discussion is a list of those questions to attach to the communique. And that should, I hope, cover the questions we had related to public interest commitment specifications and the dispute resolution process.

Regarding dot spa, I know that there have been efforts under way in the corridors to come to a text. So if you can update -- update us either now, if you have an update, or update me during the break, so that I know where you are on that. But I do hope that there is something that we can put in front of the GAC that has already been discussed and close to final, if not in fact final, for the GAC to agree to.

So that's Spa.

Then we have Red Cross/Red Crescent. And we should have some text. Do we?

It was circulated. Do we have it in hard copy?

Okay. Can we project it? On the screens, please.

Okay. So as a reminder, Red Cross, Red Crescent is something that we said at the last meetings is something we might want to provide advice on following Buenos Aires, because we were unable to conclude or come to agreement. So we have made some efforts to take in comments to consider this matter further. And when we invited these comments on the GAC list, we didn't

receive any inputs other than those from Switzerland. And then we had exchanges among the chair and vice chairs about this, trying to determine what it is that we might need to do here. And it became clear that we needed to get clarity and do it with the entire committee rather than continuing this back and forth among myself and the vices.

So what we have here is draft text. It has been circulated to you via e-mail. We are seeking the Red Cross, Red Crescent text, not the communique text.

Okay.

So if my recollection serves me well, the main issue we discussed in Buenos Aires was related to the protection of names at the national level. Okay? A bit of nodding there from a vice chair.

Okay. So we'll just wait a moment.

Okay. So here we have the text in front of us.

In your documents as well, you have a time line that covers advice that we have given earlier on this issue.

All right. So let's focus on "the GAC advises" portion and go through starting with 1.

So the proposal is to advise the board to make permanent the existing reservation of the "Red Cross," "Red Crescent," "Red Lion and Sun," and "Red Crystal" words or designations as strings

ineligible for delegation at top and second levels in accordance with the list set out in the applicant guidebook for all future rounds. Okay.

So this is for future rounds. Can we focus on the current round? Will that make our task easier?

Okay. Number two, extend the current top- and second-level protections of the words Red Cross and Red Crescent and related designations. Okay.

And the 3. 3. I cannot read 3. Thank you.

Include the Red Cross and Red Crescent designations and names on a modified reserved names list to preserve the entitlement of Red Cross and Red Crescent organizations.

Okay. So we advised to protect the names on a reserved names list, which means that the Red Cross and Red Crescent themselves cannot register those names. So if it is being requested now that it would be a modified reserved names list, I assume that means that they would then be able to register, if they wished. Okay.

And is that it? Three points? Is there a 4?

Okay. Switzerland.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Heather.

No, these are the three points. And, actually, you're right, we might definitely change the order. The first one is about future rounds.

Something that maybe because you couldn't read it well on the line was not too clear about the point 2, which is the main point.

This is to extend, in addition to the words "Red Cross" and "Red Crescent," the protection to the full names of the 189 national Red Cross and Red Crescent societies. That is the main part. So Philippine Red Cross and the German Red Cross and whatever would be protected. And the Red Cross has handed over a list of these 189 names in English and in the relevant language of the respective country to the GAC and to the board some time ago. So this is a finite list of defined names that they ask to be put, as you said, on a modified reserved names list so that only they can register these names. This is the proposal for this round.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you. Okay. So I suggest, then, that we focus on 2 and 3 for something that we might include in the communique.

So I see a couple of requests. I have Lebanon and Iran and Australia.

LEBANON: Thanks, Madam Chair. I just want to make sure -- The wording is not clear to me. The bottom line is, would the terms be protected in Arabic? That's -- that's the point that I am asking about here. I want to make sure that the terminology or the wording's protected in Arabic, please.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you.

Switzerland.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you.

As I said, unfortunately, my computer is somehow overcharged and don't open -- it refuses to open the Word file.

But we all have this list. It's -- Every national structure is listed in English and in the language that the national structure proposes that it be reserved. And they -- the proposal is to have only two languages, not to make this too overwhelming, too cumbersome for everybody.

There are national structures where the second language is Arabic, if you look at this list, which I can't do now. But if you want, I can re-send it to the GAC list so that everybody has it. But

it's two languages, English, plus the most important one on the national level, which is Arabic in a number of countries.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Okay. Thank you for answering that, Switzerland.

Next, I have Iran.

IRAN:

Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Could you kindly request going to number 1 of this text. Yeah.

In number 1, we have the Red Lion and Sun, which is coming from our country, before 1979. And now the situation has been changed, as you know, and the Iranian Red Crescent Society has changed that. And they sent a letter to me. I asked them that they should send that letter formally to GAC. But because of the national holiday from 21st of March to 25th, they would not be in a position to send it. But if you want, I can send it to Mr. Schneider to include that so that term, "Red Lion and Sun," apart from historical, does no longer exist with us. So it has been changed by Iranian Red Crescent Society. So this is something that I wanted to be included. So if you want, I can, after getting the e-mail of Mr. Schneider, send it to him on a person-by-person basis rather than put it in the e-mail of GAC, because I have not

received it from the country. I asked them to send it directly to the GAC, but they have not done that. And perhaps next week.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Okay. Thank you, Iran.

So I think those matters can all be clarified when we have the discussion of future rounds. And so it seems to me that item 1 could even go to the working group on future issues, that it's part of that effort, in fact. So, yes, we certainly should clarify, as appropriate, on that matter.

Okay. So I have Australia, then China.

AUSTRALIA:

Thank you, Chair.

So first, I think I will agree that perhaps the working group on future gTLD rounds would be a good place for this, and we can set up another little substream in there. I think that could be very useful.

In terms of 2 and 3, which I believe we're focusing on, I guess I have some questions. This is, as we all know, been an ongoing issue. And I'm just having a little bit of trouble keeping up with what the GAC has previously advised versus what we're now

focusing on. So I guess my question is, it's very clear to me that number 2, the first stop point, about the four names of the national incarnations, is the new issue. And the second one I'm less clear of. So the four names of the ICRC and Red Crescent, Red Cross societies and their acronyms, aren't these already protected for the current rounds?

So just a clarification. I may be completely missing something. So just a question.

And then my -- my last question, I think, is for -- or comment, is for point number 3, which I think proposes an approach which what we're looking at here is implementation. I think it might be more useful if we look at the effect that we're asking for rather than talking about a modified reserved name list. I recall in the past there's been great sensitivity about talking about reserved names list and so on and delving into implementation. If what we're asking for is some protection mechanism that allows the relevant entities to use their names, but protect against any other use, I think we should say that. But, again, there may be a reason for this that I'm unaware of. But I think it may be useful for us to talk about what we want at a principle level and not dive into the implementation.

So there are my comments and question.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you.

Okay. So I have one more speaker at this time asking to speak on this. But I'm getting the sense that for the purposes of the communique, we may be able to take 2 and 3 and put that in and then negotiate specific text. There seems to be an interest in at least working this through further to come up with language. And we can't get into the details now particularly easily.

So next I have China, please.

CHINA:

Thank you, Madam Chair.

I just want to express my support in general to this draft. Chinese government supports the Red Cross business very firmly. In 1993, we issued the Red Cross law in China. And in 1996, we have a regulation on the use of the Red Cross, which gave us (indiscernible) protection on the use of the logo and image of the Red Cross according to the international treaty.

Chinese Red Cross Society also pay more attention to the protection of the Red Cross on Internet. We contacted with the International Red Cross Committee very closely. So the Chinese government supports the demand from the International Red Cross Committee to give permanent protection to the name of the Red Cross and Crescent and Red Crystal. And we also support the protection to the full name of the 189 national Red Cross and

Red Crescent societies in English and the official languages of their respective states of origin.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Okay. Thank you.

All right. So we will take points 2 and 3 and put those into the draft communique for us to discuss further. Clearly, we will need to refine it further. And in the meantime, perhaps we can come to a better understanding about what we previously advised and how we might make -- come up with wording that allows us to offer advice at this meeting.

I will tell you that because this appears to be additional to what we have asked for previously and a number of top-level domains have been contracted and are now -- now live, that they won't be able to -- to offer new protections. This is something new. So it's going to make for an interesting exchange with the board on this. And I will be asked to explain it. So I need to make sure I understand where we are.

Okay. Switzerland.

SWITZERLAND:

Thank you. In fact, I would just like to clarify something.

This is not really a new request. It's, rather, a clarification. And the text that you have in the proposal before there were points 1, 2, 3, is actually trying to explain this. So I think it's important to actually take that along to make it understandable. Because it says that -- it refers -- and I think you have a document in the pile of documents that you all received that summarizes the existing GAC advice on this issue. And it refers to the fact that the GAC several times demanded that the terms most directly associated with the international Red Cross and Red Crescent movement -- and this is the whole -- which are protected in international legal instruments and also in legislation in countries throughout the world. And for the national structures, you have a legal basis in many countries. And if you take them all together, this is basically the clarification that the idea is not just to protect the name of the international movement, but as part of the international movement, the names of the national movements as well. Because this is -- this is where the fund-raising is taking place. This is where the abuse is taking place.

And with regard to the request, whether we say it in explicit words modified reserve list or whether we say to develop a mechanism or do something that only they can register it and others can be prevented from registering it, I think this is something that can be discussed. But the idea is that these national names, which nobody else, basically -- it's obvious that nobody else has the right to register Philippine Red Cross if you

are not the Philippine Red Cross, for instance. And so this is to actually make sure that nobody else does it. Or if somebody else does it, then they can take that Web site down.

So thank you for letting me explain this.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Switzerland.

So the challenge I'm referring to is the simple fact that if national names haven't been protected, then those that are already operating and signed contracts will not have protected those national names.

SWITZERLAND: As I said, the national names are protected under national laws. And --

CHAIR DRYDEN: Yes. That's not -- that's not the point that I'm making --

SWITZERLAND: If in a TLD that is now live somebody registers the name of a national Red Cross, he does something illegal anyway. So whether this protection is -- will kind of -- added afterwards, or for the ones that have gone live, that doesn't really have an effect

on the issue that there is protection anyway. It's just making things more easy.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

That sounds more like an argument for not asking for protection at the level of national names.

Okay. We clearly need to have more discussion about this, and I can see more people asking to speak. So all right. Let's focus on 2 and 3 from the current draft for the purposes of the communique. And I would ask that we do some work on this over lunch, that we think about what exactly it is that we want to ask for, and think about that implementation aspect, since we have some top-level domains that have already gone to the point of contracting and being initiated.

Okay. So before we break for lunch, are there any other pressing issues?

India, please.

INDIA:

Thank you very much, Madam Chair. And thank you for your excellent stewardship of this whole issue on gTLD.

I would seek the indulgence and support of our esteemed colleagues of the GAC on a matter relating to new gTLDs which has remained unresolved despite the concerns that the GAC had

raised in its Durban meeting. This relates to two gTLDs which have huge sensitivity and implications for India.

In the Durban meeting, the GAC had advised the ICANN board that for Dot Indians and Dot Ram, the GAC had noted the concerns expressed by the government of India and advised the board not to proceed with the applications for these two gTLDs.

I would also like to say that the government of India has had made efforts to have discussions with applicants for these two gTLDs. But despite all the efforts, no acceptable solutions or mechanisms could be found.

As far as Dot Ram is concerned, as several of you would know, Dot Ram is the -- one of the most important deities for the followers of Hindu religion. And when I say this, this implies there are nearly a billion Hindu religion followers in India and a very large number, running into hundreds of millions, outside of India, spread in various countries.

Just to give you a sense of what it means is that, in India, there would not be a single village where you would not have a Ram temple. And it is this extremely pervasive acceptance of Ram as a god.

Giving this gTLD to an entity which is outside of India, where there has been no consultation with the community at large, can have

huge religious and communal implications which could lead to serious damages in case such gTLD is misused.

We do not say that this is going to be misused. We are sure that no one has that intent. But even the slightest of possibility of misuse of this gTLD by some mischievous elements, not with the intent of the applicant by any manner, but misuse by one single element somewhere can have very serious consequences.

So Madam Chair and our esteemed colleagues in the GAC, we seek your support to say that with all our -- with the consensus of GAC that dot ram should not be awarded and we should strongly object to its grant.

The other gTLD on which government of India has expressed strong objection is dot indians. Dot indians is something which has potential for misinterpretation and misuse with the ccTLD dot india.

We had a similar problem with some of the other gTLDs, like dot Swiss and dot Thai, and GAC had taken a view that these should not be granted. I think it is relevant to take a consistent view with respect to dot indians as well.

Here again, I must say that the applicant did not consult the community at large, and our efforts to discuss the matter with the applicant did not result in any acceptable solution.

Both these issues have very serious implications in terms of the potential for misuse. These substantive matters, therefore, need to be reiterated and reinforced to the Board, taking into account the concerns that we have.

Let me also say that within government of India, we have had very considered deliberations on this matter. This matter has been taken up at the highest levels within the government, and it has been decided that government of India cannot agree to grant all these gTLDs.

We will, therefore, seek support of the GAC and your support, Madam Chair, to convey the objection of GAC to the ICANN Board regarding award of these gTLDs.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, India, for bringing this to our attention and providing us with an update. I do recall that the GAC did take note of India's concerns in a previous communique. Even though the GAC as a whole did not provide advice, we did take note and communicate that to the Board.

So in this lunch period, I propose to look at this matter and see whether we can identify an appropriate text to refer to these matters in light of the great sensitivity that they propose -- they entail for you.

Okay. So let's take that away and look at it over the break.

Okay.

So next, any other issues that colleagues believe we need to comment on and consider to include in the communique?

Next I have -- I can't read my own handwriting. I do have Lebanon and then Brazil.

LEBANON:

Thanks, Madam Chair.

Just on the item related to Red Cross and Red Crescent, just to mention that we have sent a letter to the GAC and to the Board talking about the fact that the protection should include also Red Crystal as related to item number 2, and, please, let's make sure that this is included. That's one.

Two, we talked three days ago about working group related to global engagement, the group -- sorry, global stakeholder engagement. I would like to ask the members just if we could meet for about 10 or 15 minutes as soon as this meeting is over, the people who volunteered for that working group, so make sure that we're in sync before we proceed further because we really need to plan what is next.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you.

So thank you for continuing to move along the Government and IGO Engagement Working Group. And as long as the GAC has finalized terms of reference or a charter for that working group, I think that's the main thing you need from plenary.

And then if you would logic to take some time after this session to have a meeting, I would just want to make sure that there aren't other meetings taking place in the room.

Does this mean it's okay? Yeah, okay. All right. So it's okay to meet in the room after we conclude here for 10 or 15 minutes.

All right. So I have a question from Brazil, and then Germany, please.

BRAZIL:

Thank you, Madam Chair.

Just -- sorry, it's not about the communique, but I would like to take advantage that almost everyone is here to give some quick information about the meeting in Sao Paulo.

I was just participating in a meeting on logistics, and we have received a lot of consultations during this meeting here, and by email.

So I would like to spread some very important information, if you allow me. First, to reinforce the criteria for the delegations to Sao Paulo. In the ministerial level, it will be one plus two, please. Not ministerial level, one plus one.

Please, we have an email where we are receiving all the registration and proposals which is netmundial@, I will spell it, I-T-A-M-A -- again.

Netmundial@intamaraty.gov.br.

So thank you.

So through this email, we're going to receive all the requests related to the registration and also to financial aid which is not guaranteed and is not under the responsibility of the Brazilian government. It's going to be from the trust fund, multistakeholder trust fund, which will be responsible for trying to grant financial aid for those who want to participate those. But it's a matter of gender, regional, country and stakeholder representation. So it's not about the Brazilian government.

Also, the registration. The Brazilian government is receiving information throughout our embassies -- through our embassies around the world, but the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is taking care only of those registrations from the government.

The registrations from the other stakeholders, we receive it but we transfer it immediately to the committee.

So after the registration, we're going to have a form to be filled in. It needs to be filled in with the personal data from the participants, the approved participants and confirmed participants from the government. This information we will have further on. But as soon as you informed us, or through that email or through our embassies in your country, we will proceed.

I would ask you to hurry up a little bit, because as soon as the meeting approach, it's going to be harder and harder to deal with this logistic thing.

So thank you very much for paying attention today.

Yeah, we are having a lot of consultations, and I'd like to spread this information because people -- it seems that people didn't understand very well. So, please, if you have any questions, come to me. But I think those are the information you need to know by now. netmundial@intamaraty.gov.br. The delegation and the financial aid needs to be sent to us for further consideration.

And --

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you.

BRAZIL: Besides that --

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Brazil. We need to --

BRAZIL: Besides that, dot amazon. Just quick information. We have draft a proposal of paragraph sent to the secretariat, and we would like to ask the secretariat to send to the GAC members.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Brazil. So since this is what we're currently engaged in, discussion of what will go in the communique, can you tell GAC colleagues what exactly it is that you're proposing to say or....

BRAZIL: I could speak even two more minutes about the meeting.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Okay. We don't need to know about all the language, but on dot amazon, just basically what is it that you're asking the GAC?

Just we are asking the GAC just to have in the communique the very important concerns from the South African -- south American countries.

Okay. I have the text. The South American countries represented in the ICANN GAC meeting in Singapore express their firm discom- (indiscernible) with the delay in implementation by the Board of the GAC advice on the rejection of the registration of the domain name dot amazon as stated in the GAC communique approved in Durban last July.

GAC understands this delay as a negative sign regarding the strength of the GAC as well as the validity of the rules approved in the guidebook which may open precedence for different treatments or tracks on further case.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you. Okay.

And I can see that the secretariat has the text.

So, colleagues, be advised that we will have an entry proposed on the dot amazon string.

Okay. So Germany, you've been waiting patiently. Please, go ahead.

GERMANY:

Yes, thank you.

Also, on short, we are also preparing a text on this discussion we had yesterday with the Board yesterday on IAs and the waivers. It

is only as a call of information. Our request, it's some member states' request, ICANN not to have legal actions for not fulfilling data retention requirements as long as decision on waivers are pending.

That is the main point of the text. I think we find something. We are discussing it with colleagues and providing a text in the next hours.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you. Okay.

So is there more? Okay.

Greece.

GREECE:

Thank you, Heather.

I would also like to inform my colleagues here in the GAC that I have already sent to them, and to the GAC secretariat, text, proposed text for the community application and the auctions for their consideration.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Okay. So there's a very brief text, I think, referring to auctions because it did come up in our discussions, but it's really not going into any depth in terms of comments or advice from the GAC, because we are finding that whether it's the auctions issue, community applications, or potentially some aspects of Red Cross/Red Crescent, IGO protections, that for some items where we have found there is difficulty or it has not -- the rules maybe have not covered all of the points that we would like them to, that it's really important to capture those for discussion about future rounds.

This is why we have the gTLD working group looking at future issues. It's to anticipate the need to look at all these issues, and also the interest of colleagues here to not want to leave them behind and keep them part of our efforts for a future round.

I'm hesitant to try and negotiate any detailed text on those issues for that reason, but I think it is really important that we capture them for this discussion around future rounds and how we address issues there.

Okay. So I see one more request from the European Commission. Short? Okay. Please.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thank you, Madam Chair. In the interest of time, I'll be very short.

I just wanted to mention that we will provide just two, three lines. We're drafting it at the very moment. And regarding WHOIS and the discussion we have on the Expert Working Group on new gTLD directory services.

And as we agreed before, it will be noncontentious, simply a mere reference to what our discussions were the other day.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Okay. All right. So a draft communique web circulated to you now. We will also be taking in advice only where it has been agreed that a GAC colleague will submit some text to the secretariat. And when we reconvene at 2:00, then we will have a draft in front of us and we will move from there.

Spain.

SPAIN:

Just a quick remark.

I don't know if someone has said that before me. I also would like to contribute some lines on the ATRT2 recommendations part of the communique. I will provide that to the secretariat. And I also would like to have a reference on the GAC Working Methods Working Group on the communique.

And I will -- I think there was some sentence on that issue before. I agree we adopt it, so it would be nice if it can be put into the communique again, but we can discuss about the terms of reference to that working method -- working group. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you. So on the working group on working methods, any text in the communique should already have been developed by the secretariat and by discussing it with you, as the lead on that.

Regarding ATRT2, we have text already summarizing that.

So we need to move now from the process of developing and back and forth about text to now, if there are edits that you want to make, to making them to the communique this afternoon when we're finalizing it. So we're changing gear.

So there will be text on both those items, and I assume that you have been in discussion with Tom about text for the working group on working methods. And again, it has to be on the basis of what we've discussed and clear outcomes from that.

So, anyway, we won't get lunch if we keep going. So let's have our lunch break and come back at 2:15. And Lebanon wishes to have a discussion of 10 to 15 minutes here now for anyone interested in discussing the Government and IGO Engagement Working Group effort.

Thank you.

[Lunch break]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]