
ICANN76 | CF – GAC Communique Drafting (3 of 6)
Wednesday, March 15, 2023 – 13:15 to 14:30 CUN

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Welcome to the ICANN76 GAC Communique drafting session on Wednesday, 15 March at 1315 local time. During this session, questions or comments submitted in the chat will be read aloud if you put in the proper form. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. If you wish to speak, please raise your hand via Zoom. Remember to state your name and the language you will speak. In case you will be speaking a language other than English, speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. Please make sure to mute all other devices when you are speaking. You may access all available features for this session in the Zoom room. With that, I will hand the floor over to GAC Chair Manal Ismail. Manal, please.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Julia, and welcome back, everyone. I hope you enjoyed your lunch. And this is the third of six Communique drafting sessions. I hope you managed to go through the Communique and maybe provide any text you would like to see reflected in the Communique. I'll start by making a quick read-through until we have everyone in the room. So I'll go through the standard text if you may, so that we can have the first reading and at the same time focus our discussions later today on the substantial parts of the Communique.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

So the first part reads, GAC Communique, Cancun, Mexico. The Cancun Communique was drafted and agreed in a hybrid setting during the ICANN76 Community Forum with some GAC participants in Cancun, Mexico, and others remotely. 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 hybrid meeting. No objections were raised during the agreed time frame before publication. Yes, Nico, please go ahead.

NICO CABALLERO: Thank you, Madam Chair. Would you please make the screen a little bit bigger for near-sighted people like me? Thank you so much.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, and it would be helpful for everyone. Thank you. Perfect. So under introduction, the Governmental Advisory Committee, GAC, of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers, ICANN, met in Cancun, Mexico, in a hybrid setting, including remote participation from 11 to 16 March 2023. 68 GAC members and six observers attended the meeting, and you will find the numbers highlighted because we continue to make our records accurate, so we will provide the final counts after the last day of the meeting, but also we continue to make our records more accurate, and very final figures will be found in the minutes of the meeting.

The GAC meeting was conducted as part of ICANN76 community forum. All GAC plenary and working group sessions were conducted as open

meetings. Under section 2, inter-constituency activities and community engagement, this is where we report on our bilaterals. First meeting with the ICANN board, the GAC met with the ICANN board and discussed new gTLD subsequent rounds, further developments on DNS abuse mitigation, including CCT review recommendations and contract negotiations, WHOIS disclosure system, including law enforcement requests and features to be built into the system. ICANN emergency assistance program, EAP, framework for continued internet access, curative rights protections and intergovernmental organizations. So it's basically the agenda of our meeting with ICANN board.

Next on the meeting with the At-Large Advisory Committee, ALAC, the GAC met with members of the ALAC and discussed follow-up on the 2017 joint GAC-ALAC advice to the board entitled enabling inclusive informed and meaningful participation of ICANN, a joint statement by ALAC and GAC. And second, ICANN76 plenary session on WSIS+20 review and furthering the multi-stakeholder model. Lastly, DNS abuse in the context of contemporary policy advancements, coordinating the multi-stakeholder approach.

Next, the meeting with the generic name supporting organization, which took place this morning, the GAC met with members of the GNSO council and discussed subsequent rounds of new gTLDs, including the operational design phase, closed generics and the GNSO guidance process on applicant support, DNS abuse mitigation, WHOIS closure system, accuracy of registration data, IGO protections. And we added here the two points that we discussed under any other business, namely GNSO council response to GAC communique issues of

importance and transparency in GNSO policy development process and statements of interest.

Next our meeting with the contracted parties house of the GNSO, the GAC met with representatives of the contracted parties who discussed ongoing contractual negotiations regarding DNS abuse mitigation, ongoing GNSO discussions on the statement of interest policy, the SOI, and the abuse contact identifier tool, the asset tool.com.

Finally, under cross-community discussions, GAC members participated in relevant cross-community sessions scheduled as part of ICANN76, including looking towards WSIS+20, how can we improve multi-stakeholder participation in internet governance. Then we have the section of the GAC internal matters. First the GAC membership, there are currently 181 GAC member states and territories and 38 observer organizations. Under GAC elections, the GAC elected Wang Liang from China as vice chair to complete the one-year term of Shi Yong-Shang from Republic of Korea, ending at the close of ICANN79 March 2024. The requirements of GAC operating principle 32 and 35, brackets, GAC vice chair elections were satisfied as a total of 100 ballots, which is more than one-third of the GAC members were submitted. There were no ties requiring further in-person paper balloting.

Moving to the GAC leadership, the GAC expressed its sincere appreciation to Manal Ismail for her dedication as GAC chair since 2017. Under her tenure, the GAC successfully navigated the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, providing public policy advice and input in seven successive communiques adopted in a virtual setting, here for extending the ability of its members to participate effectively in GAC

consensus building. So thank you for the kind words, these are not mine of course. The GAC thanked its outgoing vice chairs Pär Brumark from Niue and Shi Yong Chang from Republic of Korea and Jaideep Kumar Mishra from India for their valuable support and contribution to the GAC.

The end of the ICANN76 meeting marks the start of a new term for the incoming GAC chair and vice chair team. I think vice chairs, well, is it vice chair or vice chairs? First Nicholas Caballero from Paraguay as a chair, Ola Bergström, Sweden, Francis Olivier Cubahiro, Burundi, Zaina Bou Harb, Lebanon, Nigel Hickson, United Kingdom, and Wang Lang from China. The incoming GAC chair and vice chairs participated in the ICANN leadership training program and encourage ICANN to continue offering this valuable curriculum. And thank you, Lebanon, for the suggestion. Under GAC working groups, I think we did a reading of this yesterday, I don't think we need to repeat the reading again. So am being told the black text is what we read yesterday, so anything colored I'm going to read it out loud.

First, the GAC endorses the PSWG 2023-2024 work plan and there is a footnote with the work plan. We are still expecting text from PSWG working group. We have read the text under underserved regions working group. I'm going to read the third paragraph. During ICANN76 GAC plenary sessions, it was agreed that DNS abuse should form the basis of the next wave of GAC capacity building interventions in the head up to and at ICANN77. And then the last paragraph, GAC members noted their appreciation to the underserved regions working group for holding this capacity development workshop and thanked the GAC topic leads and presenters from SSAC, ccNSO and ICANN org for their

contributions. And these two paragraphs to reflect the discussions we had yesterday.

If we scroll down please, we already read the human rights and international law working group and the GAC operating principles evolution working group and the universal acceptance and IDNs working group. So now under issues of importance to the GAC. Again, we've gone through this text and agreed the only change since yesterday is the quotation marks. So Kavouss, we have checked previous GAC communique and in communique, if I recall correctly, 69, ICANN69 and ICANN70, we had the reference to auctions of last resort. So I hope it's okay. I have asked support staff to please delete the quotation marks. And if you scroll down, this is the part on the applicant support.

And thanks to Gabriela and Rose and Kavouss, I mean, Argentina, UK and Iran, thank you for offering this enhanced version of the text. It's very concise to the point and I read the clean version directly. The GAC reaffirms its continued interest in increasing the number of applications from underrepresented regions in future rounds of new gTLDs through the applicant support program and reiterates its support for proposals to reduce or eliminate ongoing ICANN registry fees to sufficiently expand financial support to be able to cover all qualified applicants. Yes, Nico, please go ahead.

NICO CABALLERO:

Thank you, Madam Chair. I just have a question regarding, that last part, qualified applicants. I mean I don't have any strong feeling about

the phrase itself, but do we really need to say qualified applicants?
Because who would determine, what a qualified applicant?

MANAL ISMAIL:

The program, there is criteria and to apply for the applicant support, you have to qualify. And I see Gabriela's hand up, so please, Argentina, go ahead.

GABRIELLA SCHITTEK:

Thank you. In the GGP working group, we just recommend or give advice to something that is already written for the previous round. So we cannot too much, the GAC can also, through this communique, express strongly the demands from the countries. The thing is that qualified applicants in the previous round were countries with financial needs but also with capabilities. And they should have a community interest. These were the qualification criteria in the previous round. We cannot change this, apparently. What we can do is suggest, as ICANN or ask more financial resources for the support. And also, within this GGP group, we try to transmit what we hear in the GAC through comments expressed before, and this was related to the expanded scope, not only least developed but also middle income countries.

And also to launch the support program timely, I mean with the time for the applicants to prepare and also the possibility to apply for the standard version of the round in case they don't qualify. The thing is that in the previous round, sorry for this extended explanation, it's just that I didn't have the possibility to do it like this. In the previous round, only three applicants applied for the program, which is really little. And

from these three applications, only one passed. This is really embarrassing for ICANN.

I think we should have hundreds of applicants, minimum 30, 40, I don't know. And for this, I mean we need to do very important work in the awareness part, in the events, explaining what is the program, explaining the business model, explaining in the different regions to the appropriate ecosystem and actors, because I think it's a mistake to try to narrow down the scope of the potential beneficiaries, because we should keep it broad, very broadly. Thank you very much. Sorry.

MANAL ISMAIL: No, no, thank you. Thank you very much, Argentina. And I saw a hand up from UK. Is this not there anymore? And then Iran.

NIGEL HICKSON: In the chat.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you. Thank you very much. So the UK's comment is in the chat. Iran, please go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you very much. Do you hear me well?

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes, loud and clear, Kavouss. Thank you.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. I'm sorry if I ask a stupid question. My stupid question is that who are regional authorities? Police, Gendarmerie? Which are the local authorities? Regional authorities and local authorities. Who they are? Because Iran support, and we have to see who they are. So this has been added. I have no problem to add anything, but would you like to know who are the regional authorities and who are the local authorities?

MANAL ISMAIL: So Kavouss, we haven't read this part yet. If you can just give me a second, we can read it and then start discussing it.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Go ahead. Sorry, I was ahead of you. I'm sorry. I came late a little bit. That is my mistake. I'm sorry. I apologize for that formally.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Kavouss. So next, the text reads, also GAC members will continue to engage in the GNSO guidance process on applicant support with the aim of fostering gTLD applications from a diverse array of applicants, which could inter alia include regional and local authorities from all regions. And I'm pausing here and there is a question from Iran regarding regional and local authorities. The pen holder, please, Argentina, go ahead.

GABRIELLA SCHITTEK: Thank you. This expression, this sentence comes from the comment of the GAC on the SubPro on June 2021. And I guess it's meant to keep a diversity within the potential applicants. I mean not only business, but public sector, NGOs, not discriminatory in this instance stage. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you for the clarification, Argentina. Yes, please, Iran, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. I'm not convinced that we refer to something 2021. I am sitting in the GAC 76, 2023. I have to be very clear what we're talking about. I don't want to put in question what has happened in the past. And we are not quoting, cutting and pasting the past. We should be convinced what we're adopting because we put issues important for the GAC. Not to prolong discussion, I would suggest the following in the last but one line, which may instead of could, distinguished Fabian, which may inter alia include regional and patatipatata at the end, where justified.

We should have justification that somebody asking for that application because this is a limited resources and we should know that what is happening. And I'm sure that my distinguished colleague from Argentina would agree that we want to have a fair distribution and fair use of this. So if it's justified, yes. If it is not justified, avalanche of the request could not be dealt with. It needs justification. So just to I was not in favor of the text totally, but not to prolong the discussion, I suggest this middle ground. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Kavouss. I'm just checking with support staff whether this is a quote or we can because I think it's a good suggestion. We can replace could with may. I'm just checking if it is a quote from -- so we're quoting from previous GAC comments. I hope it's okay if we leave the text as is. And I see your point on the justification. I think it's already covered in the previous paragraph where we say qualified applicants. So the qualification will already take place with the -- go ahead, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: No, distinguished chair, if you allow me, I don't want I want that this paragraph be quite clear. If it is the same thing, it doesn't harm to repeat that for clarification. Sometime this is a constructive repetition. This is a constructive repetition and there's no harm to do that one. Make it clear for the people to implement that. So if you allow us, we suggest that we retain where justified. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes, Argentina, please.

GABRIELLA SCHITTEK: Yes, thank you, Kavouss. You're right. We are not quoting or repeating things just for the sake of repeating things. The idea is to debate and have a position as a GAC. So I'm happy with any wording. What I want to transmit is that in the GGP, they are trying to guide the awareness events and focus only on community applications. And I think that we

should keep this diverse array of applicants in this stage. This is the important thing. I mean the wording to quote or not quote, like, is fine for me to take it out. The only thing I want to emphasize is that in the previous round, we got only three applicants and this cannot happen again. So we should keep it diverse. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Argentina. So Kavouss, I have asked support staff to see the exact quote and we can put it between quotation so that it's not a draft of this meeting, but it's clear that we're quoting from previous text. And I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Thank you, Manal. I'm sorry. I go back to school and learn English. I am not sitting in previous sessions. I am in GAC 76 and I have the right to propose that. I don't agree with that quotation. We need to have it justified. First try to, you tried that to say that this justified it as well. I was not happy. I said that is a petition. So I maintain my words and I don't want that quotation because now we are in the more clear area close to the implementation of that. And what we did in 2021 was different. So I once again retain my suggestion. They're justified. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Kavouss. And we have it highlighted. I don't want us to get stuck here. We continue to iterate in the communique. So I'm going to continue reading and we will get back to this part again. I think there

was, the paragraph starting finally. Finally, the GAC stresses the importance of raising awareness of the applicant support program, including providing applicants with comprehensive information and ample time to prepare for the program. I see no requests for the floor. Yes, Iran, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Madam. Ample is not clear. It's something subjective of the required time, not ample time. Thank you. Replace ample with the required time. It may be changed from applicant to applicant. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: It's not the same thing, I'm afraid. We're here saying more of enough time. US, please go ahead.

SUSAN CHALMERS: Thanks, Chair. I would support retention of the word ample. I don't think it is quite suitable because we don't know what -- we haven't yet set the time in the process that would be required. Ample I think is more suggestive of providing sufficient or perhaps sufficient time, maybe a way forward.

MANAL ISMAIL: So required means there is a certain number of days or a certain period that is required and we don't know how much time exactly do we need. All we're saying is that we have enough time, sufficient time, ample

time. So if you can help us choose the right word from maybe these synonyms. I see Nico and then Iran, please.

NICO CABALLERO: Since they're synonyms, we can use enough or just keep ample. I don't see a problem there because I also agree that required would imply something different in this case. So let's just keep ample or maybe enough.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Nico. Thank you, US. So Iran, would enough be better or maybe sufficient?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I don't agree with the Recording in progress. Required is a very clear expression. You want something from me, I have two weeks' time required. Something from someone else, he has three weeks' time required. So it is not wrong. I am not convinced with your justifications.

MANAL ISMAIL: Exactly, exactly, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I am not...

MANAL ISMAIL: We're saying...

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Could you please allow me to finish?

MANAL ISMAIL: We're saying the same thing, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Could you please allow me to finish?

MANAL ISMAIL: Go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: May I proceed? When it's finished, I say thank you, then you could come in. I think GAC chair should not have any position.

MANAL ISMAIL: I'm trying to help out everyone.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, I am also trying to help. But I could agree with you, I'm saying there's sufficient time. But I'm not convinced by the incoming GAC chair saying that required is not sufficient. I'm very sorry, this is not appropriate. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO: Excuse me, Kavouss, I'm not the GAC chair yet, in case you didn't notice. I'll be the GAC chair tomorrow.

MANAL ISMAIL: So, please, it's okay. We will put sufficient as a middle ground. It's not ample, it's not required. Please, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

GULTEN TEPE: Manal, this is Gultan speaking. We also have comments in the chat.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much. I'm sorry to overlook the chat. So, Brazil saying sufficient sounds good and Egypt agree with ample or sufficient. And UK is supporting Brazil, US and Egypt, so sufficient or ample works well. So I think if we need to change ample, then maybe sufficient would be a good compromise. Thank you, everyone. Yes, Argentina, please go ahead.

GABRIELLA SCHITTEK: Thank you. Just a comment. We as GAC also advise that the application support program has to be launched 18 months in advance. So there is a timing. 18 months in advance of the standard window. Just to be more precise with the timing. So to be well prepared, these awareness events should be at least be two years in advance of the launch of the program. Just to be more precise in the, for example, if it is 2026, the standard launch of the new rounds. I mean to have it more precisely. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you. Thank you very much, Argentina. So I think there is no objection to have sufficient and I see nodding. So let's move on, accept this text and we will come back to the earlier paragraph. So we are expecting text on the DNS abuse. US, please go ahead.

SUSAN CHALMERS: My apologies. Yes, we are currently working on draft DNS abuse text with other GAC colleagues. Thank you. We should be able to advance this as soon as possible.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you. Then moving to registration data, I can see we are also expecting text on the registration data. Do we have a pen holder for this part? Yes, Kenneth, please. US, go ahead.

KENNETH RENARD: We are working with other GAC members as well and should have registration data text in certainly shortly after the DNS abuse text. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you. And I think if we do a complete reading and after this session, maybe we can take a little bit longer break if needed for drafting purposes and then we can reconvene. Anyway, let's see how much we can achieve with this session. Next, we have transparency in GNSO participation and the text reads, the GAC strongly supports

transparency at ICANN and takes note of ongoing discussions within the GNSO on disclosure obligations under the GNSO's statement of interest policy, the SOI.

Several GAC representatives expressed deep concern regarding a proposed exception in the SOI that might permit GNSO participants to refrain from disclosing the identity of the entities they represent in the GNSO working groups. The GAC looks forward to further engagement in the GNSO on this issue. And I see two requests for the floor, Switzerland and then Brazil. Jorge, please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO:

Thank you. Thank you very much, Manal. Regarding the question, the sentence starting with several GAC members, I wonder whether we could have more unified messaging because I didn't hear anyone with a different opinion. So perhaps we can say GAC members or the GAC because I think it's a concern that is felt by all GAC members who have expressed an opinion on this. So perhaps we can go in that direction. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Jorge. So there is a suggestion to have this as GAC members and I see nodding and I'm giving the floor to Brazil next. Please, Luciano.

LUCIANO MAZZA:

Thank you, Manal. Thank you so much. No, actually, I think that you are right with the text. I just wanted to raise the flag that we'd like to

suggest inclusion as items of interest to GAC. The one related to the emergency program that is not there, we can propose a short text for consideration.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Luciano noted. We will have a placeholder and we will expect text from your side. Thank you. So next we have the GAC consensus advice to the board and the text reads 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. First, we have IGO protections. The GAC advises the board to first consider approving the recommendations of the EPDP on specific curative rights protections for implementation and to maintain the current moratorium on the registration of IGO acronyms as domain names in new gTLDs presently in place until the full implementation of the recommendations of the EPDP on specific curative rights protections.

Any comments on the advice? And the rationale reads, the GAC affirms that IGOs perform important global public missions with public funds, that they are the unique treaty-based creations of governments under international law and that their names and acronyms warrant appropriate tailored protection in the DNS in the global public interest to prevent consumer harm. It is also recalled that the EPDP recommendations strike a balance between rights and concerns of both IGOs and legitimate third parties. Any comments? Moving on. Iran, please go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Maybe my hand is not seen by you. The leading paragraph I am questioning whether we say to consider, please go ahead to the first paragraph of that, to consider, but say something else, to consider approving or to proceed with approval. Consider has a specific connotation. You ask somebody to consider something, they say, okay, I have considered, but they don't agree with that. Proceed with the approval is more stronger, so it depends how GAC wants that this IGO after such many, many, many years to go ahead. So a suggestion that whether you or we retain the word to consider or we replace that to proceed with the approval of. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much Kavouss, and I think first I see a hand up from Switzerland. So, Jorge, please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you. Thank you, Manal, Jorge Cancio for the record. Actually, I was thinking something very similar to Kavouss, and maybe we can be even more direct and say advice is to approve. And so, we skip the considers and directly advise the board to approve the recommendations would be more simple even.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Iran, and thank you, Switzerland. The flexibility was intended. So, if we need to be more firm about it, any objections to changing consider approving to proceed with approval of? Kavouss, please, Iran.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, I agree with Jorge, but I think the more diplomatic course of action will be to proceed with approval rather than to approve. Approve is a commanding verb. To proceed with approval is something else. If Jorge agree, I think I wish to put it to proceed with the approval. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much. Any objections, Switzerland, to have it to proceed with approval? Frankly, I thought to consider approving is the most diplomatic, but proceed with approval is also diplomatic, and it's a better wording than approve. And I see no objections, so let's accept the text. Anything else on the text until the end of the first paragraph of the rationale? If not, then the second paragraph reads, in considering approving the recommendations of the EPDP on specific curative rights protections for implementation, the GAC notes that the EPDP recommendations received full consensus and that the corresponding GNSO Council vote to approve said recommendations was unanimous. Any comments?

Inssofar as the above noted EPDP recommendation proposed targeted amendments to the UDRP rules to accommodate IGOs in addressing the abuse of IGO identifiers in the DNS, this advice supersedes those aspects of GAC advice in the following communique as follows. I think we need to either keep in the following or as follows, but it's a minor suggestion. So first, in the GAC, Los Angeles communique, ICANN51, section IV.5.b.i, in implementing any such curative mechanism, "the UDRP should not be amended." Second bullet, in the GAC, Hyderabad

communique, ICANN57, section 6.4.2, "dispute resolution mechanism modeled on but separate from the UDRP, which provides in particular for appeal to an arbitral tribunal instead of national courts in conformity with relevant principles of international law."

Third bullet, in the GAC, Johannesburg communique, ICANN59, section -- can we move the cursor? The reference section, the GAC reiterates, it's advised that IGO access to curative dispute resolution mechanism should be I, modeled on but separate from the existing uniform dispute resolution policy, UDRP, and two, provide standing based on IGO's status as public intergovernmental institutions, and three, respect IGO's jurisdictional status by facilitating appeals exclusively through arbitration. I'm pausing here. These are all extracts from previous communique, and I see a hand from Iran. Please go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Thank you, Manal. Just purely editorial, is it possible that this Roman I and Roman II and Roman III appear separately underneath of the first paragraph? It is for better reading, should, and then we break the lines, Roman I and then Roman II and Roman III, is more clear to read, if there is agreement of distinguished colleagues. It's purely editorial, doesn't change anything at all. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you. I see no objections, so moving on. In terms of the continuation of the moratorium in the ICANN71 communique in advising the board to maintain the current moratorium on the registration of IGO acronyms as domain names in new gTLDs pending

the conclusion and implementation of the IGO curative work track, the GAC noted that in the absence of access to a curative rights protection mechanism, a mere notification of the registration of a domain name corresponding to its identifier is of no real utility to an IGO, because an IGO has no current ability to arbitrate a domain name dispute. Any comments? Is this a new hand, Kavouss? Okay, then Brian, please, WIPO, go ahead.

BRIAN BECKHAM:

Thank you. Just a few very minor editing points in the -- and apologies, I couldn't raise my hand earlier. In the prior section, there's the use of the word recommendation a number of times, once in capitals and elsewhere in lowercase. I believe it should be capitalized throughout.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, noted.

BRIAN BECKHAM:

And then back into the bullets now. And on the third bullet, it says separate from the existing uniform dispute, the name is actually uniform domain name dispute resolution policy. So maybe the easiest way to address that would be to put UDRP in brackets, that way it doesn't alter the quote. And then one final point in the paragraph immediately following in the middle where it says of the IGO curative work track. Maybe just for precision, it should say of the recommendations of the IGO curative work track, and then work track, I think, in capitals as well as recommendation. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Brian, for the enhancements. Any other comments? If not, then moving to the following paragraph. In that same light, the GAC previously has advised the board to maintain current temporary protections of IGO acronyms in the ICANN61, ICANN62 Panama, and ICANN71 communiques, noting that the "removal of interim protections before a permanent decision on IGO acronym protection, i.e. a curative mechanism is taken, could result in irreparable harm to IGOs." Any comments on this last paragraph? Kavouss, please, Iran.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: It is again the quotation, whether you want to repeat the quotation or whether now that five recommendations has been approved, you could change the word could with another verb. So I'm just asking, because I don't want to get to the same discussions and same argument by somebody saying that this is a quotation and so on and so forth. So whether you want to maintain the quotation or whether you want to now after the approval of five recommendations, instead of saying is taken, could result putting a little bit more stronger. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Kavouss. And indeed, as you mentioned, we are not able to change anything inside the quotations. So thank you for your understanding. So UK, please, go ahead.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, good afternoon. Thank you. Now, just very minor in the last paragraph. Advise the board to maintain current temporary protections. I think to maintain the current protections or the current, I think just saying to maintain current temporary protections is not particularly good English.

MANAL ISMAIL: Can we mark the sentence that is? Okay, thank you.

NIGEL HICKSON: But to maintain the current, perhaps it's better to say advise the board to maintain the current temporary protections, because they are temporary, aren't they? So the current temporary protections, is that right?

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, UK, for the enhancements. Is it good as it stands on the screen now? It's been reflected and WIPO, please, any objections?

BRIAN BECKHAM: No objection. One only suggestion was it could say to maintain the current moratorium, since that's a term used elsewhere.

MANAL ISMAIL: So to maintain the current moratorium. And this is to replace temporary. Please go ahead.

BRIAN BECKHAM: That would be all the way through to acronyms.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes, thank you.

BRIAN BECKHAM: No strong feelings either way.

MANAL ISMAIL: So any comments on replacing the square bracketed part by moratorium? Nico, please go ahead.

NICO CABALLERO: Thank you, Manal. And just in case, I'm speaking on behalf of the Paraguayan government here up until tomorrow. No, my suggestion was going to be temporarily maintain the current protections, if that makes sense.

MANAL ISMAIL: I think it weakens the message that we want to maintain. So, if you don't mind. I see nothing. Thank you for your flexibility. So let's delete temporarily. And I see no objections to replacing the words in brackets by moratorium. So let's do this change as well. And I'm very sorry, I see UK and India. Sorry, please go ahead, UK.

NIGEL HICKSON: No, absolutely fine, whatever works. The only other point I had was at the bottom of the paragraph, there's two different sets of brackets. I know this is nitpicking, but there might be a reason for it. But there's a square bracket and a round bracket on...

MANAL ISMAIL: If it is a copy and paste from an old quote, we will not be able to fix it. Thank you for your understanding, Nigel. And I have India next, please.

INDIA: Thank you, Manal. So in order to maintain uniformity, as mentioned here, ICANN61 San Juan, ICANN62 Panama, ICANN71 The Hague. We can add, The Hague Communique in order to maintain the uniformity. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, India. And while reading, I thought something was missing. Please, Fabien, go ahead.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: ICANN71 was a virtual meeting. So the name of the Communique for ICANN71 is the GAC ICANN71 Communique, because it was not located. And The Hague was ICANN74.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you for the clarification. So ICANN71 was held virtual, so that's why. Okay, then. Yes, please, Columbia.

COLUMBIA: Hi, Manal. Just to bring it up to the last paragraph, if you wanted to keep the one, two, and three lines as requested by Kavouss, we need to bring down the second before providing standing.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, indeed. Thank you, Columbia. This is very helpful. Thank you. So seeing no further requests for the floor, I think we can now accept the text under IGOs and move on. Just checking on time, we still have 18 minutes. And we have placeholders for -- do we need GAC advice for the transparency requirements? Yes, US, please go ahead.

SUSAN CHALMERS: Thank you kindly, Chair. We believe that we've sufficiently addressed this in the issues of importance text. So we would suggest removing that from the advice section. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, US. So this can be deleted. I see UK, is this a new hand?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, I think, whether Kavouss was before me in the queue?

MANAL ISMAIL: The hand disappeared.

NIGEL HICKSON: Oh, sorry. I mean we only put this in as a placeholder. And of course, the eloquent text in issues of importance sufficiently covers this issue. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you. Thank you, UK. And then under follow up on previous GAC advice, we have a placeholder for DNS and SubPro. Are we expecting text here? If not, then maybe we can delete this part as well. And UK, please go ahead.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, sorry. So I think we should keep this at present, because we haven't fully discussed the DNS abuse section on issues of importance. So whether that paragraphs or paragraphs cover this issue, and just to note what this issue is to reflect the discussions we had with the board and with other parties this week, you remember the apples and pears sort of analogy, was to identify where we could, for transparency and for help of everyone, that there were parts of GAC advice that were issued previously that touch on some of these issues, which still need to be taken account of, if people agree, before the SubPro. And it was in this vein of transparency that we thought we ought to reference that. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, UK. Then we can keep it and decide on it next session. I still have one more line to read, and I would like that we take a 45-minute break. But I see first, Iran's hand up. Please go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARESTEH: Thank you, Manal. I think we could not have a subject in two places in the communique. If DNS abuse, which is very important, and it is appearing in the issues or subject important to GAC, we should not put it in follow-up action. I don't think that is transparency. It's superfluous. So I don't agree with that. But I'm happy to wait what has come under the DNS abuse and so on and so forth. But I don't think that we should have a subject two times, one time on the issue important, the other on the follow-up actions. We have negative reaction from the board. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Kavouss. I agree with you. Let's see how it goes next session. It's a very broad topic. So if the part under issues of importance to the GAC is different from the part here, it may make sense. Otherwise, we can discuss. But again, if we can scroll the last line in the communique, the GAC is scheduled to meet next during the ICANN77 policy forum in Washington, DC, United States on 12 to 15 June 2023. So I think we have completed one reading. We have identified missing text. I'd like to adjourn the meeting now. And we can reconvene at -- So I see requests for the floor. US, please go ahead.

SUSAN CHALMERS: My apologies. Manal, I know we're just about to convene. But I would like to flag that we may have an item regarding the WDS, the WHOIS Disclosure System, now Registration Data Request Service, for the advice section. So we wanted to flag that now.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, US. Iran, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Chairman. I have raised a point on the close generic yesterday, that for the last term's satisfactory solution, I propose something different, agreed by consensus. Because I don't understand what satisfactory means. So I maintain that point. And we should do set that you will come back to that. And we need to come back to that and change that. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: It's highlighted in yellow. We're getting back to it during the next session.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: It's a different point.

MANAL ISMAIL: Is it a different point? I'm sorry. So can we please highlight it in yellow and see if we can resolve it during the next session? So let's convene at the hour, at 3PM Cancun time. And please, if you can use the break also

to work on the expected language, communique language, would very much appreciate that. Thank you. The meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]