MONTREAL – GAC: Communique Review and Drafting Session
Tuesday, November 5, 2019 – 17:00 to 18:30 EDT
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: We are ready to start. You can take your seats please.

So, thank you, everyone. Thank you very much for providing communique language. Frankly, I was impressed when I saw the communique today. There was so many contributions. So, thanks to everyone.

This session is 30 minutes, or now maybe less. We will go through the structure of the communique, the text we already have, what we're missing, what we should expect, and then take 15 minutes break, then we reconvene, and we still have like 90 minutes on the communique after the break.

But for the sake of this session, let's go through the communique structure and what we have received. So, we have the normal introduction section on number of ideas. We have inserted language on the loss of Dr. Tarek Kamel, as this took place on the first plenary. Under activities and community engagements, this is the normal reporting on activities that took place here, so our meeting with the Board, meeting with the GNSO, meeting with

---

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.

the registry stakeholder group, and meeting with the new -- whenever there's a complete agenda to the meeting, we're just listing this agenda again. Otherwise, it's a more factual description of what took place during that meeting. Then under community discussions, cross-community suggestions, this reflects GAC participation in the relevant cross-community sessions. We had the one that took place earlier on EPDP, but there are other sessions taking place tomorrow and after tomorrow.

Under internal matters, there is a reporting on GAC membership and whether we have new members or observers. Then elections, the results of the elections. Then the reports from the different working groups, the public safety working group, the human rights working group, working group on -- unserved regions working group, the geographic names working group, the operating principles, the group on subsequent rounds.

So, thank you, Fabien, for the reminder. The highlighted part has been submitted by Belgium, and it was raised during the session. It's the idea of having some tool, similar to what we have on two-character codes for the geographic names. For now, we have inserted this under the relevant session, and we will discuss the text definitely and agree on it after the break.

If we scroll down further -- yeah. This is the Board GAC interaction group, which met today before lunch. The GAC operational matters. We discussed the elections and other things. So, this is, again, a reflection of what has been discussed during the session. If we can scroll down. Under other issues, we have the .Amazon. I think the text submitted by Brazil, right? And if we scroll down further.

So, yeah. Because it seems that there are two different submissions -- I mean, there is text submitted first, but someone is currently editing or -- but unfortunately, we cannot tell who is doing this exactly, so if we can just coordinate or maybe comment on the text you are editing so that we can know who is editing. You can identify each other and try to work the text together as well.

Can we scroll down? Anything else on the communique? Brazil, please. I'm sorry. Go ahead.

BRAZIL: Thank you, Manal. I had to notice that the text that was submitted is -- down. I wondered if it would not be easier to follow if my version would be there. The alternative version would be there too so people could compare. Right now, even if I had the computer in front of me, I could not read my own text. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Fair enough. If people would like to submit alternate text, try to submit a different alternative with the comment so we can know who is submitting and compare the text on the screen.

Okay. Thank you, Fabien. Fabien already did this, so instead of the strike-through, he has highlighted the comment. Thank you. We are all trying this Google thing together, so thank you for your patience.

Do we have anything else in the communique? So, under consensus advice to ICANN Board, we currently have the CCT review and sub rounds of new gTLDs. I think it's the only part under GAC advice, right? No. And access to gTLD registration data. This is a placeholder. We haven't received the text yet. Okay.

So, this is where the communique -- yet? We have a section on follow-up on previous GAC advice. We have here text for protection of the Red Cross and Red Crescent identifiers. IGO protections. This is the normal reporting on the next face-to-face meeting. This is where the current draft stands.

Again, thank you very much to everyone who submitted comments or submitted text. I appreciate those already holding a pen, that they also submit their text so that we can have the chance to discuss it. I'm not sure. I'm just checking the time. At

what time does this session end? Okay. So, we still have seven minutes. I'm not sure if there is anything quick that we need to discuss. Yeah, Belgium, please.

BELGIUM: I have made a point on the auction procedure. Thank you to those who have written some sentence -- it's not very important, but if you remember, we have now three options to choose for a foundation -- a new foundation of ICANN, or something like an existing non-profit organization. So, maybe that's something we would like to be input. We would like to give input on the selection of the project. Maybe something under the selection of the organization because we haven't said anything about the three options. Something about we would like to see -- I don't have a position, I don't know if we go to an existing non-profit organization or foundation, but I would like to be aware of the critique of the choose of this new structure. Before the selection of project, saying something about the selection of the restriction. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Belgium. Yeah. Selection of the mechanism that will be followed, right? It's one them, but we don't -- yeah?

BELGIUM: During the booth, if we have a wording.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. Let's discuss this and see the exact language. Any other initial comments on where we stand? Okay.

If not, then let's take a break, and let's meet again here at 5:00 please. We can go deeply and go through the drafts. Thank you.

ICANN ANNUAL GENERAL **66**
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

MONTREAL - ICANN66 GAC: COMMUNIQUE DRAFTING

Tuesday, November 5, 2019 – 17:25 – 18:15 EST

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Apologies, everyone. We're trying to incorporate all the text we have received, so maybe five more minutes. Sorry to keep you waiting.

Thank you everyone for your patience. We are ready to start. I think we will be making the first reading to the -- I mean, the substantial parts of the text, meaning not necessarily reporting on working groups and on bilateral meetings. We will meet tomorrow. For now, let's start discussing the text we have received.

As mentioned earlier, we received direct text under the geographic names part from Belgium. It reads "in order to facilitate the processing of future applications of gTLDs, the GAC invites ICANN to analyze the minutes of putting in place a system of timely notifications to GAC members of strings that consist in geographic names, drawing inspiration as appropriate from the existing tool for the two-character codes." Belgium?

BELGIUM: Thank you. Do you want me to explain the rationale of this point of --

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Please. Go ahead.

BELGIUM: Okay.   First of all, I would like to thank Argentina for the participation in the working group. The working group has finally achieved a compromise of three years of this cushion. We can be happy or unhappy with this compromise. I personally feel we will face the same discretions we had during the first one. That's why -- facilitate the future descriptions. React before problems arrive. The State as the representative of the general interest must have the possibility to engage a dialogue with an applicant from the moment of the application for -- introduced or even before. Such as the same notifications still exists, so the idea is to ask ICANN to analyze the possibility to extend the tool for the second corrected code to a system of timely notifications of the application of the gTLD. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Belgium. Let me also tell you, we had a quick discussion as GAC leadership on this specific text during the

ICANN 66
ANNUAL GENERAL
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

lunch break. It's a good idea, but we felt it's premature to put it as advice to the Board. So, we decided maybe to move it to the part, the informational part of the relevant session, which was on geographic names. Yeah, Belgium, go ahead.

BELGIUM: Thank you. I can leave with that, but as Jorge said, we have to ask it now and not wait to -- it's important. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Belgium. So, yeah, we can submit it as input to the PDP process. Definitely. This is something we can do. But in terms of the communique, I think it would fit in the informational part. Having said that, we need to fine tune the language. Okay.

Any comments? Yeah, U.S, please.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. Can you please explain if this is being submitted as GAC advice or a factual discussion from this working group? Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So, originally, it was being submitted at GAC advice, but we agreed to move it to the informational part, reflecting the discussion and not providing any advice at the moment. We think it's premature, and we think we may start by submitting it to the PDP itself first. U.S, please, go ahead.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. Well, the U.S. does not support the addition of this text in the second paragraph under this working group.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Sorry. Can you speak closer to the mic?

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Yes. Sorry. U.S. does not support the text. We believe the text would merely reflect the presentation -- should merely reflect the presentation of factual discussion that was made by the WT5 to the GAC, which is what we believe the first paragraph provides for. This proposal was also a proposal that was discussed in the WT5 working group and did not receive consensus support. Therefore, the U.S. does not support the proposal in the WT5 discussions, and we would not be able to support similar language in the communique. From our perspective, it provides for a slippery

slope of giving additional protections to geographic names, a concept the U.S. does not agree with. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, U.S.   I think in terms of reflecting the factual discussion, this, I believe, is agreed. We need to reflect what has been discussed.   I believe Belgium raised this from the floor during the session but was not in the presentation. Again, I would say after we hear from Argentina as well, maybe we can try to work on the text offline, then we will revisit it again tomorrow. Argentina, please.

ARGENTINA: Thank you, Manal, Belgium, and United States. I would like to stress the words expressed by our colleagues from the PDP GNSO working group. There is a sign of flexibility in the process. Such text would give us the opportunity to express the idea from the GAC to -- from this flexibility.

What I would propose is we may think about a new text that addresses the concerns from the United States and Belgium and other countries, in finding value of saying that such could be useful. It is true that in WT5, this idea that was not -- did not get

consensus, but that doesn't prevent the GAC to express other ideas. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Argentina. European Commission, please.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thank you. The European Commission strongly supports the proposal by Belgium. As we see here, we make the point we have to have a dynamic process in GAC. Even if this was not agreed in Work Track 5, just the information we heard today from the Board here in this room about the complexity of the number of recommendations and findings from the review process, with regards to the first strand of gTLDs, means we must be in a position to take account some of those recommendations of that analysis of what happened. Anticipate and prevent problems in the future. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, European Commission. I have the U.S. and then Brazil.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. Well, we agree we can find work offline to find text for a compromise. The issue we have is when you look at the first sentence. It says the GAC invites ICANN. We don't agree, so perhaps we can find a way to say this text where it reflects everyone's views. Thank you very much.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, U.S. And yeah, I fully agree. I already mentioned this, that we need to work on the language itself, since we moved it from the GAC advice part to the information part. So, we'll be doing this. I invite all concerned countries to maybe get together and provide an alternate text by tomorrow. Brazil, please. Sorry to keep you waiting.

BRAZIL: It's okay. Achilles Emilio Zaluar Neto from Brazil. Happy to take the floor right now. I detect some sign of movement towards some sort of compromise that will allow us to keep the essence of the idea of considering the geographic -- the timely notification of geographic names as Belgium proposed. At the same time, I respect the sensitivities of everybody.

I just wanted to add that if GAC cannot add anything to what was discussed previously in technical bodies and working groups, et

cetera, then there is not much value in GAC -- I think that's where we want to start. Do we want to have GAC adding value, adding a reflection? There are many governments that only take part -- here in the GAC when the plenary meet. That's reality that's maybe not ideal, but it is the reality that people, especially developing countries, seems to not have the technical resources to follow all the working groups. The chance to give an input is when the issue comes up to the GAC. I trust that yourself, Olga from Argentina will come up with some consensus language to help us move forward. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Brazil. I also trust we can come up with a consensus language as you rightly mentioned. I think we are in agreement that the text will not be in the advice part. It's premature. It's going to be a factual text under the relevant session. We will discussion potential submission to the relevant PDP at the time. So, thanks to everyone.

Can we move to, I think, .Amazon next? Fabien, yeah, if you can guide me.

FABIEN BERTREMIEUX: The editing you see in this section reflects input we've received from the U.S. So -- sorry. Okay. The editing you see in this section reflects input we've received from Brazil, I believe. So, there are two parts in brackets. I believe you provided those two pieces of text. And the edits, in addition to those two bracketed parts, input we received from the U.S.

I forgot to mention we received an expression of support from Israel to the edits that are suggested by the U.S.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So, the two paragraphs between brackets are submitted by the U.S, right?

FABIEN BERTREMIEUX: The first sentence, the very first sentence of the section is suggested, I believe, moving the sentence from the bottom to the top. I understand that what follows is a first -- is a first bracketed input that's provided as such by Brazil, if I'm correct. And there is a comment of the U.S, and I'll read the comment over this whole section. This text appears to be providing follow-up GAC advice. The GAC did not reach an agreement to provide further or follow-up advice on the ICANN Board. You recall this was redlined entirely.

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL 66
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

Underneath the highlighted section is another section of text that was bracketed as well, initially provided by Brazil, if I'm correct. Which the U.S. suggested edits that are reflected in this text. Does that make sense?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So, we will move on to another section because I understand that Brazil would like to have their text presented as is initially, without any strike-throughs. We will clean this version and make a version with the U.S. comments or edits so that we have both versions so that we are able to read the Brazilian text in full. Sorry, Brazil. Are we seeking the floor?

BRAZIL: I was a bit confused because I forgot my computer in the hotel, so I'm reading straight from the screen. I was not sure where -- if there was anything below. If you can move up the text a little bit. No, the other way. Okay. That's it.

I'm a little bit puzzled that the text -- part of the text that is proposed to be stricken down is the quote of the Abu Dhabi advice. I'm puzzled by that. I'll be glad to work on a language that -- find consensus. With the point we have is whether the advice was followed or not. For us to understand the debate of people

who -- understand the debate. It might be useful to quote the Abu Dhabi advice. The experienced colleagues who will help us find a solution to that. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much Brazil. Are you -- I mean, are you okay we go through this text, or do we need to divert to your original without the strike-through? Because if this is the case, we will move to another section, and then come back to the .Amazon later when we do the necessary edits. Brazil.

BRAZIL: By all means another section. The literal quote of the Abu Dhabi advice, I would like to keep the quote from the Abu Dhabi advice. If we don't put the quote there, nobody understands. I don't have a problem with having the quote. Some people think it was followed; some people think it was not followed. That's the situation. We needed to keep the Abu Dhabi advice.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil. At least now we know the point of conflict, which is the Abu Dhabi advice. Again, I hope we can have this discussion offline and maybe come back with a more agreed text.

But for now, let's move to another section, the following section, please.

So, this is under consensus advice to ICANN Board. First is the CCT review and subsequent rounds of new gTLDs. The text reads, "The GAC advises the Board not to proceed with a new round of gTLDs until after the successful implementation of the recommendations in the competition consumer trust and consumer choice review that were identified as prerequisites or as high priority."

The rationale reads, the competition consumer trust and consumer choice review. We need to strike one of those reviews. Is the first completed bylaw mandated review after the IANA Stewardship transition. The review identified a number of issues that should be addressed in areas such as the necessity and availability of data, including costs and benefits, the effectiveness of safeguards, the promotion of consumer trust, the mitigation of the DNS abuse, and the geographic representation of applicants.

The reviewed provided 35 consensus recommendations. It said that 14 of the recommendations must be implemented prior to the launch of subsequent procedures for new gTLDs prerequisites. A further 10, high priority recommendations should be implemented by 8 March 2020, 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 gTLDs.

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.

So, if we can move back to the advice part, and let me see if there is consensus on the language of this advice. Okay. I see no objections, so we will have this as a consensus GAC advice. Any comments on the rationale? I don't see any requests for the floor, so let's move on to the following consensus GAC advice on who is in GDPR.

The advice reads, the GAC advises the Board to take possible steps to ensure that 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 3rd, 2020.

With regard to Phase 2 and the conclusion of the EPDP, the GAC recognizes the considerable efforts undertaken by all participants within the EPDP. Nevertheless, there will likely be a significant time between finalization of the Phase 2 policy recommendations, implementation of Phase 1 and Phase 2, and the construction and the deployment of any new domain name registration system and unified access model.

The GAC advises the Board to one, deploy the ICANN organization to ensure that the current system that requires reasonable access to a non-public domain name registration is operating effectively. This should include educating key stakeholder groups, including governments, that there is a process to request non-public data, actively making available, slash, publishing. Those are alternate wordings. A standard request form that can be used by stakeholders to request access based upon the current consensus policy. Again, I think we're choosing between actively making available, versus publicizing. Links to registrar information and points on this topic.

Two, deploy ICANN compliance to create a specific process to address complaints regarding failure to respond to and unreasonable denial of requests for non-public domain name register station data, and monitor and report on compliance with the current policy.

So, let's move back again to the advice itself, and let me ask. It's two pieces of advice. Any comments on the first advice? Okay. So, let's go to B.

So, I'm sorry. Any comments on the second part of the advice? Again, I'm seeking flagging initial comments. If not, we'll be sleeping on the text and fine tuning again tomorrow. We still have tomorrow, but for now, if there is something evident that we need to resolve maybe offline before we come tomorrow. I see no requests for the floor, so maybe -- do we have anything else remaining on the --

So, with the rationale reads, consistent with our prior advice with, we take this opportunity to issue further guidance 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 a non-public register station data -- for the 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 and WHOIS accessibility, on users with -- purposes. The GAC has previously noticed that purposes include civil, administrative, and criminal law enforcement, cyber security, consumer protection, and IP rights protection. The GAC also notes the

European Data Protection Board in its guidance has encouraged ICANN and the community to develop a comprehensive model covering the entirety of the data processing cycle from collection to access.

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

Is there anything else? Okay. So, we'll make a first reading of the follow-up on previous GAC advice. But I'll ask you again when you review the GAC advice, please be mindful of how explicit we are because I've been told there are a few words like "successful" and things like that. Probably we will be asked during the post-communique clarification calls what do we mean by "successful." If there is more to say and help those who will take the advice to implementation, please be mindful of this.

Yeah. This is one example. Until after the successful implementation of the recommendations in the CCT review. I'm just flagging this so that when we come tomorrow to fine tune, you have some suggestions maybe in mind. Otherwise, we will face those same questions again when we submit the advice to the Board. They will come back to us with clarification questions, so we will have to address this sooner or later.

Follow-up on the previous GAC advice. First, we have protection of the Red Cross and Red Crescent identifiers. This reads 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 and the second level. It takes notes with appreciation of the ICANN Board's resolution of January 2019 acknowledging the public policy considerations associated with the Red Cross and Red Crescent names in the domain name system, adopting the consensus recommendations of the reconvened GNSO policy development process, and the instructing ICANN staff to execute the protections and the afforded to the names of the 191 national Red Cross and Red Crescent societies.

The GAC invites -- welcomes the outputs of the implementation review team and encourages ICANN, upon completion of the current public comment forum, and pursuant to comments

made, to publish and to notify ICANN's contracted parties of the new policy and the applicable implementations 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 name early warning and protective regimes to be agreed and implemented for the acronym of IGOs.

It wishes lastly to encourage the Board to consider to complement the Red Cross and Red Crescent designations protected at the first level and included the applicant guidebook with the full and agreed list of names and identifiers of the different Red Cross and Red Crescent organizations.

Any comments? Again, I'm thinking out loud here. My only -- this is follow-up on previous GAC advice, right? Okay. I'm sorry.

Yeah. I'm being reminded that early warning has a special meaning in new gTLDs process in general, so we may want to think of the wording to maybe -- notifications or something else along the lines to avoid confusion between what we mean and the term as it currently stands in the new gTLDs.

If there are no comments for now, we can move to the following section on IGO protections.

IGO protections [reading] and finally on GDPR and WHOIS, the GAC [reading] remain highly relevant and implementation efforts should continue as appropriate in parallel with the ongoing policy development work, the implementation of the EPDP SAI shouldn't be deferred until the completion of the EPDP. Comments on [indistinct] WHOIS or IGOs?

So as I said, this is a first reading. I hope we won't have something controversial tomorrow. If there is something evident that we can flag so we can come tomorrow with something more or less agreed, it would be great. Otherwise, just let me check if we have something else.

So I'm told that we have the .Amazon text ready. Maybe we can have a first reading of this as well and then we'll set you free. So this text now is the text submitted by Brazil, right? So I'm make a first reading now to what I hope is the Brazil reading as is and then a second reading with US comments.

So ICANN's government engagement staff provided a short overview of the .Amazon process and updates since the ICANN 65 meeting.

As a follow-up to previous GAC advice, the GAC asks the board to consider if it could facilitate arriving at a mutually agreed solution that is acceptable to the countries of the Amazon region before

the delegation of the top level domain name .Amazon as requested by the Abu Dhabi communique of ICANN60, either by designation of an outside independent mediator that would consult the applicant, the countries concerned, ACTO, civil society and other relevant stakeholder or by other means. If the board does not proceed in this way and grants the application, then the GAC asks the board to explain it chose not to follow the Durban advice of ICANN47 as well the Abu Dhabi advice of ICANN60.

During the session 9 of the GAC meeting, a delegation pointed out that granting the .Amazon application would contradict previous GAC advice which says ICANN60 Abu Dhabi communique -- I'm sorry. Which says, and there is reference to ICANN60 Abu Dhabi communique and a quote, a, in section 5 follow up on previous GAC advice with regard to the application of .Amazon and related strings, quotes, the GAC expressed the need to find a mutually acceptable solution in the case of .Amazon, gTLD applications for the countries affected and for the Amazon corporation.

And b, in section 7, GAC and then consensus advice to the board with regard to applications for .Amazon and related strings, the GAC recognizes the need to find a mutually acceptable solution for the countries affected and the Amazon corporation to allow for the use of .Amazon as a top level domain. The delegation

suggested that the GAC asked the board to appeal to an independent mediator to help reach such a mutually applicable solution, which is a prerequisite for granting the application in light of the Durban advice of ICANN47. Many delegations expressed the view that the GAC should ask the board to help promoting consensual solution to the issue, which would be important to strengthen the GAC and ICANN role in Internet governance. A few delegations expressed an opposite view and favored an immediate solution to the issue.

Can we scroll down, please. So if I understand correctly, I'm not done with the Brazilian text, this is the start of the United States text.

BRAZIL: I think somehow one of the paragraphs suggested by the United States -- I don't have a -- it repeats something in my previous language.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: The very first paragraph?

BRAZIL: No, below. Now I'm confused -- it's not important, we can work with this language as it is and take it out any repetitions. I trust the secretariat to take out the repetitions in the edit. Let's concentrate on the important issues.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. Thank you, Brazil. So now with the US edits, during session 9 of the GAC meeting, a delegation suggest that had grants the [indiscernible] would contradict previous GAC advice.

A delegation requested that the GAC ask the board to engage an independent mediator to help reach such a mutually applicable solution which the delegation believes is a prerequisite for granting the application in light of the Durban advice of ICANN47. Some delegations expressed the view that the GAC should ask the board to help promoting consensual solution to the issue which they believe would be important to strengthen the GAC and ICANN roles in Internet governance. Other delegations stated that all GAC advice on this matter have been adhered to by the board, no further GAC advice on this matter is warranted, and there should be no further delay in processing the applications. I think this is the end of the US text.

So any initial comments? Or immediate reactions? If not, then I would urge GAC colleagues to start talking together so that we

ICANN 66
ANNUAL GENERAL
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

can come tomorrow with a more agreed version on text that needs to be resolved. I believe .Amazon, the geographic names part, and please make another read-through and we still have tomorrow to go through the communique again and also read the parts that we have skipped. But I believe it's noncontroversial.

So with this, if there are no requests for the floor, we conclude for today. We are reconvening tomorrow at 8:30 -- just checking the schedule. Yeah, tomorrow at 8:30 with the GAC human rights plenary discussion and the ATRT3 review session tomorrow morning, so enjoy the rest of the day. And if you are interested, at 6:30 there is a tribute to Tarek Kamel at the main room next door to the GAC. See you tomorrow at 8:30. Thank you...

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]