
MARKUS KUMMER: Hello, everyone. This is Mark. Can you hear me?

GULTEN TEPE: Hello, Mark. Yes, we can hear you.

MARKUS KUMMER: Excellent. It's two minutes [inaudible] and I suggest we get started. I did send out proposals for a draft agenda to Thomas and Manal, and they agree with that. Originally, as we all recall, these calls have set up in essence to allow for clarifying questions from the Board. But this time, we don't really have any clarifying questions and we might make use of this opportunity to expand a bit and discuss other issues.

I had suggested to discuss the GAC advice proper, and then picking up on the GAC communiqué as regards the two-character country codes at the second level. I also suggested a clarification by ICANN Org on ongoing dialogs with the GAC, and among other issues, not just the two-character code issues but also [abuse] issues and other issues, and lastly to follow up also on the [PTI] discussions. We had at least discussions on that.

Shortly before the call, Thomas sent an e-mail and said there are some people who would like to be on the call and to hear about the abuse issues, and they will not be able to be on the call for its entirety. So, I wonder whether we could shift the agenda and start with the clarification by ICANN Org. My understanding is that Göran would be ready to give a brief update of where we are. Would that meet the

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.

approval of everyone to change the agenda early [inaudible] to accommodate Thomas's request?

Thomas says fine, so I think then we can start with that agenda item and pick up on the GAC communiqué after Johannesburg on the two-character country codes at the second level, which surprised the Board a little bit as we had a slightly different understanding of the discussions we had in Johannesburg. Göran, can you please take over from there, give us an update of where you are with your ongoing dialog with the GAC? Please, Göran.

GÖRAN MARBY: Thank you, Markus. Hi, everybody. Can you hear me?

MARKUS KUMMER: We can hear you loud and clear.

GÖRAN MARBY: Thank you very much. And good morning from Los Angeles. Yes, as you know, before the Johannesburg meeting, we engaged with several members of the GAC to have a more in-depth discussion about two letters, which I think has been successful for both sides. I think we were able to clear up a lot of misunderstandings. Not to everybody's satisfaction, but also to learn something about the process.

But what we really talked about which I talked about many times is that we need to find a way where we as the organization support the GAC

members in a better way for [what we call] not capacity building in that sense, but more to provide for a fact by discussion.

I talked about this in Johannesburg as well, and it's really for us as an organization to figure out a way where we can inform individual GAC members based on their needs, what is happening in the discussion with the rest of the community, so you can take actions earlier if it's needed, or get information earlier in the process.

To that, we have continued discussions both with... in the executive team of the organization how to do that, and we will come back to the [inaudible] the GAC with a more in-depth proposal how to do this later, or now after the summer when the vacations are over.

But the intention is really to make sure to avoid mistakes going forward, rather than seeing what we can do with for instance the two-letters. I think I pointed that out already in a discussion a couple of months ago we had a pleasure to do with GAC. I open for any questions, please.

GULTEN TEPE: I see all those hands up in the AC room. Olga, please take the floor.

OLGA CAVALLI: Hello and thank you. [inaudible], can you hear me?

MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, we can hear you.

GÖRAN MARBY: At least I can hear you very well, Olga.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you. We're in the Americas, this is why you hear me so well. A joke. Okay, good morning, everyone, from a sunny day in Argentina, Buenos Aires. Thank you, Göran, for your explanation.

I would like perhaps some clarification about the status of something that we discussed previously to the Johannesburg meeting, and during the meeting with GAC and the Board in Johannesburg, which was the idea of setting up a group of interested GAC members and Board members, call it a taskforce, working group, interest group, whatever you want to call it, and do this to review this situation in-depth.

Several GAC [inaudible] and others have expressed that we are okay with having a bilateral dialog, but we would really like to review this issue as the GAC as a whole. And if I'm not mistaken – and I remember you saying that you agreed with this idea, so I would like to... [inaudible] a mention in Board leadership team call minutes, I saw something that this issue was to be reviewed in the future. I haven't seen any further development on this idea of a group to review the issue.

As you can recall, we had rules that were established before, and they were changed by the end of last year, and this concern comes several countries about these new rules and the impact that these new rules have at the national level. So, if you could clarify that to me, that would be very helpful. Thank you.

GÖRAN MARBY: I think there are two issues at hand here. One of them is to discuss the two-letters themselves where we based on the discussion we had with GAC, we went to several countries and spoke directly to those countries about that, as things stand with two-letters. What you are talking about and what I'm talking about is that – I hope that's what we're talking about, because that's [inaudible]

Hello, I'm back again.

GULTEN TEPE: Hi, Göran. We can hear you now. Thanks.

GÖRAN MARBY: I'm not really sure where I disappeared at.

OLGA CAVALLI: If I may, you were talking to explain which was the situation about the two-letter codes [inaudible]

GÖRAN MARBY: Does anyone hear me now?

GULTEN TEPE: Yes, we can hear you now, Göran. Please continue. Thank you.

GÖRAN MARBY: It seems like I have a bad connection today. Can anyone hear me now?

GULTEN TEPE: Yes, Göran. We can hear you now, loud and clear. Thank you.

GÖRAN MARBY: Just repeating, sorry if I don't know if I say the same things again. Up to the Johannesburg meeting, we had on the request from GAC several meetings from individual members to discuss the two-letter codes. Before that, also in discussion with the GAC and the GAC leadership, we decided to set up a taskforce – which seems to be a bad name, by the way – to work on how to support the GAC and individual countries better going forward.

We are working on the proposal for that, and now after this [inaudible] come back to the leadership team doing that. I hope that is satisfactory, Olga.

OLGA CAVALLI: Yes, Göran. Thank you very much. One comment: what is summer for you is not summer for me, so could you refer to a specific month?

GÖRAN MARBY: Sorry about that. We will come back in August, September. Thank you.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Do you hear me, please?

GULTEN TEPE: Yes, we can hear you now, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, thank you very much. Thank you, Göran, for the introduction. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everybody. As far as two-letter codes for Iran [inaudible] I have seen no change, no movement from ICANN59. Actually, I'm kindly providing you the list of the two-letters that are registered for registrants from 171. [That is] [inaudible] ICANN59, but I don't know what we can do about that, if it's [inaudible] about the past.

About the future, the position of Iran is quite clear, more than clear. We have mentioned and emphasized [inaudible] minister of the ICT that any further [inaudible] of the two-letters [inaudible] must be communicated with government in order to get into negotiations. We hope we could approve many of the requests. That's my [exception]. So, without that, we do not agree.

I have mentioned in several message to [Akram], [inaudible] to Göran and [inaudible] to Chris Crocker, and I repeat it again: as far as the future concerns of the ICANN59, we no longer agree to go to the mitigation. We want to go to the agreement of [inaudible]. So, please kindly inform us whether you have taken any action on that, and please kindly advise the staff we can do about the [inaudible], about the 171. Thank you very much.

MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Kavouss. It was not the intention to go into discussion in substance to [have] the country codes. It was the intention to allow ICANN Org to give a briefing and update of where they are as a follow-up of the discussions we had in Johannesburg. With that, can we close this agenda item and go to the GAC advice proper, which is the main purpose of this call?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Göran, excuse me, what is the follow-up discussion? Please, tell me, what is the follow-up discussion? What you are following? Please.

MARKUS KUMMER: Göran just explained that they will come up with a proposal on having – on what he said a better name than the taskforce – to follow up, and it will be in August or September, and ICANN Org would come forward with a proposal. With that, can we go to the first agenda item? And that is the GAC advice proper.

There, you see in the Board clarifying question the Board wishes to clarify a phrase in the advice text where the GAC calls on the ICANN Board to ensure the [inaudible] adequately reflect input and continue and expertise provided by IGOs, and that essentially is us asking you, the GAC, what you actually understand when you say that the Board should ensure. Maybe other Board colleagues will have comments, but first I would like to ask GAC members.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Markus, [inaudible]

MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, please.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Sorry to interrupt you. I think the intent was to benefit from the fact that we have Laureen Kapin and Iranga from the PSWG with us for the first 30 minutes to quickly have an exchange about DNS abuse and about the new developments of the GDPR. So, we have 12 minutes left, so if you wouldn't mind, I think we should – I think my understanding was that we would take this first before the time is up in that sense, if that's okay. And then quickly go to the –

MARKUS KUMMER: Yes. How do you wish to proceed? Essentially, Göran said what he had to say on all these issues. It was a sort of omnibus statement. I'm in your hands if they want to go deeper into substance, if there are questions to Göran or his colleagues.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Let me maybe quickly give a chance to Laureen and Iranga to take the floor if they wish to do so.

MARKUS KUMMER: Please.

Laureen and Iranga, we can't hear you. If you have questions, you can also type it into the chat. Do I take it there are no questions? I see in the

chat that Iranga is trying to take the floor, and Iranga says in the chat that she's having microphone issues, it appears not to be working. Okay. Reading Iranga in the chat, "I'll just quickly say we are looking forward to using the cross-community session."

Well, with this, can we park this issue? Oh, no, Iranga still continues in the chat and [building] metrics with other ICANN tools such as [EAAR]. Yes, okay, Iranga says we can close this issue then.

Okay, can we go back then to the GAC advice proper? And before asking for [both our] colleagues to comment on the GAC advice, we understand the substance of the advice and we also have the GNSO reaction to that. I've seen it. But our question here is that we need to clarify maybe one word, that is "ensure," and my question to Thomas and his colleagues, what exactly do you mean when you say, "the Board should ensure?" And Mark Carvell asked in the chat that the Board members will participate in the cross-community topic session from these issues? My take on this is presumably yes. Yes, who will respond? Thomas, as Chair, can you respond?

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Yes, thank you. I had my hand up in case. I hope you see that.

MARKUS KUMMER: I'm sorry. Yes.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER:

Don't worry. First of all, hello to everybody I haven't spoken yet. Thank you all for joining this call. Where the GAC [inaudible] I think this is basically an expression of an expectation that – I just got a notice that I have been granted the microphone, so sorry for being distracted for a second – that the input that several members and observers of the GAC have made into the PDP of the GNSO during this PDP as well as before is really duly considered, and that the facts that are contained in this input are actually taken up and discussed by this working group.

Because as you know, of course this is a long standing issue and there have been some difficulties in the previous processes and lack of understanding, and let's say including irritations on several sides, and we just want to signal with this advice that it is important that the input of the GAC and its members and observers are duly considered, taken into account and processed in a way that GAC members have the feeling that this is actually done, because we've already received – and that has been confirmed in the GNSO comments to the communiqué that some key elements of the GAC advice will not be followed.

And we also have received feedback form IGOs participating in the work, feeding into the work, that also not all the facts – at least in their perception – they have sent into the process have really been considered. And we just urge that the Board in its responsibility as the highest body of the [inaudible] organization that they do everything they can that this is an Inclusive process and that all input is received and discussed. And we really want to avoid – or would like to avoid – that we end up in the same situation like we did previously.

And yes, so this is basically an expression of an expectation that the Board does everything that is in its boudoir and its capacity to make sure that all input is there, that it's properly discussed with the whole community, and everything is taken into account. I think that's at least my understanding of what the [inaudible] are happy to be complemented by other GAC members and observers on the call. I'll stop here. Thanks.

MARKUS KUMMER:

Thank you for that, Thomas. I wonder whether any Board members would like to react to that. I don't think we are that far apart. Our question was more the "ensure" which seems to be very strong language, and the Board as such, we can encourage, we can cajole, we can repeat with importance attached to it. We can technically speaking ensure anything. We don't have authority over a PDP process which is taking place in part, and the GNSO as such is obligated to take into account – according to the Bylaws – any comments made. And that would include obviously also the GAC advice.

In this particular case, we already have a reaction from the GNSO, and they sent out heads up that they may not take all the advice on Board. So, there is – yes, we can again encourage the GNSO to really make sure to look at the GAC advice, but there is very limited power the Board has, except maybe soft power you kind of alluded to. But is there any Board member who would like to comment? And I think the GNSO interaction also made clear that they did actually duly consider the GAC advice. I'm opening the floor for comments. Yes, please.

[GÖRAN MARBY]: You explained it fairly well, I think. I think it's well understood that the Board doesn't make the policies, and at least the GNSO response seems to reflect that they've seen the GAC advice. So, I guess there's very little we can do but ensure that they've heard it, and they've heard it, and we can't ensure they do it because it's not in our remit according to the Bylaws. So, mainly that.

MARKUS KUMMER: Yes. Thank you for that. Yes, we can make best efforts, we can do all we can try, we can try hard but we cannot give a guarantee that we can ensure anything. Are there other comments? And I have to apologize, I don't seem to see the hands up in my Adobe Connect. I'm on a tablet.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Markus, it was Iran and then Switzerland, I think.

MARKUS KUMMER: Yes. Okay. Please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Can I talk?

MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, you can.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes, Markus. Sometimes, maybe good you look at the time, which are already late. I raised my hand to tell that many times in the GAC, I have commented that the word “ensure” is a very strong word and in fact in many cases, no one could ensure anything. The only thing we should [either] to have the qualification to that, such as endeavor to ensure, or make every possible effort to ensure. But not ensure. And the way it was told by you was what not we meant. We have not asked GNSO to encourage. If you want to encourage GNSO as a Board, you can do it. But we have not asked GNSO, and we don’t want to encourage GNSO.

Our advice is addressed to the Board. Perhaps “ensure” was too strong, but “make every possible effort,” or “endeavor to ensure” is more correct. And what the Chair of the GAC says, “Duly consider,” I don’t agree with that. We’re not talking duly consider. Duly consider is already in the Bylaws. We don’t need to put it in the GAC advice. So, we have to soften the word “ensure” by adding something before that, or maybe [inaudible] “Board make every possible effort in order that the GAC advice implementation be ensured.”

But in no way we encourage the GNSO. You can encourage that. We don’t have this concept, encourage them. And we are not responsible for that. So, we don’t think you have to deal with the [inaudible] between advice and PDP. This is a long history in the ICANN [inaudible] but you’re not responsible. So, I think we should add something before “ensure,” things like “make every possible effort to ensure,” or say that, “endeavor to ensure.” But not “duly consider.” And not encouraging the GNSO. I’m sorry, I cannot agree with that. Thank you.

MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that, and my apologies for not giving you the floor earlier, but as I said before, for some reason I can't see the hands up in the app I have on my Adobe Connect. So, I rely on staff to tell me who's in the queue, and I understand that we have Jorge and also Mark Carvell in the queue.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's correct, Markus.

MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Jorge?

JORGE CANCIO: Hello. Do you hear me okay?

MARKUS KUMMER: We can hear you.

JORGE CANCIO: Okay. Thank you very much. Good afternoon to everybody. This is Jorge Cancio from Switzerland. I just wanted to make a reference to the comment I made before in the chat and clarify. I think that the spirit of this advice to the Board is twofold.

On one side, it is on the process. We are all aware that there is a long process, a long history behind this PDP working group on curative protections, and we think – or at least I personally think – that the GAC

has been doing its homework. Also the many governments and many IGOs – more than 20 – have contributed to the draft recommendations that were published early this year.

And so on the process side, I think it's important for the whole community, and the Board in the end is representative of the community as a whole, and that we have made these inputs and it is not only a formalistic question that these inputs are read through by the PDP Working Group or that they are taken into account or they are considered or whatever.

It is important that the substance is really looked into by this PDP working group which is composed by a very limited number of people from part of the community, and that it really shows that it's trying to take onboard the recommendations made by other parts of the community. And if they have any issues and have any questions, that they also reach out to the other parts of the community which have made massively comments on the draft recommendation.

So, there's a process aspect, and I think that the Board is a guardian of the processes in the end if we look into the commitments in the Bylaws. And on the other hand, we have a substantive issue or a result issue. And I think that we are approaching a stage where the final recommendations will be put forward by this PDP Working Group and will go up to the GNSO Council, and I think we are cautioning also the Board that in the end, the Board is responsible that the processes are not only followed as a form, but also in substance, and that the multi-stakeholder model which is enshrined in the Bylaws only really works if the inputs from all parts of the community are really taken onboard.

And that in the end it will be on the Board to make the judgment whether that recommendations really reflect the input and expertise provided by the IGOs, by the GAC as a consensus advice, by so many other governments. So, I think that could be the interpretation of that “ensuring” and that wording we put in the GAC advice. Thank you.

MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. And Mark, you're next.

MARK CARVELL: Yes. Thank you, Markus, and hello everybody on the call. I haven't got much to add to what Jorge has expressed there in terms of the anxiety underlining that text in the communiqué about ensuring reflection of all inputs.

The only point I would add, there was a difficult history with a small group proposal. Quite a lot of work and commitment into that, and that, as the GNSO commented in its reaction to the Johannesburg communiqué, has said that the outcome of that is not within the mandate or terms of reference of the PDP.

So, there's a lot of difficult history here, and it looks like we're heading for a divergence between the GNSO and the GAC when the PDP recommendations are published ahead of Abu Dhabi, and we want to ensure that there's going to be some predictable process for reconciling that divergence of positions that takes into account all the inputs and previous contributions that the IGO group has made, including that of the small group. Thanks.

MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that, Mark. Is there anyone else in the queue?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes, Kavouss is on the queue, Markus.

MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. First of all, I would like to comment on what [inaudible] said. We are not looking for any confrontation with GNSO, so I don't think that we should say response is incorrect. We are not talking who is correct, who is incorrect. We are looking for the protection of IGO, and it has not been properly done up to now, and we have to make every effort.

So, it is better not to say that this [premise] is incorrect. This was said by the two Vice Chairs of the GNSO in ICANN58, and we don't want to repeat that. There is a problem. Instead of saying that who is right, who is wrong, you have to find a solution for the problem.

And Jorge put it in the most appropriate context, and context says that at the end, this is the duty and responsibility of ICANN to judge that the views of everybody is properly and adequately and equally or in balance has been met.

So, I don't think that [inaudible] put the ball within GNSO and GAC and just say, "I don't take care about anything, even I don't encourage, and

just go and talk to each other.” No, it is not correct. We have to move from many, many [inaudible] GAC. We have the same issue, and always we do the same thing. How many meetings from ICANN46? At least as far as I remember, we have the same issue. No real movement. There has been some movement. So, I don’t think it is up to us to say that the GNSO policy is incorrect.

We could say it has not met the requirement of IGO and have to find way to do that, and that was [in two meetings] asking ICANN Board to encourage or maybe a little bit more than that that they reconsider the PDP, to [review] to resolve the problem. But not saying that we are correct.

So, I don’t think that this is a disappointing reply from the GNSO, and this is not very proper from someone saying that, “Please, GAC indicate what part of GNSO’s PDP is not correct.” It is not up to us to say that. We are responsible for [representation] of IGO which has not been [protected]. So we have to find a way for that, and I think that would be the [inaudible] point. Thank you.

MARKUS KUMMER:

Thank you. And also in the chat, there are several comments. Jorge made the very valid remark that we have not seen any substantive answer yet. So, there are only hints that the GNSO would not heed those inputs. So, I think it may also be a little bit premature to have this discussion at this stage. Are there other floor requests at this stage?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Markus, I see [inaudible] hands up at the moment.

MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Thank you. I think this has been a very helpful discussion and we definitely will take it into account in formulating the Board response to the GAC communiqué. And I would also say for instance the Red Cross issue, we have been able to move forward in a positive way by finding mediation, and that as far as I understand is well on its way [inaudible].

Can we close this discussion which is very important on the GAC advice proper? And can we briefly also touch on a discussion we had in the [inaudible] And the list discussions we had – and many thanks to GAC members who reacted to my suggestion. I think it was Kavouss and also Mark Carvell made very helpful comments.

Obviously, we don't have the time at this stage to go into any drafting, but my proposal was essentially to simplify the definitional part of what constitutes facts of [inaudible] and something which would be short, concise and same for – oh, sorry, I see Thomas has his hand up. I had overlooked that. Please, Thomas.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Markus. And sorry to come in now again, but [inaudible] that you don't see the hands up. Just one element for the Board to notice and to be aware of regarding the communiqué. As you may have noticed, we have introduced something new in this communiqué, and this is a new part of the communiqué that – let me just quickly bring the communiqué to the front – follow-up on previous advice.

In the effort or in the attempt to try to be efficient and not repeat ourselves, we have decided to not repeat previous advice in the proper advice section, but to refer to some issues where we have given advice which is still standing in a new part of the communiqué.

And just to encourage you to not just go through the advice under the advice section but to also of course read the rest of the communiqué, and whenever you feel like responding or asking questions on the other parts of the communiqué, in particular on this section called follow-up on previous advice and other issues, I encourage you to also comment or ask questions about this part.

Because as I said, the GAC considers very important, but it is not new advice, it is comments or follow-up on previous advice. So, just to raise your awareness about this, and this is an attempt to, as I said, be more structured and really separate new advice from existing advice, but we would encourage you to take that very seriously despite that it is an additional part of the document. That's all I wanted to say. Thank you.

MARKUS KUMMER:

Thank you. That's very helpful, and as you have noted, we have actually also from our side taken these up and reacted with the update from Göran on ICANN Org's efforts to improve cooperation with the GAC. But that is well noted, and we are also aware – and I wonder whether David or someone else from ICANN Org would have a brief minute to explain where we are. There is a lot of work going on in the background to tidy up that previous advice and where we are with that advice. I don't know

– sorry to put you on the spot, but I know the work is going on, and maybe an update in this [inaudible] might be quite helpful.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, Markus. I think my colleague, Christine can address this. We've both been working on it. Christine [will add] more intensely on the pending or outstanding issues. Christine, would you like to give a little more detail where we are on that?

CHRISTINE [WILLETT]:

Thank you, David. This is Christine. Yes, organization staff have gone back to previous GAC communiqués from 2013 to review GAC advice and to ensure that all advice has been considered by the Board and moved into implementation. And we are endeavoring to update the same inventory much in the way we have previously done over the last 12 months with the SSAC and the RSSAC. We are also undergoing a similar process with the ALAC to confirm the status of their previous advice.

We would expect to be able to share such an inventory first with the Board members, of course, and then subsequently with GAC members at some time to make sure that we are aligned on the status and we have clarity about what is an implementation and which items have completed implementation, as well as which items may require further review or consideration by Board members.

MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that, Christine. That's very helpful, and we look forward to that. So, can we go –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Kavouss has his hand up, Markus. Sorry.

MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, Markus. First of all, thank you very much for the [inaudible] that you have provided which is concise, precise and on the point and understandable. We are grateful to you, or you and your colleagues [who have] provided that, including Manal.

I think there were two comments. One comment I made, and the other I think is a comment made by Mark is accepted. We don't need to use request, we don't need to use ask, we use the formulation proposed by Mark.

However, with respect to the rationale, I think it is important, it is in the Bylaws. [inaudible] to the extent possible. It is difficult that we say, "To the extent possible." So, I change it. Instead of, "To the extent possible," deleted that and put that "GAC normally..." That means generally, you must have rationale.

And if you look into the independent review for the GAC [inaudible] you see that more than 20 times, [inaudible] refer to rationale, whether

rationale with E at the end or rationale with L at the end. I leave it to Mark to say because he commented that differs. I don't care about that.

But in any case, we must have rationale. But there may be a case we cannot have. It's very exceptional. That is why I want to use this word, "GAC advice shall normally have rationale." That means this is the usual way. So, please, can we delete, "To the extent possible" and "To the extent [inaudible]"?

This is very [inaudible] and I don't think that it is not consistent with the Bylaws. Without that, it is impossible. However, if you consider this, I think it is good. We can close this portion of the GAC advice. And thank you again and Manal, and I hope that reflects the views of the Board. I hope. Thank you.

MARKUS KUMMER:

Thank you, Kavouss. And I have on the list already said [that it] occurred to me, yes, I made a mistake when I proposed that, "To the extent possible" should have been ahead of the clarifying statement. But it was not something that was pre-negotiated with my Board colleagues, but I took the initiative. I thought something like that would be easier to get accepted by the Board if it's short and concise, and thank you for your positive response.

It was not my intention to go really into drafting, but just on high level comments, and I take it that the general trust of this proposal is acceptable to most people on the call and that we could work on that basis and ask Manal – and she has her hand up – to take this forward. Please, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Markus. First of all, thank you for the initiative and for triggering this discussion and to have a short and concise text. And many thanks to Kavouss and Mark for providing their inputs. I'm just highlighting that this discussion started on the BGRI mailing list as you may know, and I have already shared the essence of our discussion on the GAC mailing list just prior to our call today. So, probably not all GAC members may have had the chance to read where we stand on this.

So, as you rightly mentioned, we can simply agree in principle to shorten the text and to have a new draft just highlighting the key word that we feel describes accurately and fully the GAC advice. So, if we can agree to this approach on this call, then we can [seek] the drafting, of course taking into consideration what Kavouss and Mark have already [sent,] but also any further comments that we may receive either on the BGRI mailing list or on the GAC mailing list. Thank you.

MARKUS KUMMER:

Thank you, Manal, for that. And obviously, I may also get comments from [all] colleagues. This is a starting point, not the end of a process. And Manal and I had the exchange just shortly ahead of this call whether or not we should have a BGRI session in the next meeting at ICANN60, and we more or less agreed it might be better to have it on the calendar, and then we could – if it's not necessary, we can always cancel it. But try and go as far as we can in an online process, but maybe the meeting might well be needed to have a final agreement on the text. I think I will go down on a final text.

But can we all agree on are there additional comments? And please, again, tell me if there's a hand up which I cannot see.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Manal has her hand up.

GULTEN TEPE: Manal has raised her hand up.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes, thank you. Just very quickly to urge everyone that we continue the interactive discussion on the mailing list even if we will have a meeting in Abu Dhabi, just to have a meeting that we can adopt things and conclude over there, and we can have the substantial discussion intersessionally over the mailing list in all [cases.] Thank you.

MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. I couldn't agree more. Are there other comments? I'm not quite sure – I think – if the call was scheduled for more than 60 minutes or 90 minutes, but we don't need to go on for more time than necessary, and we can – I think we have more or less come to an end of the issues we wanted to cover. Are we all –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Kavouss has his hand up, Markus. Sorry.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. It is not about your agenda, but you have two or three minutes. I just want to remind ourselves that GAC has issued a questionnaire regarding how ICANN60 will be managed with respect to the public comments or [public community] forum and so on and so forth, and I think based on that reply, we can request ICANN Org to kindly consider the result of that after it's approved by the GAC.

Because currently, there are some repetitions. We received a same presentation for our public forum. We have that again the same people coming to the GAC and so on and so forth, so [inaudible] some of that and efficiently use the time. And also with the other issues that are important, because now we are running short of time in the ICANN [schedule] and we would like to make it quite clear.

And also about the GAC and Board meetings, we would like also to the number of the questions is the minimal minimum, and should be made available before time sufficiently for the Board to kindly consider that and when they come, they reply to that. Thank you.

MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. And Jorge reminded me that the call is scheduled for 90 minutes. So, if we want, we can carry on for another half hour, but we don't need to carry on. If there are no objections, I would suggest then coming to closure at the top of the hour, and I think it was a productive call, and also, I would echo what Mark said in the list, that we should

aim to finalize the text on the discussion of the definition of GAC advice [intersessionally] for endorsement in Abu Dhabi. That [inaudible] preferred scenario.

With that, can we close the call, or is there another very last, urgent request for the floor?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Kavouss has his hand up, Markus.

MARKUS KUMMER: Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, Markus. I wanted to type something, but this is more quicker. We would like to express our sincere appreciation to Board members attending this meeting, and hope that they will kindly take into account the result of discussions and chat, and continue this collaboration which is quite useful. Thank you.

MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. It's always very good to end on a positive note, and I'd also like to do the same. Thank you all for participating in a very constructive way on this call, and I think with that, I would then like to close the call and thank you for participating actively and constructively. Thanks, and goodbye, everyone.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. Goodbye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you. Thanks, Markus, for chairing.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]