

---

ICANN71 | Virtual Policy Forum - GAC Communique Drafting (3 of 4)  
Wednesday, June 16, 2021 - 16:30 to 17:30 CEST

DEVAN REED: Thank you. Welcome back to the ICANN71 GAC communique drafting session on Wednesday 16 June 2021 at 14:30 UTC. When speaking, please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English. Please speak clearly and slowly into your microphone to allow for accurate interpretation and also make sure to mute all your other devices.

I would like to leave the floor the GAC Chair, Manal Ismail.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Devan, and thank you everybody for being back on time for our third drafting session of the communique, and the last session of the day. So it was a long day. Thank you for being there. I hope we have the text on CCT and I think we have pending 2 things. The text under CCT review, and the last paragraph under accuracy.

Maybe we can confirm the accuracy part quickly and then review the CCT? So any comments on the accuracy text? The last

---

**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.**

---

paragraph now reads so, I'm sorry, Fabian, if you can -- okay we -- please correct me if I'm wrong but the final text reads as follows. In this context the GAC supports the prompt launch of the accuracy scoping exercise by the GNSO and would request to take part in it. Together with other interested constituencies to bring in the different perspectives on the issue. We support the view that the scope of work on accuracy should not limit itself to compliance with GDPR and should include the accuracy of all domain name registration data. Any comments?

Seeing none, then maybe we can accept the changes. And instead of me, I agree with Denmark, thank you, Finn. Maybe we can replace we by the GAC in the last sentence, which we normally do. And thanks for the confirmation, Nigel, as well. Now moving to the CCT part and echoing what Susan U.S. has typed in the chat thanking European Commission and U.K. for collaborating, so thanks to everybody. On CCT we are now under issues of importance for the GAC, which part is this I'm sorry? Or this is the old text?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Correct, Manal, this is the text we've received via e-mail, that we've reflected here. Maybe we should start with reading the new text for the full advice, so this is where everything originates and

---

then maybe we come to the issues of importance to the GAC for the remainder part.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. Makes sense. Thank you, Fabian. So under CCT -- under follow up on previous GAC advice we have now the text under CCT reading as follows. The GAC wishes to recalling its ICANN66 Montreal consensus advice on CCT review and subsequent rounds of new gTLDs section 5... and in light of the constructive discussions which took place with the Board and the wider ICANN community at ICANN71 as well as the GAC follow up advice from ICANN70 namely in paragraph 1 of section 6, and considering the Board scorecard there on dated 12th of May, 2021, draws the attention of the Board to the related suggestions referred to under section issues of importance to the GAC, of this communique.

Any comments? I very much appreciate the efforts in keeping this part... and in reference of previous GAC advice, so thanks to all who contributed, Jorge, Susan, Nigel, Luisa, and Anna, everybody thanks. I hope I didn't miss anyone.

And so the rest of the text goes under issues of importance to the GAC. If we scroll up again. And the text reads the GAC observed challenges in tracking the implementation of those CCT

---

recommendations that the Board had passed onto different parts of the community, including the GNSO, welcomed the proposal from the GNSO council liaison to the GAC to request a briefing with GNSO to discuss exactly how they have addressed the CCT-RT recommendations. It didn't read well to me. Maybe I misread it, but I think it is agreed text. We need to at "and welcomed"? Okay yes please do. And welcomed the proposal from the GNSO. Thanks Luisa.

In addition regarding further work related to the ICANN66 Montreal consensus advice on CCT review and subsequent round of new gTLD, section 5.1.A the GAC would welcome the Board to undertake the following. To start facilitating before ICANN72 discussions with the ICANN org, GNSO, GAC and other interested AC's and SO's on the establishment of a comprehensive and interactive tracking tool which would include the ongoing status of the CCT recommendations, specified in the ICANN70 GAC follow up advice, and to facilitate work between the Board, ICANN org, GNSO, GAC and other interested ACs and SOs to ensure implementation to the extent feasible of the following recommendations with respect to existing gTLDs, and gTLDs introduced through any subsequent application process.

And the listing of recommendations, number 5, collection of secondary market data, 9 costs of defensive registrations.

---

Number 12 cost incentives regarding new gTLD Iran for good actors, 14, contractual changes to provide incentives to adopt a proactive anti-abuse measures. 15 contractual changes in preventing systemic use of specific registrars or registries for DNS computer abuse. 17, identification of chain of parties responsible for gTLD domain name registrations and 31 pro bono assistance program. So I think also in recommending number 14 we need incentives to be in small letters, and thanks to support staff for their other things.

I'm stopping here to see if there are any comments, and truly appreciate the collaborative efforts in dividing the text between issues of importance to the GAC and follow up on previous GAC advice.

There are further texts below that is proposed to be moved as footnotes. And it reads concerning the above recommendations, number 5, 17, and 31 are currently under consideration by organize while 9 and 12 were addressed to the GNSO in the light of the SubPro PDP. I think -- so if it is going to be a footnote, or are we keeping it as notes here? I'm sorry, I see Nigel's hand up and then Fabian, by I think we need to be consistent. I feel they are not following the same language. Anyway, Nigel, please, U.K., go ahead.

---

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thank you very much, Manal, and thank you colleagues for you know the drafting. I think we are in a good place. Thank you.

I mean, depending on what the what the sort of protocol is I think these would look fairly good as notes rather than as a footnote now. They would have been a footnote in the advice section, but I think in issues of importance we've had more flexibility and we could prance rephrase them as notes but that's just a session. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Nigel, and indeed we have all the flexibility under issues of importance to the GAC and if you agree maybe, we can title it as the GAC notes that, and then we list our understanding of the status of the different recommendations but I don't have a strong position, so employees feel free to push back. And Fabian your hand is up, please.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Sorry, your discussion responded to the question I had about where we would plug those notes. Thank you.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much. Nigel, is there a new hand? Okay seems not it's okay the okay so it now read the GAC notes concerning the above recommendations number 5, and 17 and 31 are currently under -- so let me propose this I'm sorry. Maybe concerning the above recommendations the GAC notes, and then we start -- yeah. Again, no strong position. I'm just trying to -- and no change on meaning, I hope.

I'm just trying to make it read better and please feel free to confirm or oppose concerning the above recommendations the GAC notes recommendations 5, 17 and 31 are currently under consideration by ICANN.org while 9, 12, and 12 were addressed to the -- in light of the -- I believe SubPro PDP. And maybe also a comma between 5 and 17 but not necessarily. Then moving to the following one I think we can say and again feel free to comment as well. Recommendations 5, 14 and 15 are identified in the scorecard, let's paste it here okay -- as pending with the following explanations. I hope this makes sense.

And then moving forward we have number 5 the Board understands that ICANN org is continuing with preparatory implementation planning for ... along with other data collection recommendations, 14 and 15 the Board had directed ICANN org to facilitate community efforts to develop a definition of abuse, to

---

inform further action on this recommendation, the Board has continued to follow the community's discussions on this, and other aspects of DNS abuse mitigation, including the recommendations from the SSR2 review team and the recently issued advice from the SSAC.

So I'll stop here. Again, with many thanks to everyone who contributed, and see if there are any comments. Okay. Seeing none, Fabian, anything specific that we need to tackle, and thank you Luisa for confirming the text on the screen.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Manal, this is Fabian speaking. May I suggest that we take a look starting from the top all the way to the bottom and identify section that is have been reviewed and section that need confirmation. We have a few in sub standings contribution I believe in a few places.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Sure, we can make a complete read-out if we are done with everything else, we still have time, so -- we read this before, I'm sorry, okay, okay then I'm in your hands. Which parts need to be confirmed?

---

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Sorry, I was checking on my end. So if you scroll down to -- community and community engagement we've covered everything. Internal matters. I believe we have confirmed everything for GAC operational matters. I just want to confirm that so section 5 of the internal matters we have clarified that the GAC was briefed by the GAC support team, so this is just to highlight, and this will happen tomorrow obviously, but the clarification as requested earlier.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you for flagging. Yes, I think we are good to accept this please if you have any objection raise your hand or if you have any comment. And I see no requests for the floor so -- we can move on.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Then I believe we are complete on DNS abuse, subsequent round of new gTLDs -- sorry on constituent round of new gTLDs we have made a staff edit to clarify in the third paragraph do you see here? References the... from the GNSO council to the GAC. I would suggest again a clerical edit.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yeah, and thank you for flagging this. I think this text has been incorporated under CCT recommendations. But I understand to be and... we have already incorporated this under CCTRT so maybe we can delete it from the subsequent round. Thank you very much Fabian for that reminder as well. Any comments? Okay. Let's keep moving.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: The accuracy section of issues of importance I believe was also confirmed earlier, you read the last paragraph in the final reading. EPDP faced two -- has been confirmed we added -- I just wanted to flag -- in the second paragraph a reference a footnote that clarifies the origin, the source of the quotes and you see it in the footnote there. That's the -- a reference to the to page 5 financial sustainability in the GAC minority statement on... with the date and URL.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Uh-huh. Just a second. I see a comment from Nigel in the chat asking about nonpublic, okay.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: I've just made the edit on the slide much it was on the first line.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Of section 4. Then on EPDP page 2A we had made some edits that I think you had approved in if reference to the policy ... staff that contributed to the EPDP Phase 2A deliberations as a support team.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Then CCT review recommendations I believe we have just confirmed, and that will be in the last edit here†-- IGO protection in GAC consensus vice to the Board. This was reviewed earlier. And then the 3 section followed previous advice and CCT recommendations policy, and [inaudible] and all those were reviewed as well.

Manal, we are not aware of other pending suggestion or issue.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much, Fabian, and thank you very much everybody for your collaboration. So I'm just wondering whether we make a full read of the communique and conclude it now, or -- and release the session tomorrow, or conclude early today, and make a full read of the communique during the session tomorrow, but first I see Benedetta's hand up. Benedetta please go ahead.

BENEDETTA ROSSI: Thank you, Manal. It was just to flag that there had been a comment about re-ordering the issues in importance to the GAC for the flow to have new rounds of gTLDs first followed by I believe DNS abuse and then accuracy. So I think that was one small pending item.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Benedetta, for flagging. So in the -- if we can fix the order.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Manal, this is Fabian speaking to confirm that we have done that.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I'm sorry I was distracted by the chat Fabian. Please can you please repeat.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: We confirm the re-ordering of the issues of importance was just completed.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay thanks. So just seeing Jorge in the chat in favor of a full reading now and release the session tomorrow which is normally a holdback. Indeed. So tomorrow's session is always scheduled if needed, so I'll make a full read of the communique now, and this would release tomorrow's communique drafting session. And I've been reminded to read slowly. I hope I keep an appropriate pace of reading the text. Please bear with my slowness. So this is GAC communique, ICANN71 Virtual Policy Forum. The GAC ICANN71 communique was drafted and agreed remotely during the ICANN71 Virtual Policy 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 a virtual meeting. No objections were raised during the agreed time-frame before publication and this

---

is to be confirmed when time comes. Introduction, under introduction we have the governmental advisory committee, GAC, of the Internet corporation for assigned names and numbers, ICANN, met via remote participation from 14 to 17 June 2021. Per ICANN Board resolution on 11 March 2021 in response to the public health emergency of international concern posed by the global outbreak of COVID-19, ICANN71 was transitioned from an in person meeting in the Hague Netherlands to a remote participation only ICANN meeting.

Ex GAC members and ex GAC -- and ex observers attended the meeting, and we will be inserting the figures.

The GAC meeting was conducted as part of the ICANN71 Virtual Policy Forum. GAC plenary and working group sessions were conducted as open meetings. Under interconstituency activities and community engagement first we have our meeting with the Board, the GAC met with ICANN Board and discussed subsequent rounds of new gTLDs, introduce, CCT and SSR2 recommendations. Registration data, WHOIS, GDPR matters. ICANN return to in-person meetings. Board responses to GAC questions and statements presented during the meeting are available in -- if we can scroll. Thank you.

---

In the transcript of the GAC ICANN Board meeting accompanying this document. And the transcripts of this meeting will be attached to the communique. Meeting with the at large advisory committee ALAC, the GAC met with members of the ALAC and discussed subsequent round and procedures for new gTLDs. Register straight data services. Potential future committee collaborations including Internet governor man's, DNS abuse and ATRT3. This will take place tomorrow morning if anything emerges you will be notified on the changes of the agenda.

Meeting with the generic names supporting organization the GAC met with members of the GNSO and discussed follow up to ICANN70, EPDP and SSAD and Phase 2A. Accuracy and DNS a Guos and CCT review and GNSO... subsequent procedures of new gTLDs and or issues coming out of GNSO council.

Then cross-community discussions. GAC members participated in relevant cross-community sessions scheduled as part of ICANN71 including impact of regulatory developments on ICANN policy topics. ICANN's multi-stakeholder model within the Internet governance ecosystem. Understanding representation block lifts on the post -- future of ICANN public meetings. And the last 2 will take place tomorrow. In -- under internal matters, first we have the GAC membership reporting on the GAC meant ship. Text reads, there are currently 179 GAC member states and

---

territories and 38 observer organizations. Under GAC elections, the 2021 election process for vice chairs will be initiated shortly after the ICANN71 meeting.

The initial nomination period will close on 9 September 2021. If needed a voting process will be conducted until 24th of October 2021, during the ICANN72 public meeting. After which time the election results would be announced, and then more information on the election will be provided during the wrap-up session tomorrow.

Future GAC meetings. GAC members discussed ICANN planning for a return to in-person meetings, including the option of conducting hybrid meetings, combining in person and virtual participation at ICANN72. ICANN org staff reported on the preliminary results of a recent survey of previous ICANN public meeting... regarding the possibilities of and the conditions under way the hybrid ICANN72 meeting would be conducted.

While there appears to be substantial interest in a return to in person public meeting GAC members expressed the need to ensure that any transition practice to in-person meetings ensure a level of preparedness... from all around the globe and that considerations be made to assure virtual capabilities, much it is considered that the virtual pandemic experience has forged

---

positive meeting innovations and that all future ICANN public meetings will essentially be hybrid rather than purely physical gatherings. Under GAC working groups we have the GAC Public Safety Working Group if we can scroll, please.

The GAC PSWG continued its work to combat DNS abuse, and promote effective access to domain name registration data. The PSWG lend a session to update the... to include, 1, a detailed review of joint work by the PSWG and registry stakeholder group, develop a framework on domain generated algorithms. Associated with botnets and malware. 2, representation from the messaging malware and mobile anti-abuse working group on the results of a survey of -- service providers to understand how ICANN's... of the specification has impacted access to domain name registration data and anti-abuse work. And 3, representation from Japan on complete steps for ICANN compliance.

The PSWG also highlighted its continued focus on DNS abuse discussing possible steps forward which include, assessing how contract provisions may be improved response to the end of DNS abuse. The PSWG continued its active participation to support the GAC small group towards the development of EPDP Phase 2A recommendations on the treatment of data from legal entities, and ... in gTLD registration data services. The PSWG also signaled

---

its intent to contribute to the scoping efforts on generation data accuracy -- and registration data accuracy, and to store highlighting policy efforts. Members of the PSWG continue to support the GAC in if the implementation review team, Jorge is one of the EPDP.

In addition the PSWG noted that collecting data and requiring the publication of the chain of parties responsible for gTLD domain name registrations, her CCT recommendation 17 would benefit -- and others that rely on domain name registration data for their investigations by more precisely identifying the entity WIPO assesses the relevant registrant data.

During ICANN71 the PSWG held discussions with ICANN org including representatives of the office of the chief technology officer, the security stability resiliency team. Strategic initiatives department, and contractual compliance, the security and stability advisory committee the at large advisory committee. Registry and registrant stakeholder groups and the GNSO commercial stakeholder group. GAC operational matters were upped GAC operational numbers the text reads the GAC was briefed by the GAC support team on a number of operational matters design to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of GAC operations gunman. An update on implementation of the

---

recently launched GAC action delegations radar tool which launched in May 2021.

Additional, GAC introductory Republicans being planned and an update to the GAC website scheduled for July 2021. And as Fabian mentioned earlier, GAC support staff will be providing further information on this tomorrow at the wrap-up as well. Moving to issues of importance to the GAC, first we have subsequent rounds of new builds, and the text reads, the GAC discussed subsequent rounds of new gTLDs. Focusing on key topics and messages praised by GAC members in the selective GAC comment to the subsequent procedures for new gTLDs. Final output to the ICANN Board public comment proceeding.

Goran Marby, ICANN CEO, provided an introduction on the next round of new gTLDs noting that enhancing competition and enhancing opportunities for all Internet users to have their own identifiers is part of ICANN's mission and duty. The operational design phase ODP was presented by ICANN org, and the expected ODP scope for SubPro which is in the process of being finalized by ICANN org prior to ICANN Board review.

GAC members discussed potential next steps for the GAC to consider including call for volunteers to serve on the operational design phase for SubPro as part of the community consultation

---

process, and potential GAC consensus advice to the ICANN Board before it votes on the SubPro PDP final report.

Next under issues of importance to the GAC is DNS abuse. DNS abuse mitigation remains a priority for the GAC. The GAC recognizes the collaborative efforts taking place within the ICANN community to develop voluntary mechanisms to address DNS abuse, such as the framework on domain generating algorithms associated with malware and botnets and appreciates the efforts from all parties within the multi-stakeholder community to identify opportunities for advancement on the topic of DNS abuse when and where possible.

The GAC acknowledged the importance of ensuring that registries and registrars comply with ICANN contractual obligations. At the same time we continue to e-mail -- I think this needs to be the GAC -- continues to emphasize the need to develop and implement improved contract provisions with clear and enforceable obligations to better address DNS abuse before further expanding the route through any subsequent application round for new gTLDs. Improvements to the measurement attribution and reporting of abuse are also much needed and the GAC will continue to closely follow developments within the community related to her work to any such improvements.

---

Under accuracy the GAC would like to reiterate that maintaining accurate on complete domain name registration data is an important element in the prevention and mitigation of DNS abuse. The GAC gives -- the GAC gives therefore particular importance to the verification, validation and collection of all registration data by registries and registrars in line with their contractual obligations and supports vigorous monitoring and enforcement of such contractual obligations by ICANN. The GAC will continue to contribute actively to the work on an accuracy within the ICANN community in an attempt to address the public policy concerns related to inaccurate domain registration data in a timely and effective manner.

In this context the GAC supports the prompt launch of the case scoping exercise by the GNSO and would request to take part in it together with other interested constituencies to bring in the different perspectives on the issue. The GAC supports the view that the scope of work on accuracy should not limit itself to compliance with GDPR and should include the accuracy of all domain name registration data. Fourth under issues of importance for the GAC is EPDP Phase 2ODP.

Regarding the critical issue of how to centrally handle requests for nonpublic registration data the GAC notes with interest the upcoming requests for the information, with regard to the

---

operational design phase ODP. The ODP is an assessment intended to help inform the Board deliberations on whether the Phase 2 recommendations of a system for standardized access and disclosure SSAD are in the best interests of the ICANN community. This assessment aims to determine the feasibility and associated risks, costs and resources required in the potential implementation of SSAD.

... the RFI would seek information in order to assess among other things the range of costs related to identity and other verification services and the level of effort for system designed development and operations of the SSAD.

The GAC welcomes this development because of the risk that the Phase 2 recommendations could create a system that is PRM that is expensive for the users for which it is intended including SSAD users that investigate and combat cybersecurity threats. The GAC would support a financial sustainability model which ensures that the SSAD is accessible to all categories of users for which it is intended.

I'm just checking, does the first sentence read well? Okay. Then moving to EPDP Phase 2A, the GAC welcomes the publication of the initial report of the temporary specifications for gTLD registration data Phase 2A expedited policy pro's EPDP and

---

acknowledges the efforts of the participants leadership, and policy teams there.

In developing these recommendations under a streamlined schedule of under six months this initial report contains useful guidance on the proposed methods and safeguards to publish one registration data from legal entities which is not protected under the GDPR and 2 analyze registration or registrant-based e-mail address. The GAC notes that the voluntary nature of the proposed guidance may not sufficient PLI address the issues considered in the expedited policy development process.

The GAC anticipates submitting a public comment on this important issue, on these important issues, and looks forward to GAC's continued participation in the work of the Phase 2A team. And finally under CCT review implementation, the GAC observed challenges in tracking the implementation of... CCT recommendations that the Board had pass today different parts of the community including the GNSO and welcomed the proposal for the GNSO council liaison to the GAC to request a briefing with GNSO to discuss exactly how they have addressed the CCT-RT recommendations.

In addition, regarding further work-related to the ICANN66 Montreal consensus advice on CCT -- on CCT review and

---

subsequent rounds of new gTLDs section 5.1.5 the GAC would welcome the Board to understand the following. To start facilitating before ICANN72 discussions with ICANN org, GNSO -- other interested AC's and SO's on the establishment of an interactive tracking tool which would include the ongoing status of the CCT recommendations specified in the ICANN70 GAC follow up advice.

And second, to facilitate work between the Board ICANN org, GNSO, GAC and other interested ACs and SO's to ensure implementation of the implementation to the extend feasible of the following recommendations with respect to existing gTLDs and gTLDs introduced through any subsequent application process. And the list of recommendations include number 5 collection of secondary market data. 9, costs of defense of registrations. 12, costs of incentives regarding new gTLD round for good actors. 14, contractual changes to provide incentives to adopt proactive anti-abuse measures. 15, contractual changes in preventing systemic use of specific registrars or registration for DNS security abuse. 17, identification of chain of parties responsible for gTLD domain name registrations, and 13, pro bono assistance programs. Concerning the above recommendations the GAC notes recommendations --

---

GULTEN TEPE: Manal, before moving on to the next section a quick reminder for our interpreters. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. I'm sorry, I, I will try to slow down more. I know it's a tough session, that of the communique, and apologies to interpreters, so I'll try to slow down.

Concerning the above recommendations... the GAC notes first on recommendations 5, 17 and 31 are currently under consideration by ICANN org, while 9 and 12 were addressed to the GNSO in the light of the SubPro PDP. Recommendations 5, 14, and 15 are identified in the scorecard as pending with the following explanations.

Number 5, the Board understands that ICANN org is continuing with preparatory implementation planning for number 5 along with other data collection recommendations. Number 14 and 15, the Board has directed ICANN org to facilitate community efforts to develop a definition of abuse, to inform further action on these recommendations -- on this recommendation, the Board has continued to flow -- to follow the community's discussion on this, and other aspects of introduce mitigation. Including the recommendations from the SSR... and the recently issued advice

---

from the SSAC. And I'm just reading next in the chat, if you can keep the text, please. Did we not agree to use the word to the extent possible instead of feasible? Indeed, thank you, Finn.

Okay. Noted and corrected. Thank you very much, Finn. Then moving to GAC consensus advice to ICANN Board. The following items of advice from the GAC to the Board have been reached on the basis of consensus as defined in the ICANN bylaws. IGO protections and the text reads, are while continuing to welcome, work being undertaken by the gaining... in terms of a curative rights mechanism the GAC wishes to clarify that the current moratorium on the registration of IGO should remain in place pending a conclusion to such curative work track.

Accordingly, the GAC advises the Board to maintain the current moratorium on the registration of IGO acronyms pending the conclusion of the IGO curative work track currently under way, noting that it is expected to conclude within the calendar year, and under rationale, in the context of the above-mentioned curative rights work track, in if the ICANN70 communicates the GAC had recalled ICANN agreement on a moratorium for new registrations of IGO acronyms ahead after final resolution of this curative rights protection issue.

---

The GAC does not share the Board's view in its June 2, 2021 e-mail that the GAC's concern about the need to protect IGOs on a permanent basis is addressed by the Board's determination to provide IGO with forced notification registration system on a permanent ongoing basis. The GAC does not share the Board's assessment that such notification would allow an IGO to take appropriate action to protect related action items.

In the absence of access to a curative rights protection mechanism a notification is -- no, the utility because an IGO has no current ability to arbitrate a domain name dispute. The GAC previously has advised the Board to maintain current temporary protections of IGO acronyms in the panel and some communique. Noting in the San Juan communique that the removal of interim protections before an important decision on IGO acronym protection is taken that could result in irreparable harm to IGOs. With an example of a curative mechanism.

And I just see two hashes after Panama and San Juan. Is there something to be inserted here and also reading Nigel in the chat, should it be this rather than such in third line of IGO advice? So if we... third line of IGO advice, I'm sorry, I'm lost. Can we put the cursor on such -- I can't find such in the third line.

---

SPEAKER: Sorry, Manal, at the start of the text there.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay, sorry. Noted conclusion, and we have Brian in session so please, Brian, let us know if replacing such would -- by this is okay and also reading Brian in the chat saying those hashtags were a place holder for the particular ICANN meeting number. So please if we can mark them, yellow highlight them yellow and we can insert the ICANN meeting thanks for the confirmation Brian, and Jorge is suggesting dissent instead of this or such if we can scroll up again.

So third line in the paragraph. The conclusion to the same curative work track. Nigel and Brian, is this okay? I hope it is. Okay. So Brian is flexible. Thank you. And we have inserted the ICANN meeting numbers. And thank you Nigel for being flexible. Despite feeling this works better but Nigel is complex comfortable so whatever you agree in the chat -- so thanks to support staff for fixing the ICANN meeting numbers of Panama and San Juan, so one last sentence.

I'm sorry, no, we have the follow-up on previous advice, and apologies for running a few minutes over time, this is the last substantial part. I hope it's okay with everyone to stay for 5 more

---

minutes under follow-up on previous advice, the following items reflect matters related to previous consensus advice provided to the Board. First CCT review recommendations the GAC wishes to recall its ICANN66 Montreal consensus advice on CCT review and subsequent round of new gTLDs. Second 5.1.A and in light of the constructive discussions which took place with the Board and the wider ICANN community at ICANN71 as well as the GAC follow up advice from ICANN70 namely in paragraph 1 of section 6, and considering the Board scorecard there on dated 12th May, 2021 draws the attention of the Board to the related suggestions referred to under section issues of importance to the GAC of this communique. EPDP Phase 1 policy implementation the text reads the GAC notes its previous advice within the Montreal communique and the ICANN 67 communique with regard to Phase 1 of the EPDP on gTLD registration data, and the request for a detailed work plan identifying and updated real realistic scheduled to complete its work.

The GAC observes with continued concern that the phase one implementation review team, IRT, lacks a current published implementation time-line. I'm just wondering if we can also insert ICANN66 with Montreal for consistency, but I'm flexible.

And lastly, the privacy proxy services accreditation implementation, and the text reads the GAC previously advised

---

the ICANN Board recording the needs to resume implementation, example Marrakech and Montreal communique, in light of the importance of implementing procedures that govern these services. The GAC notes that ongoing work between ICANN and the GNSO on re-starting this work and highlights the need to prioritize this implementation, and finally under next meeting the GAC is scheduled to meet next during the ICANN72 annual general meeting on 23 to 28 October 2021.

So with this I think we're good to go about the communique, thank you for your patience and thank you for your flexibility, and thanks to interpreters for coping with us that long, and I know it's -- it's tough always with the communique, so I appreciate your efforts. Just reading one final comment from Nigel Hickson in the -- before if you can -- Fabian, please, I see your hand is up.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Sorry, Manal, it was an unrelated matter and maybe it will resolve Nigel's comment and I will come on-line again.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So, Nigel, I'm sorry, I'm not clear about the comment, if you can elaborate.

---

NIGEL HICKSON: Yeah, it's just a small point so it's in the second line of the text that Fabian was adjusting at the moment. So where we say brackets EG, in the†--

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay.

NIGEL HICKSON: I mean, it's not that but it just sort of -- it's not that important I know, sorry.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: That's okay. Noted. Thank you. And -- thank you, and you have the last word Fabian, please, go ahead.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Manal. I don't mean to -- I am afraid I might -- if we scroll all the way up now that we've reviewed the entire text you may recall that we had discussed the date by which the review period of 72 hours would end. So we may need to adjust these dates. I think we had assumed the communique would be complete by tomorrow, Thursday, and then consequent literature 72 hours would end on Sunday. So I just wanted to make sure you have this in mind for potential, thank you.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Fabian, for this important procedural point. I think we -- yeah, we need to fix the date accordingly. The Sunday date replacing it by Saturday, but also, I think in all cases and I hope the colleagues will confirm -- that mindful of the weekend week still expect the communique to go public by Monday. But the review period ends on the Saturday.

Yeah, I hope this is clear, and agreed by everybody, and with this, if there are no further requests for the floor or further need for clarification then I think we are good to conclude. So thank you very much everybody.

Tomorrow we are reconvening at 9:00 the Hague, 700 UTC for our meeting with the ALAC. And please be reminded that the GAC leadership will hold the first 30 minute daily brief in just a few minutes at 45 past, so please for those who need the brief, see you there. And this concludes our meetings, thank you very much.

The meeting is adjourned. Thanks.

[ END OF TRANSCRIPT ]