EN

MONTREAL - GAC Communique Drafting Session 26(C)
Wednesday, November 6, 2019 - 16:30 to 18:30 EDT
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So we are just waiting for the text being drafted. Thank you for your patience, and please let us know when you're ready with the text so we can start again. So we are ready to start. If you can take your seats. We have the latest proposal on .amazon language on the screen, so the text reads obstruction' government engagement staff provided a short overview of the .amazon applications process and updates since the ICANN65 meeting. During session 9 of the GAC meeting a delegation expressed that granting the .amazon application without a mutually-agreeable solution would contradict previous GAC advice, which states, and there is a remembrance to ICANN 60 Abu Dhabi communique. The GAC advice Z the Board -- the GAC advice Z the ICANN Board to, 1, continue facilitating negotiations between the Amazon cooperation treaty organizations ACTO member states and the Amazon corporation with a view to reaching a mutually-acceptable solution to allow for the use of Dot Amazon for a top level domain name.

Some delegations supported the proposal that the GAC should request the Board to exhaust all possible means to facilitate parties to arrive at a mutually-agreeable solution through the organization of a time limited and independently mediated final negotiation round. Which they believe would be important to strengthen the GAC and ICANN roles in Internet governance.

Other delegations stated that they believed that all relevant GAC advice on this matter has been addressed by the Board, no further GAC advice is needed, and that the applications should not be further delayed in accordance with the applicable IRP decision. These delegations did not necessarily agree with the basis of the concerns as articulated above

Do we have anything else? Is there -- so that's it. Any comments? Excellent. So thank you very much for your co-operation, and for reaching this mutually acceptable text. So can we go to other parts of the communique that reads -- that needs to be read out loud?

So shall we make one -- yeah, one full read through before we conclude, so, interconstituency activities and community engagement. This is the meeting with the ICANN Board. The GAC met with the ICANN Board and discussed implementation of plans that will shape the future of ICANN and its multistakeholder model. GDPR WHOIS matters DNS abuse mitigation and CCT

review and subsequent rounds of new gTLDs and this is basically the agenda with the Board. Meeting with generic names supporting organizations. The GAC met with the members of the GNSO council, and discussed, IGO access to curative rights protection mechanisms and the proposed charter for a new IGO work track under the review of all RPMs. PDP, working group. 2, can evolving ICANN's multistakeholder model including GNSO, PDP 3.0 matters, and 3, work of the new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP, including the recently concluded Work Track 5 on geographic names. Meeting with the gTLD stakeholder group. The GAC met with a representative of the registries, stakeholder group and discussed 1, expedited policy development process on gTLD registration data. 2, registries obligations and practices regarding the mitigation of DNS abuse. Meeting with the cross-community working group on new gTLDs auction proceeds. The cross-community working group is finalizing its final report, which will provide opportunities for GAC input. GAC members discussed considerations be on the scope of the cross-community working group's work on possible mechanisms to allocate auction proceeds funds including the importance of GAC discussion and input on, 1, the mechanism that will be ultimately selected to allocate the proceeds. 2, criteria for the selection of projects to be funded via this vehicle. Cross-community discussions GAC members participated in relevant cross-community sessions. Scheduled as part of

ICANN66. Including Phase 2, Phase 2 of the expedited policy development process on gTLD registration data, DNS abuse, and evolving ICANN's multistakeholder model will take place tomorrow at the main room.

So as you can see this is all mostly factual information, and then internal matters. GAC membership, the GAC will summon the council of regional organizations of the Pacific, CROP, ICT and the Caribbean community secretariat, CARICOM, as new observers to the committee. There are currently 178 GAC members, and 38 observers.

And GAC elections the GAC elected as vice-chairs for the term starting after ICANN67, March 2020, and ending at the close of ICANN 70, March 2021, Olga Cavalli, Argentina, I'm sorry, this is -- Burkina Faso. Canada, Cook Islands and Switzerland. I apologize for not being able to pronounce all the names properly. I'm sorry.

And on GAC working groups, so again all the previous was factual information. I see no requests for the floor, and no comments, so going onto the working groups. GAC public safety working group. The PSWG. The PSWG discussed DNS abuse mitigation measures including the need to implement the CCT review team recommendations on DNS abuse, the importance of the domain abuse activity reporting system, and the need to ensure that the

requirement for "reasonable access" to nonpublic domain name registration information is operating effectively given the impact on investigations, and other activities to preserve public safety, and enforce the law. The PSWG also participated in the expedited policy development process on the temporary specification for gTLD registration data, and the cross-community session on DNS abuse. Finally, the PSWG held discussions with ICANN compliance, the security and stability advisory committee, and the noncommercial registry and registrar stakeholder groups, and intellectual property, and business constituencies. Any comments?

Okay. Moving on to the GAC Human Rights and International Law working group. The human rights and international law working group and cross-community working party discussed community implementation of the human rights core value in collaboration with a panel comprised of SO and AC members, and an ICANN Board member. The ICANN Board confirmed that the human rights core value will come into effect once the ICANN Board adopts the CCWG accountability WorkStream 2 recommendations, and is on the agenda of the annual general meeting of the ICANN Board at ICANN66

The human rights and international lawing with and community panel recognized that once the Board adopts the WorkStream 2 recommendations cross-community work will be crucial in the

implementation process. The human rights and international lawing with encouraged GAC and other community members to participate in this effort. Specifically, an understanding is needed regarding the consequences of a negative human rights impact assessment in policy development processes.

Any comments?

Okay. Moving on to GAC working group on GAC participation in NomCom. The working group presented to the GAC recommendations that the nominating committee of ICANN, NomCom, should consider when selecting candidates for ICANN Board positions. The GAC approved the recommendations which will be communicated to the NomCom leadership. On GAC, any comments? I'm sorry.

On GAC underserved regions working group, the working group discussed the outcome of the GAC middle east workshop held in Bahrain on 30 September, 2019 with ICANN's stakeholder engagement treatment for the Middle East. The working group is now considering GAC capacity building workshops for fiscal year 2020. The underserved region working group also considered an update on the GAC focal group effort regarding subsequent rounds of new gTLDs and will continue to contribute to GAC capacity building in this area.

Working group members are invited to lead and assist with inter-sessional activities, consistent with the underserved regions working group Work Plan including development of a survey for newcomers' engagement kit, creation of a newsletter, and webinars on regional DNS issues, and ICANN processes. The working group will report on progress of these difficulties during ICANN67. Yes, Pua, please.

COOK ISLANDS: Pua Hunter. Just to be consistent can we stick with the working group instead of the USRWG -- and WG at the second paragraph. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Or else put WG in brackets at the start of the first line and use WG throughout.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, Denmark, please.

DENMARK: Thank you. Sorry to go back but I will suggest that we use the official title of the working groups especially that on NomCom which have a very long title, and I can say that the -- it's called the

GAC work to examine the GAC's participation in the NomCom. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Denmark. So any other comments? We have just been alerted by Par that we have overlooked our meeting with the ccNSO so he is help fly writing a couple of sentences and we will insert them and read them at the end when we finish.

So GAC working group to examine the protection of geographic names in any further expansion of gTLDs. Work Track 5 on geographic names at top level, a sub team of the new gTLD subsequent procedures policy development process working group, has concluded its work after conducting 52 meetings in nearly two years. With an inclusive leadership composed of 4 co-leaders from ALAC, ccNSO GAC and GNSO respectively. Work Track 5 focused on reviewing the existing protection of geographic names at the top level to determine if new recommendations were needed in future rounds of new gTLDs. The consensus recommendations of Work Track 5 have been submitted for consideration by the PDP working group. Do we need the full stop after respectively? Yeah okay thank you.

In order to facilitate the processing of future applications for gTLDs and many GAC members expressed interest in the

development of a tool that would provide timely notifications to GAC members of strings that consist in geographic names, drawing inspiration as appropriate from the existing tool for the 2-Character Codes. Any comments? Argentina, Olga, please.

ARGENTINA: I think the title is confusing because we have use this had for assigned to the working group during the last 2 years to update the GAC about Work Track 5. I don't know how we could reflect that in the title because if you read the title then you think that the working group is, is updating and we are talking about Work Track 5 which is not exactly the GAC working group. I don't know if you see it the difference. But I leave it to you, or to Fabian or the staff to rephrase it somehow.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So should this be another bilateral meeting between the GAC and Work Track 5? Or is it a working group meeting? I mean --

ARGENTINA: I don't know. So, it's not really a report of the GAC working group. It's the report about Work Track 5 which finished its work and has been using this lot for that update to the GAC. So I think we should reflect it somehow. I'm okay with any text that you provide that could be more clear because if it not its confusing.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I can see Fabian already trying to propose something, so we will find.

ARGENTINA: He will solve everything. He will solve it.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I see your point, Olga. Thank you. So if we can move onto the working group on GAC operating principles evolution.

The GOPE working group met in plenary session to review the GAC working group guidelines document developed since ICANN64 with a view to supplement the GAC operating principles. The working group aims to finalize the document by ICANN67 with input from GAC members on pending items. Any comments?

Okay. Moving on to the GAC focal group on subsequent rounds of new gTLDs, the GAC was briefed on recent developments from the subsequent procedures PDP working group co-chairs including time-line, priority topics for the GAC and upcoming opportunities for GAC input. The GAC focal group provided an update of its inter-sessional work since ICANN65 towards building capacity on priority topics for the GAC. The GAC agreed for the GAC focal group to review and update relevant GAC positions with a view to providing input in the upcoming subsequent procedures PDP WG public comment proceeding. GAC members are encouraged to

volunteer as topic leads to assist in this this effort. Any comments?

So moving tonight ICANN Board. ICANN Board and GAC members met in the GAC plenary session and discussed follow up on the ICANN Board's GAC Marrakech scorecard. The schedule for addressing advice in the GAC Montreal communique. The status of previous GAC advice, and the feedback on use of the 2-Character tool. Any comments?

Okay. Then on the GAC operational matters. The requirements for GAC operating principle 32 and 35, vice-chair elections, were satisfied as a total of 101 ballots, which means more than 1/3 of the GAC members, were submitted. There were no ties requiring further in person paper balloting. The GAC leadership will consider developing recommendations for amendment of the guidelines for GAC participation in the empowered community. A new process will be considered to enable efficient GAC assessment of the ICANN Board's response to consensus advice. Any comments?

Okay. Moving on to issues of importance to the GAC.

Let's read .amazon one more time. ICANN's government engagement staff provided a short overview of the .amazon populations process and updates since the ICANN65 meeting. During session 9 of the GAC meeting a delegation expressed that

granting the .amazon application without a mutually-agreeable solution would contradict previous GAC advice, which states, and there is a reference to obstruction 60 Abu Dhabi communique. Quoting the advises the ICANN Board to continue facilitating negotiations between the Amazon co-operation treaty organizations ACTO member states and the Amazon corporation with a view to money reaching ago mutually-acceptable solution to allow for the use of .amazon as a top level domain name. End quote. Some delegations supported the proposal that the GAC should request the Board to exhaust all possible means to facilitate parties to arrive at a mutually-acceptable solution through the organization of a time limited and independently remediated final negotiation round. Which they believe would be important to strengthen the GAC and ICANN roles in Internet governance. Other delegations stated that they believe that all relevant GAC advice on this matter has been addressed by the Board. No further GAC advice is needed and that the applications should not be further delayed in accordance with the applicable IRP decisions. These delegations did not necessarily agree with the basis of the concerns, as articulated behalf. Any comments?

Okay. Can we scroll down? Consensus, a consensus advice to ICANN Board. The following items of voice from the GAC to the Board have been reached and the basis of consensus as defined in the ICANN bylaws. First the CCT review and subsequent

procedure and subsequent rounds of new gTLDs. The advises the Board, not to proceed with a new round of gTLDs until the complete -- I'm sorry until after the complete something is not reading well here. -- okay so the advises the Board not to proceed with a new round of gTLDs until after the complete implementation of recommendations in the competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice review that were identified as prerequisites or as high priority. Any comments?

The rationale. The competition consumer trust and consumer choice review are the first completed bylaw mandated railway view after the IANA stewardship transition and serves as a vital accountability mechanism. The review identified a number of issues that should be addressed in areas such as the necessity and availability of data, including no costs and benefits, the effectiveness of safeguards, the promotion of consumer trust, the mitigation of DNS abuse, and improved geographic representation of applicants. The review produced 35 consensus recommendations. It said that 14 of the recommendations must be implemented prior to the launch of subsequent procedures for new gTLDs. Prerequisites, and a further 10 high priority recommendations should be implemented by 8th of March 2020. Which means 18 months after the issuance of the report.

It is particularly important that a new round of gTLDs should not be launched until after the successful implementation of those recommendations that were identified by the review team as necessary prior to any subsequent rounds of new gTLD. It has been suggested that although some of the recommendations are for the Board to implement, other recommendations are for other parts of the community to implement. It would be helpful for the Board to monitor progress on all of the recommendations and support other parts of the community to implement the recommendations that are addressed to them. Any comments? Okay.

Moving on to domain name registration directory service and data protection. With regard to Phase 1 of the EPDP, the advises the Board to, take all possible steps to ensure that the ICANN Org, and the EPDP Phase 1 implementation review team generates a detailed Work Plan identifying an updated realistic schedule to complete its work and provide and inform the GAC on the status of its progress by January 3, 2020. Just a second. Can you scroll up again? Should it be generate rather than generates? I mean -- take all -- generate. Okay

With regard to Phase 2 and the conclusion of the EPDP the GAC recognizes the considerable efforts undertaken by all participant within the EPDP. Nevertheless there will likely be a significant time between finalization of the Phase 2 policy regions

implementation of Phase 1 and Phase 2 and the construction and deployment of any new domain name registration system, and unified access model. Consequently, the advises the Board to, 1, deploy the ICANN organization to ensure that the current system that requires reasonable access to nonpublic domain name registration is operating effectively. This should include educating key stakeholder groups, including governments, that there is a process to request nonpublic data. I'm sorry, I'm lost here.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Actively making available.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay, I'm sorry. So I'll read it again. Not to confuse everyone but have we changed deploy to something else? Or --

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So deploy suggest [inaudible].

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, Georgios, please.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Georgios ... we suggested instead of deploy to put the word instructs.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, European Commission, and I think we will make it in both bullets for consistency. So let me read this again the advises the Board to, 1 instruct the ICANN organization to ensure that the current system that requires "reasonable access" to nonpublic domain name registration is operating effectively. This should include educating key stakeholder groups including governments, that there is a process to request nonpublic data, actively making available a standard request form that can be used by stakeholders to request access based upon the current consensus policy, and actively making available links to registrar and registry information and points of contact on this topic.

So this is a suggestion for formatting, which I think makes it more clear. Bullets. Is that okay? I see nodding from European Commission. So 2, the advises the Board to instruct ICANN compliance to create a specific process to address complaints regarding failure to respond to, and unreasonable denial of requests for nonpublic domain name registration data, and monitor, and report on compliance with the current policy. Yes, Lithuania.

LITHUANIA:	Thank you. This is more clarifying suggestion to clarify the addressee or the reporting because usually in our wording we use or report to the GAC or publish the report so I would suggest after the words report include to the GAC.
MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:	There is a suggestion to add to the GAC after the word report, and report to the GAC on compliance with the current policy. Any comments? I see nodding from the European Commission. Laureen, please go ahead.
LAUREEN KAPIN:	Thanks. And I'm not opposed to the clarification, but I let me share with you what my thought process was. ICANN compliance actually has a dedicated part of its website which provides these very detailed reports including on the complaints that it receives, and the subject matter of those complaints, so my thought process was, not to provide a report to the GAC, but to actually include as part of its public reporting the -- a new category so to speak so that the public would know how many complaints they're getting about lack of access to nonpublic information.
MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:	So Lithuania, are you okay with deleting to the GAC after clarification provided by Laureen?

LITHUANIA:	Yes, I would be okay but then I say whether we are advising to publish the report because there is not clear what we are advising for.
MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:	So Laureen, if you can speak to the microphone please so that we can hear.
LAUREEN KAPIN:	My apologies, I missed that. Can you repeat the last part for me?
LITHUANIA:	So the question was what GAC advice is for to provide report to the GAC, and or another alternative would be to publish the report or there would be a double advice to do one and another. I mean, the latter doesn't provide clarity. That means that it can be choose any alternative can be chosen.
LAUREEN KAPIN:	So when making it publish the report, would that add the clarity that you're asking for or are you suggesting that we should actually advise them to do both?

LITHUANIA: No, for me it's okay just publishing the report. If you would say that it will be done in any case. So just to put that the publish the report.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think that works; I think that works better, yes.

LITHUANIA: Okay.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So does the text on the screen accurately reflect the conclusion? I see nodding. So I -- yeah, I think we are confusing the meaning hereby saying publish the report as if we are speaking about a specific report. So -- and monitor and so Lithuania would you be okay reverting back to the initial text because I think now it reads as if we are speaking about a specific report? We're asking them to publish the report on compliance? I mean --

LITHUANIA: So if we will delete it then what we advising for? The Board can choose what to do with the reporting that means like that.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I think we're asking the Board to ask ICANN compliance to monitor and report on compliance with the current policy, so they monitor the current policy, and report on it, so yes please, Spain go ahead.

SPAIN: Yes, we are all for expressing clearly, as we said the thought process behind it. There is no report as such document. But we could in a substitute the words publish the, by publicly report.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. So and monitor and publicly report on compliance with the current policy? Is this okay with everybody? Okay. Thank you, Lithuania, and thank you Spain, I can see the U.K. please go ahead.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you. I'm just worried that publicly report is not the same as publish a report. And I'm worried we might lose something with this new drafting. I would suggest perhaps, and publish regular reports as a suggestion, because we don't want only one report. We want something regular to keep the up to date picture so perhaps publish regular reports would work. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you for the fine tuning. Any comments? I see a thumbs up. I have European Commission and then European Commission, please. Georgios go ahead.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: I'm happy to pass to Laureen.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay, Laureen, please.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So this -- for Paul, ICANN compliance publishes currently monthly reports and my intend here is merely to have this included in their regular monthly reporting. They actually have this very robust part of their website which gives a lot of information on all the complaints they receive, and my modest ask here is to make sure that they include information on this particular issue so the public and the GAC and anyone who's interested knows that they are getting complaints and they're doing X, Y and Z in response to those complaints on this particular issue as opposed to just general WHOIS issues, which cover a lot of things. We are interested in this thing and I would like them to call it out but I'm happy to have this refined, but I want to let know they have these regular reports and I want to make sure they call out this particular category.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, European Commission, please, Georgios.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: I would suggest publish in their regular reports referring to the regular compliance. And publish the reports in their regular reports, monthly reports. Their regularly monthly reports. And then I don't think we need the rest after reports. Compliance do we need that? The rest? Okay.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So it should be publish not publishing.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, European Commission, I'll wait for a few seconds for everybody to read the -- so it reads now the advises the Board to instruct ICANN compliance to create a specific process to address complaints regarding failure to respond to, and unreasonable denial of requests for nonpublic domain name registration data, and monitor and publish the results in their regular monthly reports, on compliance with the current policy. Yes, Laureen, please.

LAUREEN KAPIN: It's still a bit of a work in progress. They publish the subject matter of what they receive complaints on. They don't necessarily

publish results, so what I would, what I would propose is, and monitor, and publish -- and monitor and publish I would strike their results. Monitor and publish in their regular monthly reports, good, Paul it is going to help me out.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you I'll try. How about this. And publish reports on compliance with the current policy as part of their regular monthly reporting I will say that again and publish... as part of their regular monthly reporting. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So it reads now, and monitor, and publish reports on compliance with the current policy as part of the regular monthly reporting.

U.S. please. I'm sorry, okay sorry, I misunderstood. So any comments? Okay then the rationale. Consistent with our prior advice we take this opportunity to issue further guidance as the progress, as the progress of the development and implementation of the EPDP activities have raised concerns. The GAC has consistently advised on the necessity of finding a swift solution to ensuring timely access to nonpublic registration data for legitimate third party purposes that complies with the requirements of the GDPR and other data protection and privacy laws. In view of the significant negative impact of the changes in

WHOIS accessibility on users with legitimate purposes. The GAC has previously noted that such legitimate purposes include civil, administrative, and criminal law enforcement, cybersecurity, consumer protection and IP rights protection. The GAC also notes that the European data protection Board in its guidance, has expressly encouraged ICANN and the community to develop a comprehensive model covering the entirety of the data processing cycle, from collection to access.

So why is it part highlighted? So we have active participants in the Google docs real-time. Okay so, I was just wondering whether this needs to be -- why its highlighted but it's okay so we are reading this right.

As already highlighted in the GAC's San Juan and Kobe communique. The GDPR provides for mechanisms to balance the various legitimate public and private interests at stake, including privacy, and accountability. We note that the legitimate interests reflected in ICANN's bylaws, are consistent with the recitals to the GDPR, which provide examples such as "preventing fraud", "ensuring network and information security" including the ability to resist "unlawful or malicious actions", and reporting possible "criminal acts or threats to public security" to authorities, and there is a reference to GDPR recitals 47, 49 and 50.

So any comments on the rationale? Okay. Then follow up on previous advice. The following items reflect matters related to previous consensus advice provided to the Board. First on protection of the Red Cross and rest Crescent designations and identifiers. The GAC welcomes the progress made towards the permanent protection and reservation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent designations, names and identifiers from registration at the second level. It takes notes with appreciation of ICANN Board's resolution of 27 January 2019 acknowledging the public policy considerations associated with the protection of the Red Cross and rest Crescent names in the domain name system. Adopting the consensus recommendation les of the reconvened GNSO process and instructing ICANN staff to execute the protections to be afforded to the names of the 191 national Red Cross and Red Crescent societies, the international committee of the Red Cross, and the international federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent societies. The GAC welcomes the outputs of the implementation review team and encourages ICANN to completion of the current public comment forum and pursuant to comments made to publish and notify ICANN's contracted parties of the new policy and of applicable implementation and compliance deadlines.

The GAC also reaffirms its past advice that the acronyms of the two international organizations within the International Red

Cross and Red Crescent movement, the ICRC and the IFRC, be addressed under the same protection regime to be agreed and implemented for the acronyms of IGOs. The GAC lastly encourages the Board to consider to complement the list of Red Cross and rest Crescent designations protected at the first level and included in the Applicant Guidebook with the full and agreed list of names and identifiers of the different Red Cross and Red Crescent organizations. So any comments on the Red Cross and Red Crescent part?

Okay. On IGO protections the GAC notes that the topic of rechartering a specific PDP work track concerning a curative mechanism to address the issue of protection of IGO identifiers remains under discussion with the GNSO. Any comments?

And lastly, domain name registration data service and data protection. The GAC emphasizes that the policy -- I'm sorry, the GAC emphasizes that the privacy proxy services accreditation issues, the PPSAI policy recommendations remain highly relevant and implementation efforts should continue as appropriate. In parallel with the ongoing policy development work in the EPDP on gTLD registration data. The implementation of the PPSAI should not be deferred until the completion of the EPDP. Any comments? Spain, please.

SPAIN:	Yes, thank you. Well, it is just as well that the words GDPR -- WHOIS have been erased because PPSA does not have to do with that. It has to do with some special services that are being sold by registries, and that is a practice that should be stopped. I think this we can all agree that this is a matter that law enforcement deeply cares about it in all our countries. In the past, what the Board has answered to this request which has been requested to them many times, is that the PPSAI policy recommendation is old, and that it is not any more applicable due to the existence of the EPDP. And I think we -- are in danger of running the same course of before of telling them the same thing and getting the same answer, unsurprisingly.
	Therefore, maybe we could perhaps with, maybe we could add some disclaimer saying that the implementation of the most relevant parts of the PPSAI or of the still applicable of the PPSAI to remark that it could be -- that this is urgent. That these addresses are an urgent need. Because as they -- as they both said us to before. Some parts of the PPSAI are already old. Do not address the problems changing from GDPR.
MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:	Thank you, Spain. So any reactions to comments made by Spain? European Commission please. Go ahead.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: I don't know if it helps but would it be possible for -- to be a little bit more specific with parts of the -- do we deem more of the privacy proxy service accreditation issues we have in mind when we were making this because I have the fear that when we address this again and again, as you say, we get the same answer, so it doesn't -- it doesn't resonate to the Board as we gave the same remark. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So are we going to specify the parts, or -- I mean the suggestion was just to mention that some parts, not everything, right?

SPAIN: Well, I think I do not know the -- I have never been able to recall the specific part of the PPSIA. What I do know is that this privacy proxy services quite simply should not be sold any more. So that we could address -- we could mention the implementation ever the PPSAI concerning the -- how you say the shall maybe you could word it in English -- like [Interpreter Speaking] the discontinuation (Spain in English) maybe a small the implementation of the PPSAI concerning the -- the interruption of these services for the -- interruption. The stopping. The banning maybe to have that word -- the deprecation, what would I say is registries should not be selling these special privacy services anymore. Privacy should be given as a right, and a privacy laws in

every country but not as a -- not be sold as a special privilege which could be abused by parties.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So, maybe we can try to take this offline, and try to dig some specific language, but meanwhile let me ask, do we have anything else pending? I think the ccNSO, and the ALAC, yeah, so we have text on our bilateral, what does the ccNSO meeting with the country code name meeting organization. CcNSO. The back met with members of the ccNSO and discussed the fundamental connection between country code top-level domains ccTLDs and the ISO 3166. But I think the focus was on retirement of ccTLDs. In fact, the session was more of onboarding on the retirement of ccTLDs.

So, we have now the ccNSO part and we will double check again cross-check with the agenda that we already discussed with the ccNSO, on meeting with the at large advisory committee, the GAC met with members of the ALAC and discussed updates on the EPDP on gTLD registration data. Co-operation in capacity building efforts, collaboration of ALAC with the GAC focal group on subsequent rounds of new gTLDs. Any comments on this? Okay. I think we are also missing a text on our meeting with ATRT3 so the GAC met with representatives of the ATRT3 GAC work party who shared the status of the review team's efforts.

This was our meeting this morning with at respect. So if there are -- so under the GAC working group, to examine the protection of geographic names in any further expansion of new gTLDs there is a slightly modified text to address Olga's point. The GAC plenary considered the conclusion of the deliberations in Work Track 5 on geographic names at the top level. A sub team of the new gTLD subsequent procedures policy development process working group. With an inclusive leadership composed of 4 co-heaters from ALAC. CcNSO GAC and GNSO Work Track 5 conducted 52 meetings in nearly 2 years to review the existing protection of geographic names at the top level. And determine if new recommendations were needed for future rounds of new gTLDs. The consensus recommendations of Work Track 5 have been submitted for consideration by the PDP working group. And the rest of the text remains the same. Any comments? So thank you support staff for this proposal.

So the one last pending thing is the PPSAI part, so, so we'll be checking this for like 5 minutes if you want to stretch, we will be providing text for the PPSAI part and this will be the last thing in the communique so hopefully we will finish soon. Just give us a few minutes. Thank you.

(BREAK FOR DOCUMENT DRAFTING)

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So, thank you for your patience. We're good to start. So if you can take your seats, I promise to finish half past as scheduled. So very quickly, on the domain name registration directory service and data protection, we -- there was just one mine or addition the word again, so the GAC emphasizes again that the privacy proxy services accreditation issues, PPSAI policy recommendations remain highly relevant, and implementation efforts should continue as appropriate. In parallel with the ongoing policy development work in the EPDP on gTLD registration data. The implementation of the PPSAI should not be delivered until the completion of the EPDP. So any comments?

Okay. If not, then let's move upwards. We have identified a couple of missing sessions, but again it's all factual information, but just to bring it to your attention, so meeting with the root server system advisory committee. The RSSAC. The GAC received an update from the RSSAC leadership on status of its efforts regarding RSSAC 037 on a proposed governance model for the DNS root server system. So this is the presentation we had on Saturday from Fred and Brad. Then meeting with the universal acceptance steering group. The GAC received an update on the work of the universal acceptance steering group and decided to establish a new working group to address universal acceptance and internationalized domain names matters of relevance to

governments. Again this is the meeting I think we had yesterday with the steering group. And then meeting on the ICANN legitimacy project. The GAC met with researchers from the university of Gutenberg and received an update on initial results of the ICANN legitimacy project. Anything else I'm missing?

Okay. Checking. Okay, so I've been told that Pua submitted a comment on the number of observers. We are cross-checking again. We are to make an accurate count and reflect this in the communique. So any final finally comments? Or yes, please, France.

FRANCE: Thank you chair. For the record. Speaking for France. I will once again speak in French. A bit longer this time all apologies. [Interpreter Speaking] in this education we are talking about the .amazon I don't want to reopen the text. I don't want to go again on that difficult topic that took us too long. Do you -- France consider that the text adopted reflects all the sensitivities and opinions and views that were discussed during these days, and if I take the floor, it's because I want just to state something regarding principle. France thinks there should be an external mediation so as to proceed with the negotiations. What we appreciate is the idea provided by the European Commission supported by a significant number of GAC members. France finds

satisfactory that the negotiations with the Amazon corporation should go on, but not just negotiation -- negotiating for the sake of negotiation. That we need to be focus -- or they need to be focused on a solution. If you allow me, I would make a comparison to, but we should not make any -- remake or waiting for Godot. So we should limit -- or we should give a limit to this negotiation that should be set. So all parties should sit around the same table and in good faith negotiate an agreeable solution. I thank all of you for your patience. Ergo, I think it is very late in the afternoon so it's very difficult to listen to the statement of principles at this late time. Thank you very much.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, France, and thank you for putting your views on record, well noted and thank you for not asking to reconsider the whole thing at this late hour, so, thank you very much, and I think it's always an option for both parties to sit down and agree, and I definitely hope this takes place. So any other requests for the floor? Brazil, please.

BRAZIL: [Interpreter Speaking] with respect to the text we did everything we could so as to be sensitive enough so that everybody may enjoy the evening in Montreal. When we say that sometimes the reality is kind of hidden, and when we consider all the delegates

that kept taking the floor, and thought about time limited mediation, I don't know how to say it in French but I would like to say clearly, that this is completely acceptable, and is acceptable by the Amazonian countries because the Amazonian countries are interested in taking advantage of the proposal by the European Commission. There has been several delegations on one side and the other. And certainly this kind of a controversial is not helpful for moving forward.

The ICANN Board, if they decide to get committed to the subject, I would like the Amazonian countries to open their arms and fully willing to commit to this new independent mediation, with a mechanism to be decided upon by the Board. Otherwise, this has taken a lot of energy, and a lot of time, we hope it would be concluded, that -- and I foresee that the outcomes, the consequences of this, I don't know if there would be positive for the balance of the Internet governance and forget this euphemism particularly when we talk about private and public sector. I will shift to English now.

(Brazil speaking in English) on behalf of the Amazonian countries not able to be here. All the delegation that is work hard to facilitate the consensus on the -- on this important issue, and I also think that the delegations that had a different point of view for the constructive atmosphere that prevailed here at GAC, we, we should -- the best for all the people who worked on this, on

this, on the one side or the other. We may be very close to removing the .amazon issue from the GAC agenda once and for all.

And but I'm afraid that this issue of geographic names will be with us for a long time, and with other regionals, with other cities. With other cultures.   With other neighborhoods.   With other communities, that will face the situation in what they consider to be the cultural heritage, their symbolic -- how do you say? [†Speaking in French†] (Brazil speaking in English again) their names appropriated by, might be a legitimate commercial enterprise. We have nothing Guelphs the company itself. On the contrary we always had a very good dialogue with the company and its representatives, but I don't think it's satisfactory and I hope to prove you wrong but I think this issue will come back in other forms and in other ways. The -- what could prevent this from happening would be what I call the -- in my statement a win-win situation which would be a situation in which the application is granted. But with the consent of the Amazonian countries. By way of certain formalities and solutions that we worked out informally on the house of ICANN.   In Kobe, elsewhere. That could lead us to a positive development. If there is still a chance to do it, by all means, we will be ready. And I'm very happy to have made this speech, like our Canadian diplomat; half in French; half in English, so it's part of the international spirit

of ICANN. Thank you all for -- and good for the secretariat that is always helpful and always guided our delegations into the minutiae of finding where exactly in website are the documents under the Google words or whatever it is that we needed to take part in the debate. Thank you very much.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Brazil, and thank you for the constructive dialogue, and flexibility, and co-operative spirit. I think we all sincerely hope that everybody would end to the satisfaction of both sides, and we hope that this had can -- I mean there is always still a chance. Doesn't have to be you know in a formal set up. If the parties are willing to, to discuss.

So, any last requests for the floor before we conclude? Okay. If not, then allow me to thank our generous host for their warm and kind hospitality here in Montreal and thanks to you all for your active participation. Your fruitful discussions and co-operative spirit. And thanks to my GAC leadership colleagues, working group chairs, topic leads. Liaisons and points of contact for their help in preparing, and in in running the meetings here. And a warm welcome to incoming vice-chairs, we are all looking forward to working with you all. And as always, a big thank you to our fantastic GAC support staff team, for their tireless efforts before and during the meeting. The dedicated IT team working

silently behind the scenes, and last but never least our wonderful interpreters, and scribes who are instrumental to our discussions. So safe travels to everyone. We'll continue to engage inter-sessionally and hope to see you all in Cancun. Thank you.

[Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]