
ICANN70 | Virtual Community Forum – GAC ICANN70 Communique Drafting (1 of 5)
Wednesday, March 24, 2021 – 12:30 to 14:00 EST

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Welcome to the drafting session, Wednesday March 24th. We will not be doing a roll call for the sake of time, but GAC members' attendance will be available in the annex of the GAC communique and minutes. May I remind GAC representatives in the attendance to indicate presence by updating participant time to reflect the name and affiliation.

If you would like to ask a question or make a comment please type it by starting and ending your sentence with question or comment to allow all participants to see your request. Interpretation for GAC sessions include all 6 U.N. languages and Portuguese. Participants can select the language they wish SPO speak or listen to by clicking on the interpretation icon on the Zoom tool bar.

Your microphone will be muted unless you get into the queue to speak. If you wish to speak, raise hand in the Zoom room. When speaking, state your name and the language you will speak if other than English. Please speak clearly and at reasonable pace and mute other devices.

Finally, the session like all other ICANN activities is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behaviour. You will find a link in the chat for your reference. And now over to chair, Manal Ismail. Manal, please.

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.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Julia. And welcome back everyone this is the first of 5 sessions dedicated to our communique drafting. It is scheduled for 90 minutes. We have 2 other sessions later today. 90 minutes and 60 minutes and we have 2 sessions tomorrow, one at the beginning of the day, for 60 minutes, and another one at the very end of the day, and we are assuming that this is a place holder should need be.

It's at the very end of the day for 60 minutes, but I really hope we can progress the drafting today maybe review it tomorrow morning, and, and release everyone and we release also the last session. That said we already have the communique on the screen thanks to support staff and thanks to everyone who started put communique language in the documents.

I will start by a quick read of what we have already. And as we go we can identify what's missing, and and who can be our pen holder on this, and also in a second iteration we can get into discussing the substance itself. So this is GAC communique of ICANN70 virtual community forum. The GAC ICANN70 communique was drafted and agreed remotely during the ICANN70 virtual community forum.

The communique was circulated to the GAC immediately after the meeting to provide an opportunity for all GAC members and observers

to consider it before publication bearing in mind the special circumstances of the virtual meeting. As you can see highlighted in yellow, no objections were raised during the agreed time-frame before publication.

Everything highlighted in yellow is because it didn't yet happen, but should we proceed normally we will remove the highlight and this is how the final version would look like. Also, if you can see even the date is highlighted in yellow because again, we are not sure whether we will finish today or tomorrow, so again, remains to be seen.

Apologies, I see a comment from Kavouss in the chat suggesting that we go to sensitive parts or statements and potential advice first. I was trying to give a sense of the overall thing before we get dragged into deep discussions, but please I'm in your hands. So let me know your preference.

We have a proposal to go directly to the advice part versus to make a quick iteration and the whole thing and then get substance. So any preferences? Kavouss, please go ahead.

IRAN:

Yes, Manal, I'm sorry, I don't want to take the time of the meeting but I think it is justifiable because the general skeleton and so on and so forth is a normal thing we do.

We are not writing the U.N. charter on Chapter 7, and it is something we could do it but I think it is preferable to go to the sensitive parts to have a first look to see what is come out, and then having some reflection on come back to that. So that is what I suggest trying to have some justification and some rationale. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Fair enough. So let's move to the advice part, and then we can look at other parts. I see European Commission also -- I'm sorry, I see European Commission suggesting that it may be useful to do a first outlook, so let me do this as a matter of compromise.

We can skim quickly through the whole thing without reading it so people -- to the benefit of newcomers as well. They know the structure. They know how to look at the communique and then follow Kavouss's advice to start the discussions with the sensitive parts. So, as I said parts highlighted will be revisited in due time, and will be reflected accurately. We have the introduction part reporting on numbers [inaudible] I'm sorry, someone needs to -- (audio is gone).

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Now you're on mute.

IRAN: I don't hear you, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Sorry, can you hear me now?

IRAN: We can hear you now, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay, thank you. Then I was saying under introduction we normally report on the attendance of the meeting number of GAC members and observers who attended.

Then we have the interconstituancy activities and community engagement and here is where we report on our bilateral meetings. We had our meeting with the Board, and it's mainly reporting on the agendas of the meeting. It's a bit high level -- I'm sorry, is someone seeking the floor?

Then we have a meeting with the ALAC, and our meeting with the GNSO which took place today, and then the cross-community discussions, and this is in reference to the panel that will take place tomorrow.

Then we have internal matters, and this is where we report on internal

matters, so new members, elections if any, ending terms and new coming vice chairs, or chairs so this is the section under which we report internal matters including working groups and we have reporting from 2 working groups.

The PSWG, we heard the updated to -- I'm sorry it was yesterday, and GAC Human Rights and International Law where we discussed the implementation of Work Stream 2. Then going forward to GAC operational matters, and this is where we reflect any, any non-substantial matters that we discussed and we will be going through the text.

So starting the substantial part here is section 4 issues of importance to the GAC, and this is to report substantial discussions that took place on priority topics to the GAC, but we haven't concluded on specific advice.

This is just for information to the Board, and just to share our thinking, share our concerns early on in the process. And this is what was referring to when I said we had a call with the Board discuss inter-sessionally discussion issues of importance to the GAC despite not being [indiscernible] under the section we have the DNS abuse as proposed by the U.S. We have the public interest commitments also as proposed by the U.S.

We have rights protection mechanisms proposed by Japan, and if we scroll down please, we also have subsequent procedures of new gTLDs,

and then comes the GAC consensus advice to ICANN Board, and this is where he stopped our discussion yesterday. We started discussing the GAC request for cost-benefit analysis before the new round, and we thought it may be crucial to know what we shared before, and where we stand on this topic before we provide new advice.

I'm sorry, just reading the chat from U.S. we are still working out some of the details on the advice so it may be better to discuss during the next drafting session if possible. Thank you very much, Jaisha. Noted.

So, I'll stop here. We will be discussing this part at the following session since the drafting is still ongoing. And maybe we can go to issues of importance to the GAC, but let me first give the floor to Kavouss. Kavouss please, go ahead. Iran.

IRAN:

Yes, Manal. Thank you very much for the interconstituancy part. I suggest that from now on where we add in that at all meeting for further information, consult the recording, and see the transcription because for instance meeting with ICANN Board, and with others they were transcribed and people could get more information on that and we could not mention here but tell them okay if you want to see what has happened please consult the transcription and also the recording.

This is one. With respect to the last part you said that what is the U.S.

suggestion for the next suggestion, for another GAC advice? Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kavouss. On the first point, we already for specifically for the Board meeting, if you recall, and based on your comment, we already attached the transcripts of the meeting to the communique.

And we can get into a discussion on the process during the wrap-up session because we were wondering sometimes the transcripts are not ready, and we need to issue the communique, we thought maybe we can put a link to this, but if things become very old after years the link may be broken or not working for one reason or another, so something we need to bear in mind.

I'm not sure if your proposal is to do this for all the bilaterals. I mean, the recordings of the session are there, and I think -- again, we need to bear in mind that if we are going to insert links, we may lose them with time, so -- I --

IRAN: I was not clear, I'm very sorry. I fully agree with you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay.

IRAN: For ICANN Board we have transcription, thank you. For others -- please also consult without link, without anything, and then if available, or when available. That's all. Without attaching to that, just the cost of a simple --

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Footnote you mean. Okay, we'll see how to reflect that and thank you Kavouss for the suggestion. On your other question, so, the U.S. are drafting communique language under GAC advice to the Board as proposed yesterday.

They are still working on it, so they were asking if we can postpone the discussion until the draft is ready. The draft language. And I see Olivier, European Commission I see your hand is up please go ahead.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thank you Manal. Olivier Bringer, European Commission for the record. I just wanted to go through the different things we have been discussing in the 2 days and where we think we could provide some communique language and I would have also a proposal for a possible advice.

So on the new gTLDs we think, and this has been discussed during the session, and several GAC members have mentioned the same thing that that communique text on the need to conduct cost-benefit analysis and address the question of DNS abuse before the next round of gTLDs, and this might be what our U.S. colleagues are working on.

The question of DNS abuse is also quite important and we think we could have communique text on the need to address the issue as a matter of priority including in the short term by ensuring robust contractual enforcement, and by promoting voluntary measures by contracted parties. Which is something we discussed in the session on DNS abuse yesterday.

On the third topic which is WHOIS and the registration data, we would also suggest to have communique text on the question of implementation that we discussed with the Board yesterday, on EPDP Phase 2A to say what we have told the GNSO today. The GNSO council today that we would really like the conversation to continue. And on the question of accuracy on the need to start the work on this very important issue.

And then I would have a suggestion -- something I'd like to discuss with the whole --

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I'm sorry to interrupt you, Olivier. Just to seek clarification is everything you're saying now you're seeking to put under GAC advice to the Board?

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: No, everything I've said is GAC communique text. Simple text. No advice, and now I come to my proposal for an advice, and that would be on the GAC minority statement that we have issued this Summer on the Phase 2 EPDP report which has been taken into account by the GNSO council, but I mean, we can say that the final report and the final recommendation of the GNSO council do not really reply to the different points we have put in our minority statements. And I think these points are still very important.

So, we would like to, if possible, transform it into an advice from the GAC to the Board, advising the Board to take into account these points and to try to solve the issues that we have raised, issues around the centralization of DSSID, etcetera.

So, that would be, that would be our proposal for an advice. I don't think we need to rewrite everything. Everything the substance is in the GAC minority statement, but we would have in a way to point to it or to refer to it in an advice to the Board. Thank you

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, European Commission. I think maybe we need to see language for the advice to be able to to decide. I see and I hope have we taken note of everything that European Commission mentioned -- so I think that was mentioned of continuation of Phase 2 and thank you Fabien for the comment.

Thank you. And reading the chat and then I will give the floor to Kavouss. Thank you, Jaisha, for the confirmation that you agree with the proposed approach to start first with the topics of interest and then the advice just reading Russia's comment in the chat.

DNS abuse we proposed a statement regarding DoH impact on threats for public interests as are result of our previous session. Text will be prepared, so thank you for the heads up, Russia. We will await the text and take it from there. Kavouss, sorry to keep you waiting. Please, go ahead.

IRAN: No problem. It seems we are not speaking the same language with European Union at all. Not at all, totally different language. They want to keep us up to 4 o'clock in the morning by converting anything into the GAC advice.

I don't agree simply. Manal, we have 2 type of -- yeah, wait, wait, wait, wait. I have not finished. With all due respect to the chair, please allow

me to talk.

I know European Union are 27 country and we are one country but we have equal rights. They are observer and we are members. We have to be careful that we have 2 type of communication. First of all there is no communique to ICANN Board. Communique is from outward of GAC. We have 2 type of things. One is GAC advice with capital A. The other is statement or declaration.

We call them a statement collectively agreed by GAC. I don't know whether European Union wants to put something in their statement. I have no difficulty with there is sufficient qualifier to that, but I don't think that we could put for instance minority statement into the GAC advice for the following reasons. I invite the people to read the bylaw.

GAC advice must be with rationale and consistent with the bylaw. Approval of the recommendation of GNSO in accordance with the bylaw. We cannot override them in the GAC advice.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Kavouss, Kavouss --

collectively agreed or declaration by the GAC which is different from the GAC advice as referred to in bylaw. When Olivier --

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay.

IRAN: Discuss talk about converting minority statement into the GAC advice, there is what he said. If he changed the view I'm very happy that he changed the view, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you again, Kavouss, and please -- I don't want to confuse everybody with different terminology so we have GAC advice to the Board and we have issues of importance to the GAC.

IRAN: Okay, very good.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So this is -- exactly. This is where we are going to put all the substantial discussions and the text that is not GAC advice to the Board. I understand there is one proposal from European Commission, they will

draft it.

Share it and then we can start the discussion in order for the discussion to be fruitful. It's very difficult to decide now without having text in front of us. And another thing just for the benefit of everything on the all specifically newcomers -- there is no difference between a member and an observer.

All members and observers participate equally throughout our sessions and throughout our discussions, the only difference is when we get to voting for elections for GAC leadership so no differentiation between members and observers and as Jorge mentioned European Commission is a member but nevertheless I do not -- I mean, everyone participates equally.

I know the terminology is different in other fora, but within the GAC members and observers participate equally. So we will await the text and then take the discussion Kavouss whenever we have the text in front of us.

IRAN:

Manal, can I reply [inaudible].

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Sure. So I have Olivier European Commission and then I have Kavouss. Please, Olivier.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Yes, thank you. Yes, Olivier Bringer, the European Commission. The European Commission is a member of the GAC not an observer, contrary to what my Iranian colleague mentioned.

Secondly, I do not speak in the name of European Union. I spoke in the name of the European Commission so it's not the our European Commission and 27 member state. It's only the European Commission.

Secondly, yes, I think you have clarified, Manal. My intention, my intention was not to have advice on every point I mentioned. On all points I mentioned except for the point on the GAC minority statement I would like this -- I would propose that this is covered in the section on issues of importance.

On the question of whether we want to have an advice on the on the minority statement, my idea is simply that we have a numb of important message in this GAC minority statement and I think it would be interesting to point the attention of the Board to these statements. So in a way, the -- the objective would be to elevate what is a consensus minority statement to a possible, to a possible advice simply by suggesting that the Board carefully considers the message contained in

the GAC minority statement but here again I agree with you.

Maybe it would be [inaudible] to have a piece of text to see whether colleagues could agree and I would have course invite other colleagues to share their views whether it makes sense or not. So this would be my, these would be my replies. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Olivier, and I also would rather wait until we have the text. I see also Denmark supporting this approach, and with this let me get the floor to Kavouss and then we can proceed with the communique. Kavouss, please.

IRAN: Thank you, Manal. I don't believe that there is a mobilizations that are people saying that 27 or 26 or 2 or 5 overriding the others. We need to have a consensus. GAC advice must be consistent with the bylaw. Approval of the recommendation of GNSO in an accordance with annex A of the bylaw and we could not advise the Board to ignore that because that has not been taken care of the minority advice. That's all.

We can't agree to have any advice on the minority statement but we can put elements with necessary qualifiers in the issues important for GAC if agreed by everybody. We may, or we may not agree.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kavouss.

IRAN: If you do not agree you can put collectively agree. You put issues important by some GAC member. You refer it our colleagues by U.S. they want to have something on the cost and benefit analysis. I sent 4 e-mails to you and Fabien and everybody those distinguished delegates need to take into account the essence of what I have sent.

The -- if they want to refer to something either the GAC communique in Helsinki there was a -- they reply from the Board that they have difficulty with that, and so on and so forth. In addition to that, we could not postpone the implementation of anything because of the needs of the GAC.

We need to respect all communities and you have sent that we could not put any obstacle. We would like to maintain reputation, fairness, good judgment of the GAC, but not a unilateral declaration that we want to put everything, a blocker on everything because our point has not been taken into account.

We have expressed our point. It was not accepted. That's all. We could bring back again to the ICANN Board in the issues important for GAC or

for some GAC member but not being GAC advice. Certainly not in GAC advice. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Kavouss. And I agree with all what you said. I feel this is what we are doing. I'm not sure what is triggering otherwise, but anyway, I'm having difficulty continuing the discussion without draft text in front of me.

So I think we need to wait for the text to come, then debate it and as you said either agree or disagree and definitely nothing goes no the consensus GAC advice unless agreed by everyone so we are on the same page. Just let's wait for the text and meanwhile, let's go to -- so let's go to the parts where we have funeral drafts that we can discuss so issues of importance to the GAC.

Do we have issues of importance to the GAC. Do we have the text ready? I know European Commission will be adding new topics but for the topics we already have is this everything or so let's read what we have and see what's missing so we have DNS abuse, and the text reads DNS abuse should be addressed in collaboration with the ICANN community and ICANN org prior to the launch of a second round of new gTLDs.

We also urge the development of proposed contract provisions applicable to all gTLDs to improve responses to DNS abuse. We

welcome the recently launched DNS abuse institute and encourage community efforts to co-operatively tackle DNS abuse in a holistic manner. So, any comments on this text? Moving on to the public interest -- Jorge, please, I'm sorry, go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO:

Thank you, Manal. And thank you for leading this discussion.

I have just a general comment which may apply both to DNS abuse, and the text on the public interest commitment. It's a comment of style and this is the following. Normally, the subject of our sentences is the GAC. The GAC thinks blah-blah-blah or the -- and the GAC encourages, so we normally don't use we, or impersonal sentences, but as to the, as to the substance I wouldn't have any comment for the time being. Thank you

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Jorge. Point taken. It's a fair point and I see Fabian already reflecting it on the screen. So the GAC urges and the GAC welcomes.

Okay. On public interest commitments, if a subsequent round of new gTLDs occurs, additional [indiscernible] and voluntary PICs should remain possible in order to address emerging public policy concerns. ICANN's mandate clearly contemplates contract requirements such as voluntary and mandatory PICs that promote the security, stability,

reliability, and resiliency of the DNS.

Any comments on this part? And on rights protection mechanisms the GAC reviewed Phase 1 final report on the rights protection mechanisms, PDP and discussed preparation for providing early input to inform the initiation of the upcoming Phase 2RPM, PDP set to review the UDRP. The GAC also acknowledged the economic damage by on-line piracy, and necessity of taking measures to comply with the contracts with ICANN, including disclosure of registration data.

I see Kavouss's hand up so, Kavouss, you go first and then I have also a comment but Kavouss, please go ahead.

IRAN:

I suggest we replace damage by consequence. I don't understand damage. Yeah, it's too strong, damage. Consequences thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

Thank you. Any other comments? So, I don't mind the text staying here, but on a first read, I got the feeling that it's more of informational, but anyway, let's keep it as is.

Moving to subsequent procedures of new gTLDs the GAC discussed subsequent rounds of new gTLDs following the GNSO council adoption of the SubPro PDP work group final report.

Vice chairs provided an overview to GAC members on priority topics to the GAC. The namely clarity and predictability of application process, public interest commitment PICs, and global public interest, applicant support and participation of underserved regions. Closed generic TLDs, GAC early warnings and GAC advice, community-based applications, and auctions and mechanisms of last resort.

On predictability some GAC members shared concerns relative to the implementation of the SPIRT and added clarity may create regarding GAC consensus advice.

GAC members agreed that further clarification on the implementation of the SPIRT should be encouraged as well as on the role the GAC will play in it, especially in light of implementation guidance noting direct dialogue between the SPIRT, ICANN org and the ICANN Board on consensus GAC advice.

On public interest commitments GAC members observed that any future PICs must be enforceable through clear contractual obligations and consequences for the failure to meet those obligations should be specified. Additionally --

IRAN: Yeah. Please stop at the end of each paragraph and allow us to comment because it's difficult if you go all of them if you agree kindly. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Sure, Kavouss. So, let's please scroll up and, let me ask if there are any comments to the end of the bulleted list. If not then any -- Kavouss, your hand it up. Is this regarding this part?

IRAN: Yes. On the subsequent paragraph on the SPIRT. Yesterday we had agreed on something allowing the following. Should SPIRT be established GAC would like to have equal participation and equitable access to the participation, something along what we discussed yesterday disappeared. We need to emphasize on that, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kavouss. We have a sentence already drafted that was read during the Board session. Maybe we can dig it, and we can add it here and see if there is agreement with this addition? It's in the language we read during the Board session.

Meanwhile, can we move onto the following paragraph? So any comments? I'm not sure have I read this paragraph? Let me -- yes, so

any comments on the paragraph starting with on public interest commitments? Okay, and I have some emergency I need to attend to so can someone please fill in for me for a few minutes? Just reading through the text.

LUISA PAEZ: Absolutely, Manal. It's Luisa here.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Luisa. Thank you.

LUISA PAEZ: No worries, no problem Manal. Okay. And apologies, Fabien can you let me know I was, I was reading so I'm just not sure where we are at. I know Kavouss mentioned we pause after every paragraph. Yeah, thank you Fabien. Go ahead.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yes, Fabien. To confirm we read the first paragraph and predictability and we were waiting for comments on this one.

LUISA PAEZ: Perfect. Wonderful. So just giving me one more minute for GAC colleagues to read the first paragraph on predictability. Kavouss is that a new hand. If so.

IRAN: Yes, a new hand.

LUISA PAEZ: Wonderful thank you.

IRAN: May I pose it, please.

LUISA PAEZ: Yes, please go ahead.

IRAN: Yes. The second paragraph and the public interest commitment, 4th line says GAC members noted that the lack of policy recommendation -- this is a negative message. We should say that there is a need to have policy, but not saying the lack of that one. This is a negative.

It continues always I don't know where its come from. I know who has after that. I know the origin of the pen however it should be replaced by there is a need to have a policy and at the end I don't agree to the need to saying before subsequent round we have to have the policy. It is not possible.

We should not propose the postponement. We should say it necessarily but not postponed. If it you look into the chat of the previous session there was many people saying that GAC should not propose something to postpone its application or implementation of a second round because of what they want whereas the other member of the community they want this thing so we should be should listen to the others.

We should be firm and mindful so we have to change this in instead of saying GAC members noted that there is a need of it a policy recommendation on DNS abuse mitigation. Which remains a high priority issue finished full stop and we should not subject the implementation of new round to this policy.

It is not possible to do that. This is a blocking of the system, thank you.

LUISA PAEZ:

Thank you, Kavouss, for that. And so perhaps a few thoughts but also welcome thoughts from other GAC members. So perhaps something -- I

mean 2 points that come to mind for that particular text is we do have to be mindful with our last GAC communique advice in Montreal which was consensus advice, so just pointing that out that we do have to be consistent, and the GAC consensus advice to the Board in Montreal, and I have it here in front of me.

Says that the GAC advises the Board not to proceed with the new round of gTLDs until after the complete implementation of the recommendations in the competition consumer trust and consumer choice review [inaudible] high priority.

But perhaps so again just noting that we do have to be consistent but we -- I mean, I do take the point that perhaps we can ensure a bit of a more constructive positive text.

And, yeah, so GAC members noted that and perhaps Kavouss you can set a specific text here to ensure it is, it is a more constructive or positive text here.

IRAN:

If you want I can say what I said.

LUISA PAEZ: Yes, please, go ahead.

IRAN: GAC members noted that currently -- I mean -- currently there is no policy, recommendation on DNS abuse mitigation which remains a high priority issues. And then if you want to add something saying that it is necessary to consider, it is necessary to consider whether the implementation of subsequent round of new gTLD would be.

It is -- it is considered whether the implementation of subsequent round of new gTLD could be carried out before such policy is developed and agreed by community. What I'm saying is that we talking positively.

We say in a positive manner. We say they should consider whether there is appropriate to go to the second round before this policy.

This is the positive message but not saying that don't go the second round unless you have the policy because you condition one to the others which may not be appropriate so I am sending the same message but in a different way. Thank you.

LUISA PAEZ: Thank you, Kavouss, and I appreciate your constructive spirit. And so I was just waiting until Fabian was able -- if you can make sure to re-read the text to ensure it reflects what you said, and, of course, as that

communique text is consensus, I will wait as well of course for other members to ensure there is collective agreement, and, of course, we can always go back to this text. I'll just take one or two minutes.

IRAN: I have a comment on the following paragraph.

LUISA PAEZ: Okay, Kavouss. On the applicant support if you could just wait one minute.

IRAN: Okay thank you.

LUISA PAEZ: Just wonderful, thank you. I was just reading this last paragraph if I guess I'll read it out loud for the benefit of everyone. So GAC members noted that currently there are no policy recommendations on DNS abuse mitigation which remains a high priority issues.

It is necessary to consider whether the implementation of subsequent rounds of new gTLDs could be carried out before such policy is developed and agreed by the ICANN community. I'm just going to see if there are any comments. So for now no comments but -- Jorge, is that

hand in particular for this text? Please go ahead.

IRAN: For the other part.

LUISA PAEZ: I was just -- sorry, I was just seeing Jorge's hand and I just wanted to ask him if his hand was in regards to this text or to the following Jorge?

IRAN: The following relative to applicant support.

JORGE CANCIO: If I may.

LUISA PAEZ: I think Jorge would like to make a comment in regards to the text on DNS abuse. Go ahead, Jorge, thank you.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you, Luisa. So perhaps some friendly amendments or amendments to what Kavouss is proposing. The sentence GAC members noted that currently there are no policy recommendations on

DNS abuse mitigation in the final report.

Because in general I think it would be -- could be misread as that we are affirming that in general there are no policy recommendations, and with this in the final report I think it's clear we are referring to the final report of subsequent procedures which remains a high priority issue.

It is necessary to consider whether the implementation ever subsequent rounds of new gTLDs would be carried out before said issue said issue is possible because we are referring to DNS abuse mitigation. Is addressed by the community. Because we are not taking any pre-judging decision whether we need policy or not. This is consistent with what we have discussed with the GNSO, with other parts of the community.

We know we have an issue with DNS abuse, we still haven't determined if the best way to address it is through policy. So, I would leave that open, and not specify in the sentence that we are referring to policy. So I hope this is helpful and can be acceptable. Thank you.

LUISA PAEZ:

Thank you, Jorge. And, of course, we can always go back to this text, and appreciate your recommendation in order to give the GAC more options and flexibility in regards to addressing DNS abuse. And so, I will first read the following text, and then I will give you the floor Kavouss

and, of course, others GAC members that would like to take the floor.

So I'll read the text, relative to applicant support program, GAC members observed the importance of fostering gTLD applications from all regions, and that continued discussions between the GAC, GNSO, ICANN org, and ICANN Board will need to take place to increase the number of applications from underrepresented regions.

The some GAC members also reiterated that GAC support to proposals to reduce or eliminate on going ICANN registry fees to expand financial support. And now, Kavouss, thank you for your patience if you can take the floor, please.

IRAN:

Yes, thank you, thank you for that. I think in the paragraph I suggest that in the first line we replace must by need to be enforceable because must is the most strongest. And after that you have shall. And after that, we have need.

And after that we have many, many, so I suggest that we replace must by need to be enforceable, and then enforceable by whom? By the contractual agreement within ICANN and the registrar? Do you want that the ICANN put that into the contractual agreement? So it is very unclear.

Later on they will ask that GNSO, maybe you have said that it will be conceded in the further contractual agreement with the registrar and the registrant saying that is had you had be enforced by whom so this is something that we have -- we have to have Luisa always to whom we address, and who will do the job?

If you address to the ICANN Board or ICANN org that in the agreement, contractual agreement we have to mention that ICANN Board or ICANN org is invited, requested to take that into account in future contractual agreement, with the contractual party so we have to but the -- that one. Very very clear.

Thank you. And then I have difficulty with the subsequent paragraph but we do it one by one. Thank you.

LUISA PAEZ:

Thank you, Kavouss. So just to be clear, we are here on the text from my understanding on public interest commitments so I will just read it one more time and they can make sure to add a suggestion, your edit, Kavouss.

So on public interest commitments PICs GAC members observed that any future PICs must be enforceable through clear contractual obligations, and consequences for the failure to meet those obligations should be specified. And so if I understand correctly Kavouss, you were

mentioning at least the first edit would be to replace must with shall, if
I --

IRAN: No need to be --

LUISA PAEZ: Need to be perfect.

IRAN: Yeah.

LUISA PAEZ: Okay. GAC members observed that any future PICs need to be enforceable to clear contractual obligations in consequences for the failure to meet those obligations should be specified. And then you -- you mentioned another edit, Kavouss.

IRAN: Yeah, here exactly. After specified, and that should be included in the future update of the contractual agreement with the contractual party. Something along the line of that. So we have to say that this should be put in the contractual agreement. This is your request.

Whether they agree or not but that was something you say. And be included in the contractual agreement with the concerned party or the contractual party or with the registry and recommending star whoever you want to put so I leave it to you to put something at the end in the contractual agreement or in the relevant contractual agreement.

LUISA PAEZ:

Thank you, Kavouss. I see Fabian trying his best efforts to accommodate those edits. So I also see, Jorge, your hand is up. Please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO:

Yes, thank you very much, Luisa, and maybe as -- as a friendly amendment towards Kavouss was fairly saying, I think that we can be shorter and more concise if we say should be specified in relevant agreements with the contracted parties, and in ICANN we all know who the contracted parties are, so in relevant agreements with the contracted parties.

And with that, I think everyone would know what we are meaning. I hope this is also helpful.

LUISA PAEZ: Thank you, Jorge. Just taking a minute to read here the edits. Much so then it will be -- it says and consequences for the failure to meet those obligations should be specified in relevant agreements with contracted parties.

IRAN: In the relevant. In the relevant agreement.

LUISA PAEZ: Yes, yes, I agree. Thank you, Kavouss. In the relevant agreement with contracted parties.

IRAN: By the way, I always welcome any friendly suggestion. Always friendly, yes.

LUISA PAEZ: Thank you, Kavouss, for that collaborative spirit. I do see, and hand is up. Please, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Just to let you know that I'm back and we're filling in. If you would like to finish the paragraph and then I can take it from there. Thank you.

LUISA PAEZ:

Wonderful, Manal. Just to let you know so we, we did some edit to the DNS abuse part of this text, and then we were finishing some edits on -- in regards to the public interest commitment so to say that we're still, I think almost finished this text, and then pass we can pass to the second text which is the applicant support program.

But perhaps I see -- perhaps Kavouss you have a comment on this on either the public interest commitment or the DNS abuse text.

Please go ahead and I will leave it up to you now, Manal, thank you.

IRAN:

And the subsequent paragraph relevant to applicant supportive comment there. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

Okay, Kavouss, go ahead.

IRAN:

Yeah, thank you very much, Manal. Thank you for coming back. I see no difficulty with the text but I have difficulty with the applications.

To say that fostering the gTLD application from Oregon. What do you

mean by fostering? Who will do that fostering? How will that fostering will occur?

So we have to very careful this is more ICANN Board. This is for ICANN org. This is for community. And then we say that we have -- for all regions that continue discussion so on and so forth. What we -- who is going to have this continued discussions within GAC, GNSO, ICANN org and ICANN Board.

Is there any obstacle we have that discussion? Do we agree to have a quadricide(Sic) meeting within all these people? How we implement this? Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kavouss, so are you proposing some modification or proposing to -- some deletion?

IRAN: I don't propose deletion but I leave it to the people to propose after kindly listening to this suggestion to modify the text and to address the things.

If you want to have discussions between GAC, GNSO, and ICANN org I don't know. Someone should be facilitating. Who is the facilitator? In fact, to whom it is addressed? I leave it to the author of this paragraph.

If the author does not have any suggestion then delete that.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. Noted, Kavouss. I see Jorge's hand up but before this, I think Nigel was first so Nigel, please.

UNITED KINGDOM: Nigel Hickson, U.K. GAC. Fully support this paragraph. We didn't draft it but it's an excellent paragraph. We can come back with further edits to address some of the Mr. Kavouss's comments but I just wanted to say that I this I that in the second line it should say the importance of fostering GTD applications from a diverse range of applicants from all regions.

From a diverse array or range of applicants a diverse array of applicants. In other words, we are looking for applications for new names, not just for existing registries and registrars but from other, other actors as well. Thank you very much and I'll stop there.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Nigel. Thank you on reported on the screen.

JORGE CANCIO:

Thank you so much, Manal, and good to see you back here in the meeting. Regarding the question. The questions from Kavouss, perhaps we -- if we are granted too many aspects because if you look at the final recommendations and implementation guidance from the subsequent procedures working group regarding the applicant support program, there are a lot of good recommendations, but they are very dependant on effective implementation work and communication and outreach by ICANN org in the implementation again of the recommendation -- recommendations and then the effective rolling out of the new round of gTLDs so that was what we aimed at to refer that.

This will be a process of discussions where obviously ICANN org ICANN Board GNSO and also we as the GAC should have a role to make sure that this outreach that this communication is implemented as effectively as possible. So I don't know if we could add a couple of words in the sense of, and that continued discussions during the implementation work, or in the framework of the implementation work between all those partners will need to take place, blah-blah-blah so that's a bit the background of course.

It's impossible because it would blow up for the frame of these very synthesized sentences if we were to bring in all the complexity that the final report has. But I hope this is helpful for Kavouss, and all others.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jorge. I see Kavouss's hand up already so Kavouss, please does this address -- yeah, please.

IRAN: Thank you very much, Jorge. I -- first of all I disagree with Nigel. He changed the sense of the paragraph. The sense of the paragraph for underrepresented region, but not diverse array of applicants. What does it mean array -- diverse arrays of applicants?

We were talking of the un -- non-represented or unrepresented regions Africa so please kindly Fabien before changing please retain the initial text with revision Mark please. We could come back to that note immediately changing so I thought give a diverse array of applicant because it's not clear. So --

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: The original, the original text is already --

IRAN: Yeah, the original text, yeah.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: It's there.

IRAN: Just --

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I'm sorry go ahead.

IRAN: No, it is not there. Where is the underrepresented, yeah, not -- yeah, yeah, so we, we put that one there so I don't -- I don't know the meaning of diverse array of applicants, with we want to do?

What we want that the ICANN Board or anyone to do the diverse array of that? For instance, country A may have one applicant and country B may have 1,000. What we are doing to do that? I don't think -- I don't know what is the message behind it means?

So we leave it to Jorge to come back to that. Please retain the original one, and second, I -- once to after the old regions, and that continued discussions during the implementation work between the concerned parties such as GAC, and so on and so forth be explored, be explored but still we want to have discussion within GAC, GNSO, ICANN Board, ICANN org. Who will do that? Someone from the sky? Who is the

facilitator?

So either we delete this sentence and not saying that after that continued discussions during the implementation work between so and so, will need to be take place to increase the number of applicants. So I think that we have to delete that part and saying that every effort should be made to increase the number of the applicant from underrepresented region, so in summary, my suggestion is that Fabian, please, after regions delete -- take and that continued discussions during the implementation work between GAC, GNSO and so on and so forth.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Just a second. Just a second, yeah, until Fabian is.

IRAN: Yeah, and continue that. Yeah. Okay the no, no, not totally. Takes place, after takes place. Please delete that.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Let's put in brackets.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yeah, I --

JORGE CANCIO: And beyond that just to comment. I don't have strong feelings, but I think that everyone with some experience in the ICANN community should know what IRT is, an implementation review team, and an implementation work, so that is what we were referring to, but if Kavouss can't live with that text, of course we can delete it.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So let me read the text as it stands on the screen now relative to applicant support program GAC [inaudible] diverse array of applicants from all regions and that every effort be made to increase the number of applications from underrepresented regions.

Is this good for everyone? I see no requests for the floor so I'll continue. Some GAC members also reiterated the GAC support to proposals to reduce or eliminate on going GAC registry is to expand financial support.

If we are good with this paragraph, and I urge everybody to mute please -- I'll go to the following paragraph regarding closed generics.

GAC members noted support for the proposed suspension of closed genetic TLD applications until policy recommendations and/or a

framework on the delegation of closed generics which serve a public interest are developed, as per the at large minority statement.

Some GAC members drew the attention of the Board and the community to the GAC consensus comment object the SubPro draft final report which elaborates and adds substance to the Beijing GAC advice on closed generics. Any comments? Kavouss, please.

IRAN: [Inaudible].

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I'm sorry Kavouss, we cannot hear you properly, I'm sorry.

IRAN: Can you hear me now.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: No, not yet.

IRAN: I don't know what happened.

GULTEN TEPE: Kavouss, there is still static on your line. And we can always dial out to you if you like.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So meanwhile any comments on this paragraph until we are able to bring Kavouss --

IRAN: It's okay, do you hear me now.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, loud and clear.

IRAN: Yeah, thank you. With respect to the previous paragraph the reduction of the fee I would like to add some word between the 2. If you go back to that paragraph previous paragraph when you say reduction of the fee.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Can we scroll up a bit, please?

IRAN: Yeah, some GAC members.

[Voices speaking simultaneously]

IRAN: I think before some GAC members we should add in this connection that this connection of the underrepresented in this connection some GAC members -- so on and so forth. I'm asking the question, does other GAC members object that this fee should be reduced? If that is the case I have no problem.

But I thought that for the underrepresented regions, maybe everybody agree that the -- if possible fee should be reduced to encourage them to have [inaudible] the previous round that Africa only few below 10 and some other has hundreds so I don't know. Much I leave it to who are Jorge to see whether still we need some GAC members.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kavouss. Any objection to Kavouss's proposal to delete the word some. With the new addition it reads in this connection GAC members also reiterated the GAC support to proposals to reduce or

eliminate on going ICANN registry piece to expand financial support.

I see Jorge is fine. Saying he's fine with the amendment in the chat so back to the registry close generics paragraph and it reads back members noted support for the proposed suspension of closed generic TLD applications until policy recommendations and or a framework on the delegation of closed generics which serve -- which serve a public interest are developed.

As per the at large minority statement. Some GAC members drew the attention of the Board and the community to the GAC consensus comment on the SubPro draft final report which elaborates and adds substance to the Beijing GAC advice on closed generics so any comments or this? Kavouss, is this a new hand?

IRAN: Yes, it's a new hand. I think we need to have some slight changes to this paragraph. When we say --

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Please, go ahead.

IRAN: Yeah, okay, framework on the delegation of closed generic, which sends a public interest are developed, as per the at large -- so we don't need first of all to go to the some GAC members in the Beijing because the public interest is already in the Beijing and we do not want to have a double reference to that.

So we limit to the public interest which is already in the Beijing GAC. If you want to do that we say that public interest as referred to in GAC advice in Beijing communique. But not with some. As referred to or as contained after public interest, as contained in the GAC advice in Beijing community.

But because I'm always very -- I would say susceptible with some because you may get division. I'm not in favor of polarization I'm in favor of unit but not polarization so either you don't mention anything about the Beijing communique or you mention that after public interest, as contained or as referred to in the GAC advice in Beijing communique or developed.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. So proposal is to delete the last sentence, which starts with the word some? And take the reference to the Beijing advice after the public interest right?

IRAN: Yes.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay so can you repeat you said as, as --

IRAN: As contained or as referred to in GAC advice in Beijing community -- in Beijing communique excuse me. In Beijing communique, yes. And then for the policy, I have -- the implementation I have another text to add.

Until policy recommendation are developed with consensus because policy may be developed without consensus.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Well --

IRAN: After develop or develop with consensus, or by consensus because we don't want that they develop a policy or close [indiscernible] without consensus, so we need to have consensus.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: All very good suggestions, Kavouss. I'm just worried that the sentence became very long and very complicated so -- maybe we can try to read it again and see how we can simplify.

IRAN: I can simplify that as referred to in the advice of GAC Beijing communique put it at the end. See also GAC advice in Beijing communique.

Yeah, put it at the end of the sentence, yeah. Please Fabian pick up, yeah, as referred to, and cut and put it at the end of the sentence after full stop. See also GAC advice in -- I think communique, that is another way to make it shorter thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kavouss. Jorge, sorry to keep you waiting. Go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you so much, Manal. I'm starting to wonder a little bit if we should next time perhaps ask Kavouss to write these sections of the communique because it would perhaps be more purposeful, and more efficient.

But beyond that, I don't think this this new sentence see advice in the

GAC Beijing communique so I would delete it. Because it's a reference that we don't need to make in that fashion, and I'm not very sure or what the reason is to delete the last sentence because the GAC consensus comment we filed in -- on the SubPro draft final report really adds substance to the discussion, and goes beyond what the Beijing advice said, and now it's the right time to draw the attention of the Board on that consensus comment we made in September.

So that when they consider the lack of of recommendation from the subsequent procedures working group and the GNSO, they see that the GAC has added some thinking on what we had advised in 2013, so I would really beg to put it at least in square brackets and seek some friendly amendment as we have been proposing from all sides, from Kavouss if he has any specific issue with that sentence. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jorge, and Kavouss, thank you.

IRAN: Thank you very much. I have no problem to delete see also GAC advice Beijing. Delete that one. My problem is the following sense is some. If you remove some and saying that GAC members also consider or noted I have no difficulty. My problem is some.

Some is uncountable number of person or entity. One, 2, some others.

Before several and before many and before overwhelming majority. I have always difficulty with the word some.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay, I can see.

IRAN: If you can change that I have no problem but I don't want that to -- my distinguished friend Jorge says I have to spend my lifetime on the midnight to write something I'm saying it you don't take it I don't agree with the text.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I see Jorge agreeing, Kavouss, so Jorge agreed to delete the word some. Of course if nobody has a problem, so in absence of any objections let's delete the word some, and Nigel I'm not very clear about the comment, sorry maybe I read it late.

Agree we should probably not be specific to all advice. Does this mean you're proposing to delete the reference to the Beijing advice? I'm sorry.

NIGEL HICKSON: No, it was just referencing to the Beijing advice much the point that was before us so yeah, I'm sorry about that. It was just in reference I think we should be descriptive here on not have to cite previous advice but it's not a big point.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. No, it's okay. Thank you very much. Let's move to the following paragraph. We have I think 3 minutes remaining before the break. Many so let's try to at least finish this section. Oh it's long -- so on GAC early warnings GAC advice some members continue to harbor concerns about the PDP working group's proposed removal of language in the 2012 Applicant Guide Book which notes that GAC consensus advice will create "will create a strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application should not be approved" while others considered that such language is not supported by the current ICANN bylaws.

Some GAC members proposed to recall the compromise language presented by the GAC for recommendation 30.67 as it may not always be possible for an applicant to address a specific concern expressed in a GAC early warning. So, Kavouss I assume this is a new hand.

IRAN: Yes, it's a new hand to simplify the text I don't think that we need to quote or site the 2 parts of the discussions. Some say this, some say

that. We should just say the last part.

And put it in the sentence in an appropriate part to say that with respect to the recommendation and so on and so forth. Taking the possible GAC -- language presented by GAC. So delete the part that while some I other considers so -- I think we have to change that because there is no sense to quote what was discussed at the meeting.

It makes sense that we believe that the [indiscernible] we used or presented should be considered. So we may refer to that on the GAC early warning [indiscernible] GAC advice some GAC members continue to [indiscernible] after -- delete everything and send that taking the language of the proposed by GAC so after -- in the first slide after some.

Pick up everything until the proposed language presented by GAC. Go down please, up to proposed language. Yeah, yeah that one, and continue that one please, yeah you can take up to here.

Yeah, so -- what I am saying distinguished chair is we need not to quote the 2 sides of discussion, we should just refer to the recommendation, and ask that our compromised language need to be considered. Is it possible, Jorge, to do that? Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Go ahead Jorge. I see your hand is up.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you, Manal, and thank you Kavouss. I'm afraid that the 2 sentences refer to different parts of the recommendations.

The first sentence refers to a 34 which is the one related will create a strong presumption and where we have seen all along the last year that we have 2 schools of thought, in the GAC with some having concerns with the deletion of that language from the Applicant Guide Book -- which is what the subsequent procedures working group is proposing -- while some other GAC members agree with this deletion, or at least have no objection to it because they consider that that language about the strong presumption is not supported or has no basis in the ICANN bylaws.

So that's one piece of the discussion, and the completely different part of the discussion is recommendation 36, which refers to a recommendation where the GAC where it is implied that an applicant will always be able to address the concerns expressed by the GAC or by some GAC members or by individual GAC member in early warning, and where we, as GAC in our GAC consensus input to the public comment in if September 2020 proposed compromised language, which would specify that not -- this possibility will not always exist, not always an applicant will be able to address the concerns if those concerns are, for

instance, of a fundamental character regarding the string which is applied for, and, of course, again, to understand this one has to bear in mind the GAC scorecard, and all the precedents we cannot mix up 2 sentences which relate to different things. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jorge. I also see Luisa in the chat agreeing that it is important to be accurate in the communique text. And keep the [indiscernible] text of some or other GAC members to reflect the variety of opinions in the GAC.

We have done that in if previous GAC communique, and also in the last GAC input into the SubPro public comments. And so I hope, Kavouss, you can live with the text as it stands on the screen. I see your hand is up.

IRAN: Yes, I cannot live with that. It doesn't make any sense we mentioned the 2 sides of the issue. What you want to say here? You want to say that we have different views? What does it mean in communique? In the statement or whatever? Important -- I, I understand now Jorge that the last part some GAC members with respect to 36 is a different issue.

We could put it in a different issue, and I come to that later on but was the usefulness Jorge saying that we are divided in that. And what do

you expect from this? Our communique say that we are divided community? What does it means?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So maybe -- and I see already Finn processing this as well Denmark maybe we can try to see if we delete 30.4, but keep 30.6 the reference to 30.6?

IRAN: For 30.6 I have another suggestion. For 30.6 we start before some GAC members saying that in regard with recommendation 30.6 and they continued discussions I have no problem.

Separate that from the previous so on and so forth and then the first part also start in record to 30.4. We try to separate the 2 issues in one paragraph. I have no difficulty but my question again with respect to the first part, quoting 2 sides of the discussion, what is the usefulness of that? What does one get from that? Is it --

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: And I see Luisa in the chat says this part is a summary of our discussions during that the GAC had on SubPro GAC sessions and I also see Jorge's hand up, so Jorge?

JORGE CANCIO:

Thank you, Manal. I think we we have been following here a standard practice within the GAC on this part of the communique where we synthesize the discussions within the GAC, and this is very useful for the rest of the community so they have a sense of what specific issues are of interest, are of concern to the GAC, and it's also standard practice sometimes, I'm a bit surprised that this is now put in question -- that whenever there is an important question discussed within the GAC, and we have different opinions we use this style of language of some consider this, and some consider that.

So we have been following that standard practice but of course we are in hands of -- in the hands of the membership. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Jorge. We are already 7 minutes past the hour. I have the U.S. Kavouss. I'm assuming this is on old hand.

If not, I will get back to you but let's see the U.S. and we need to conclude the session. I didn't think that issues of importance to the GAC would take so much time in terms of discussion. I thought the substantial discussion would be on the advice part but anyway. Susan, please go ahead.

UNITED STATES: Thank you, Manal. And thank you, Jorge, for making that observation. With which we agree, just very briefly, I wanted to add to the second part of that first sentence an expression that indicates that we think that the language -- or the Applicant Guide Book should be consistent with the bylaws.

So if there's a way to add some text that, that communicates that idea I think it would be useful.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Sorry, I missed this Susan if you can repeat please which --

UNITED STATES: Sorry, I'm looking at GAC early warnings. GAC advice I see where Fabian he just had his curser at the end of that sentence, yes, while others consider that such language is not supported by the current ICANN bylaws.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Uh-huh.

UNITED STATES: And that the Applicant Guide Book should be consistent with the ICANN bylaws or that -- yes.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So let me try to read it now. I think it's becoming very long. I don't oppose to the addition but on GAC early warnings GAC advice in regard to recommendation 30.4 some GAC members continue to harbor concerns about the PDP working group's proposed removal of language in the 2012 Applicant Guide Book which notes that GAC consensus advice quotes will create a strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application should not be approved, and "while others consider that such language is not supported by the current ICANN bylaws, and that the Applicant Guide Book should be consistent with ICANN bylaws.

Any objections to the current formulation and then in regard to recommendation 30.6 some GAC members proposed to recall the compromised language presented by GAC as it may not always be possible for an applicant to address the specific concerns expressed in a GAC early warning. Kavouss, is this a new hand?

IRAN: Yes, I just wanted to sake of the time I agree with this suggestion. I am not happy but I agree with that provided that you also deal with the 2 paragraph remaining that we go to break.

When we start GAC members discussed potential next step. So take the 2 other paragraph because I have some other commitment and I have to deal with this, if everybody agree to deal with this 2 paragraph which are simple. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, and also in reaction to Kavouss's comment the fact we don't agree on every comment on of the SubPro does not necessarily mean the GAC is divided. We can show diversity. Thank you Vincent.

So I think we need to take a break now, and do we need to be -- we are supposed to be back at 1430 Cancun time, 1930UTC, so 15 minute break or 17 minute break I hope would do the magic and we can refresh and come back more energy to progress. Thank you, everyone.

GULTEN TEPE: Thank you, Manal, and a reminder we will be using the same Zoom room so you may remain on the line.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]