GULTEN TEPE:	Okay. Since you joined us, let me start the roll call.
	Hello, everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is Gulten Tepe speaking from the GAC Support Team. Welcome to the ICANN Organization Arranging Group Consultation with GAC members regarding the use of two-character country codes as second level domains session #1 taking place on Wednesday, 17th of May, 2017, at 16:00 UTC.
	This call is meant to be interactive so if you have questions or comments at any point, you are welcome to raise your hand in the AC room. And if you're not in Adobe Connect room, please let us know on the phone. Also we need you to state your name for the transcript purposes.
	Over to you, David. The floor is yours.
DAVID:	Thank you, Gulten, and welcome, members of the GAC and colleagues. I just wanted to say that I will be moderating this call. You see from the agenda items that we'll have some introductory remarks by Göran Marby and followed if indeed Thomas wishes to also send his greetings.
	On the call today we have Akram Atallah from the GDD group, Tarek Kamel from Government Engagement, myself, Cyrus Namazi from the GDD, Rob Hoggarth and Rochelle and Nigel also from the Government Engagement and the Policy Team, plus the Policy Staff supporting you, Olof and Gulten.

We have 60 minutes for this call and we'd like to get underway right now. After the opening remarks presentation by Akram Atallah and then further discussions.

I wanted to note that unless there is objections we will record the call for note taking purposes and provide a summary notes of the call for people.

If there is no objection to that procedure, I would then like to turn it over to Göran Marby for his remarks. Göran?

GÖRAN MARBY: Thank you, David.   Hello, everybody. And first of all, thank you very much for taking the time to have this meeting. I think that this is a way of communication that I'm sort of looking forward to we can do in the future where we can have these kind of calls where we discuss things and learn things from each other.

Our intention with this call is to provide you with a little bit more information from the viewpoint of understanding the processes and especially what we've done on your behalf to address any potential confusion of the two-letter country codes at the second level and how that corresponds to the country code at the top level, and the mitigation measures that the Board has adopted. And it's really for me to understand and to understand your concerns and issues and I'm looking forward for examples. A couple of you have raised over time that there has been examples of issues and I really would like to hear more about that. And also, of course, answer any questions you might have.

It is very important for the ICANN Organization to hear the concerns of the GAC and to really for work on enhancing our communication and continue to work with a mutual trust between us.

With that, I would like to hand over to Akram who will provide a very brief presentation on the process, really so everybody is in the same page when it comes to the release of the two-character labels.

DAVID: Thank you, Göran. Before we move to Akram's presentation, Thomas might be on the line would just like to say a word of welcome.

GÖRAN MARBY: Thank you. Sorry about that.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: This is Thomas. Can you hear me?

DAVID: Please. Yes, Thomas. We can. Please.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Okay. Thank you. I just came out of the [IG] Council meeting which is not over yet. I just wanted to very briefly first of all thank ICANN and Göran and his team and Akram for organizing this call because I think we've all understood that this is a very sensitive issue to governments and also knowing that ICANN has undertaken steps to trying to

accommodate for these concerns and I think this is a very good opportunity to listen to each other, learn from each other, and see what can be done in order to accommodate these concerns and implement [inaudible] into any procedures and further activities that may pop up. So thank you all for being here, for listening to each other. I hope that it will be a constructive meeting. Thank you.

DAVID: Thank you, Thomas, for those remarks. I now turn over to Akram for the presentation. You see it on your screen. Akram, please.

AKRAM ATALLAH: Thank you, David. Can you hear me?

DAVID: Very well. Yes, indeed.

AKRAM ATALLAH: Yes. Thank you everybody for giving us the opportunity to present this and to discuss and also to hear your concerns. We look forward to a very constructive dialog so I will try to be very brief on this. I know a lot of you know all of this but some of you might not and so we're going to go over the quick agenda here.

Next slide please.

The first thing is I will go a little bit over the background then I'll talk a little bit about the timeline, I will mention the GAC advice, the principles

that we've taken to do this, and then I will talk about the measures to avoid confusion that we've put in place for you to deal with issues as they come up.

Slide please.

Just very briefly, the GNSO Reserve Names Working Group back in May, 2007, made some recommendations and these recommendations were used to actually develop the contracts and put the how we release country codes into the contracts. It's very important to note that the WIPO 2 report statement said that if [inaudible] two country code elements are to be registered and the GAC supported the statement as domain names in the gTLDs, it is recommended that this will be done in a manner that minimizes the potential for confusion with the ccTLDs. So these set of recommendations came out in May, 2007.

Moving to the next slide please.

As I mentioned this is very briefly, the [inaudible] agreement implemented these as well as a lot of other recommendations and things to make the contract, but the contract mentions two ways for releasing cc country codes at the second level. The first path is by government and ccTLD approvals. The second path is by mitigating confusion and ICANN approval. So these are the two things that are in the contract.

Next slide please.

So the implementation of this bit of the contract took over three years and was very well thought out, and as you can see in the timeline it was

done in phases. The first phase was to release everything that's not a character character and then we worked on developing mechanisms for the GAC to provide input on every country code and then we released the ones that were approved, then we developed a mechanism for mitigation. So the program was very well thought out and all the GAC advice during that period was taken into consideration and we had implemented what we thought was the – next slide please – what we thought was in the contracts, what was needed for security and stability, what was the Board resolutions to the GAC advice, as well as providing the measures to avoid confusion which was one of the recommendations that I mentioned earlier.

So the key principles for developing the implementation were based on either the contracts or the policies or the advice that the GAC provided, and we implemented [what] we thought was a very good process that actually satisfies everybody, not as quick as everybody desired for us to do it, but as carefully and as feasible for allowing the GAC also to interact without having to get the GAC into an operational mode. So these were very carefully constructed.

Next slide please.

Now, the measures to avoid confusion – it's very important that I go through these one by one. We wanted to provide the opportunity for the TLDs that want to issue a similar to what's called a Sunrise, allow government and ccTLDs that want to register their two-characters in that TLD the opportunity to do that before general availability. This is optional. It's not a requirement. But it was important to have that opportunity.

The second thing is that we requested in the registration policy that the registrants may not misrepresent affiliation with a government or ccTLD operator, meaning that anybody that actually goes into the TLD with the intention of registering a country code or a two-character representing a country code, they cannot be misrepresenting that they are the country that was represented by the two characters or to try to impersonate an agency of that country or the like. That was required in the registration policy.

Third, if there was [misabuse] of that, we wanted to have the registries investigate and respond to the complaints from governments and ccTLD operators and that basically says that they have to investigate any complaint that was made and then they have to report back on it. Of course, like everything in our contract it is something that the registries must comply with. So if there's any complaints from the country code about somebody in the TLD using the two-character code to misrepresent themselves, then actually you can complain to the registries and the registries must investigate and respond to the complaint.

Also very importantly, if the registry does not investigate and report back on the complaint, then you can go to our Compliance Department and actually file a complaint there. So it's not basically that we're leaving this between you and the registry. Everything that is in our contract is something that our contracted parties have to comply with and our Compliance Department will have to make sure that they do that as well.

I think I don't want to take too much time, but I want to open it up for discussions and answer questions so that we can actually make full use of the hour that we have.

One more thing that I want to mention – one of the things that actually we were worried about is that we kept saying that basically every two-character code was already used either in at the second level either in previous ccTLDs or the legacy registrations, and we wanted to make sure that we're not actually just using anecdotal data for that so we went and we did some research on that and we actually determined that at the minimum previously every two-character code is at least used 13% or 14% of the time in the TLDs that were pre the new gTLD program. So we had also precedent that these are used and they're not causing any harm as well. And we have the data if you are interested in that as well. So we're really doing everything we can to make sure that this issue is not an issue that's going to create more harm or at least if it does create harm, there is a way, an avenue, to address that.

So with that, I think I'll give it back to you, David. Thank you.

DAVID: Akram, thank you very much for the presentation and the summary. I would now like to open the floor to any comments or questions and I'll be taking the queue beginning with Olga Cavalli. Olga, please. You are recognized.

OLGA CAVALLI: Hello. Can you hear me?

DAVID: Yes, Olga. We can.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much. I would like to thank- thank you, David. I can hear you as well. First of all, thanks to ICANN for organizing this call. I think it's extremely useful to have this basis of dialog and to work close coordination in between our members of the GAC and ICANN and members of the Board and our ICANN CEO.

And thanks, Akram, for the detailed explanation. I personally have been reviewing all the resolutions since the very beginning and there was a time by the end of 2014 when a process was established by ICANN that it was a consultation with some countries that we had expressed the desire to be informed at the release of the two-character codes before the release of the new gTLDs. It was in place for a while and it worked very well. Just for you to know, at a local level [inaudible] – there's a phone echo – at the national level we had implemented a simple procedure when we the GAC representatives received the information about the future release of two-character codes and the new TLD, we had a consultation with our national ccTLD and if there were no comments the process went on.

I don't remember having any conflict or any problem but we had this feeling that we were kept informed and kept in the loop of a very pertinent and transparent way of getting this information. So what I would like to ask you is, what makes this radical change in the way that

things were implemented before and why the GAC was not consulted before making this change? Thank you very much.

AKRAM ATALLAH: Thank you, Olga. I believe that once the contract was actually put out for final public comment and approved, then we moved into the implementation of the process. I believe that we've had at least three webinars on the issues – Cyrus might correct me if I'm wrong – with the GAC and we actually presented how we're doing things and we actually worked with the GAC on the issues that they had in implementing the [list]. So I thought that we actually were engaged with the GAC throughout, and if you feel like we didn't, then actually we didn't do a good job on that.

So I will actually look into that and try to figure out where the communication did not happen and will get back to you on that, I guess. I thought that we actually did every step of the way we worked with you on that.

DAVID: Thank you, Akram. Is there someone next on the queue? I think there was someone from Brazil – Benedicto, yes. Thank you. Sorry, now I see your hand. Please.

BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Yes. I'll be speaking over the phone. Can you hear me?

DAVID: Yes, we can hear you.

BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Thank you for the presentation and for these clarifications, but my point refers very much in the same vein as Olga Cavalli has just mentioned because when this issue was first considered last year at the Hyderabad at the meeting we had last year, it came as a surprise for most GAC members including my own delegation, and I don't think that an issue that is of such importance that we would refrain from being engaged. [Inaudible] engagement in [inaudible] phases of the process [inaudible] a few years ago. But my concern is that when we [inaudible] radical change a total new game that is being played that Akram has explained, there were two alternatives to deal with it – either consulting the countries or adopting policy. So when we move from one to the other, it is not clear that such consultation took place and we would like to have more clarity on this.

The GAC communiqué, as you are fully aware, really seeks – one of the points seeks clarification of the decision-making process and the rationale for doing it also regarding the timing and how it was, and particularly why the GAC was not at that point in time brought on board because an issue of such magnitude, of such importance, for the GAC as a whole that to change our modus operandi, a procedure that was in place and that was to the extent we can understand was working fine. So it is not clear at all the way I understand Akram has explained some steps that were taken, particularly in the process of the decision-making, the final stage of it is not clear and this reflects the perception of most [countries] and by the way, I think it's not a minority of

countries as many people have been saying. I think the majority of countries were concerned about that.

The full GAC, the [inaudible] by consensus expressed concern in regard to the procedural aspect but also in regard to the substance, I would say many, many, countries were of many different regions and levels of the development were concerned so I think we will need really more clarity. But I think information is not only what we need. I think information is good to know what happens but I think the important thing is to address the substance. As governments, we have the task and the role. This is our role in any multistakeholder format we participate is to perform our roles and responsibilities and it is to make known our ideas from the political point of view. We are not only engaged in technical discussion. We are there to provide our views on how things should go.

And there is a substantive problem here. We would like to know what the Board intends to do about it beyond providing information. It's very good, but the real issue, the issue of substance, remains. Again, I think also part of the communiqué calls for the exploration of measures to find a satisfactory solution. So in spite of that information we are not satisfied with the situation. We would like to know if there are any intended measures proposed by the Board to provide for a mutual satisfaction solution which clearly was not attained by the decision that was taken last year. Thank you.

DAVID: I thank the representative from Brazil. I now turn to the representative from Mexico, please.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible].

DAVID: Could you please speak up, the representative from Mexico? It's very hard to hear you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. Thank you very much. [Inaudible]. Can you hear me now?

DAVID: It's still very vague. Could you try to speak up a little more?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I am the representative from the [inaudible] ccTLD. I would like to know, how can we make sure that we get the right that [inaudible] and the government of Mexico get the right to specifically authorize which second level domain can [be open]. We actually make in the public comment period the statement that we would like to have that authorization right and we didn't think that [inaudible]. [Inaudible] please explain how can we proceed from now on and basically [inaudible] we can still [inaudible] that right to decide which can be open or not open. Thank you.

GÖRAN MARBY: David, it's very silent right now. Have we communication problems?

DAVID: I'm sorry, I just wanted to clarify that the authorization question that the representative from Mexico was asking – and he put that in the chat – thank you very much, [Manuel]. Your line was rather weak so we thank you for that.

I now recognize the representative from Egypt.

[MANAL ISMAIL]: Thank you, David. And thanks to Göran, Akram, and everyone who contributed to having this call.

I think we have two issues here – the issue of the process and the issue of the substance. I think, as noted by Argentina and Brazil, from a GAC perspective there was a disconnect in the process. And in terms of the outcomes or the measures I think Measure #2 is an excellent one. I believe Measure #1 is voluntary so you cannot really rely on it so I can't frankly count on Measure #1 since it is optional.

And finally, Measure #3, I believe it's moving the burden from the registry side to the government side, and instead of receiving notifications now we have to put some process in place to follow up and to… it moves the burden of the notification from the registry side to the government side. Those are my remarks regarding the process and the measures [inaudible]. Thank you.

GÖRAN MARBY: David, are you still online?

DAVID: Yes. I wanted to clarify that Olga Cavalli asked us to go back to a question raised by the representative from Italy who asked that we answered in our public comments but our comments were not taken into account. I just wanted to make sure that we captured that question and comment raised by the representative from Italy.

GÖRAN MARBY: I just want to join in here and make it because on the representative [immediately has said], there are two issues – one of them is the substance, the other one is a process. I'm not very happy to hear that we have not been able to communicate with the GAC individually or collectively in a way that you feel is [trustworthy]. This has nothing to do with the substance now, I'm talking about. And I realize this a while back ago so I engaged with a discussion with Thomas and my executive team and we are working on how to make sure that you have the right information at the right time for you to have a better capability while having a substantial discussion.

We have the poetic name of [fertilization] of a fact-based discussion within the GAC where I can recognize that we have not done enough. I will be happy to share a little bit more about my thoughts going forward on this one because we are obliged, of course, in the same way we inform other parts of the community to make sure that you have the right information. And this is nothing to do with the actual processes or anything else. You know that I'm working together with my team in Johannesburg, we are bringing what we call the flowchart discussion

back to you and together with the rest of the community to try to explain a little more how the processes works because I think that that needs a clarification as well.

But we have to say this that your comments about information sharing and we need to work together with you to help to improve that going forward. It's recognized by me. Thank you.

DAVID: Thank you, Göran. Any other comments or questions? I do not have anyone else in the queue. Mark Carvell writes in the chat for those who are not in the Adobe Connect room, "It would be helpful if this call could separate the two aspects – process and substance – of the mitigation measures.

AKRAM ATALLAH: David, if I may.

DAVID: Yes, Akram please.

AKRAM ATALLAH: Yes, thank you, Mark. And thank you, everyone, for your comments. I agree with Mark actually that if we can separate the two, it might be easier to deal with each one and try to address the issues. On the process, as Göran mentioned, we have no issue in working with the GAC to any process that you would like to put in place in order for us to –

whenever we're implementing something that either it's a Board resolution or it's in the contract, the GAC has interest in to engage with the GAC in the implementation process and make sure that we have a mechanism to continue to engagement and communication along the way and not just intermittent times. So if you have any proposals on how we can actually better engage during the implementation process, I would love to actually hear them and try to put them in place. And so we're more than interested in doing so, so that we can hear you and we can actually communicate more frequently, so that at the end, we're all arriving – we're never going to be all happy, I know. But at least we're arriving without any surprises at the end results.

And then on the substance, I see what Manal brought up. I heard that actually also what Ambassador of Brazil brought up. I will actually – we will look at the recording and we'll try to get back to you on that. If there are any more issues on that, that you'd like to bring up, please let us hear them. I don't know that we can do anything but at least we will look at them and see how we can improve things in the future.

With that, I think, now I got everybody to raise their hands so please go ahead, David. Thank you.

DAVID: Thank you Akram. The representative from Brazil and then from Argentina. Brazil, please.

BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Yes. Thank you for this further clarification provided by Akram and I am very happy to hear, the CEO and Akram. I think we'll need to improve our interaction along the way. I just waved my hand to say because Akram mentioned the importance of the implementation period to be more attuned. I think it's important but I think now for this particular case, it has also demonstrated the needs to be fully involved in the policy development process because this is what happened here, the policy development and implementation in the previous stage. Clearly, it is not only [inaudible] to my delegation, I think the full GAC will have that [impression]. That's why there was a consensus advice basically regarding the procedural aspects regarding the needs to have more information and more participation in the policy development. It is very unfortunate sometimes I would say for government's representatives just to be able to intervene in the very late phase of some policy development process.

I know there has been efforts to reach out to governments to involve governments but to may acknowledge the amount of work involved in ICANN, the amount of issues, the amount of documents. I think we would really need to improve to have some targeted and more [very focused] requests or inputs on particular aspect. In that issue, myself and my team were surprised. We tried to keep abreast of everything that is taking place in ICANN is important for us.

But we were taken by surprise by that decision, so there is clearly room, I think, for improvements in the process – in the policy development process – in spite of we recognize the effort has been made so far. This is in regard to the process but again for instance, we would really appreciate if… We're not calling for the issues to be – I don't know. I

think the thing that emanates from the decisions the contract, they're probably already in place.

I think it would not be realistic to request that these contracts would be recalled. I think there is also an issue of the judicial aspects about it. But as we look for the future, because we understand those gTLDs were delegate for a number of years, a new round of gTLDs is being negotiated with the adopted at some point in time. So we think we would really like not to only have information on how this rule [develop], but to reveal its – think about that we are laying the ground for the ground rules for future. And really we would say that with regard to substance, the term of the decision will not – for my government or many governments who would like to have the opportunity to further have input and discuss this in [inaudible] what would take place in later stages. Thank you.

DAVID: Thank you, representative from Brazil. Representative from Argentina.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, David. I'm just supporting all with my colleague, Benedicto Fonseca, has expressed in his previous comment. I would like to take two of your comments, Akram. You said that you would review the process if you were the misinterpretation of the process or the misinformation from the GAC side, that would be very helpful as Benedicto have said, we in Argentina try to follow very closely. As you know, we tried to be very active in as many processes as we can.

But sometimes, it's difficult to be present in all the different activities that are happening at the same time. So it would be interesting to, if you can help us understanding what needs [not interpretation], the use of the process that we can follow maybe also I can learn from there. And you said that you would welcome complete proposals I think there is a group of interested countries that have expressed. We are not interested in having bilateral discussions about this issue but as a group.

So my suggestion, this is a suggestion from Argentina maybe other colleagues who's joined this idea. We could have a group of countries following with you, just understand which were the problems and how we can move forward in relation with policy development processes and what was expressed by other colleagues in this call. Thank you very much.

DAVID: Thank you very much. The representative from the United Kingdom.

MARK CARVELL: Yes, thank you and hello, everybody. First of all, I just wanted to acknowledge gratefully the office from ICANN Staff and from Göran to look back on possible lessons learned from this particular process with regard to decisions taken by the Board and then implementation. If we look back at potential lessons to be learned, I think we can move forward and ensuring that this apparent disconnect that has happened will not be repeated in the future.

The ICANN Leadership and the GAC Leadership, when they get together, I think we can look at how in particular we can find a mechanism for keeping track on implementation. I noted that particular point, I think it was Akram that made it. I think that's a very valid suggestion. Let's look at that and then consult our colleagues from the GAC Leadership side and look at what mechanism we can then enhance or newly device if necessary.

With regard to PDP process, it's very difficult and challenging for many stakeholders across the constituencies to devote time and resource to participation in the PDPs. We're all finding that as a new era for the GAC in terms of this [term universal] working and committing time to join PDP Working Groups and so on. We're finding that it's a huge challenge. Most of us in the GAC, we have very wide portfolios in our national governance and keeping on top of the GAC agenda is challenging enough.

But we are committed as a committee to engaging transversely to policy development. So we need to look at how we can resource ourselves to do that, so it's not left to a small group who do have resource. We need to ensure that the diversity and the multiple participation in PDPs. And the liaison, I think, from the GNSO, I think it's a very important mechanism that perhaps we ought to make more use of. As the GAC, the GNSO liaison to the GAC and keeping us informed and pointing us, steering us, this is where we need you the GAC to give us advice on the public interest aspects or potential legal aspects or something that's more directly of concern to government's sensitivity, the government's may have.

[There] from PDP management to the GAC, this is where we need you. Hear the alert. Here's what we need – where we need your interactions. I'm hoping very much we will move to that kind of [transverse] operation in the months ahead because it's very important for us to be engaged in that way. Thanks.

DAVID: Thanks, representative from the United Kingdom. Any other comments or questions at this stage? We have in the chat a note from… Göran, please.

GÖRAN MARBY: Thank you. Thank you very much for that comment. Hopefully probably [inaudible] but I was looking for practical way to go forward. With that last comment, do you have a practical suggestion how I can engage with my team to have that conversation about making sure that it will – GAC members of the GAC has better information and interaction. What can I do to facilitate that? If you have any ideas about that.

MARK CARVELL: Shall I come back in?

DAVID: Yes, Mark, please.

MARK CARVELL: Thank you David. Well, yes, we need to look at in particular the communication mechanisms. Now this can take in various forms. We can have direct reporting into the GAC's Secretariat and the Secretariat then disseminates the update with some highlighting. Because we are overwhelmed with lots material about some highlighting and underlining, this is significant. This relates to GAC advice with regard to sensitivity, public interest, law, whatever.

So the communication mechanisms modalities, I think need a bit of scrutiny what's going to work effectively. Now as the communication can take various forms. We can have written communications. We can have calls – my experience with calls, it's quite difficult to maximize GAC participation in calls. I'm sort of going down the track looking at the written communications and the respective roles of the ICANN and GAC Leadership in coordinating and then disseminating across the four committee membership.

So that is my first thoughts, Göran, which I offer. Maybe others have other thoughts as well. Thank you.

BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Thank you very much.

DAVID: Thank you very much, the representative from Brazil and then Argentina after that. Mr. Ambassador, please.

BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Thank you. Well my point to refer to what was previously said by Mark, I'd like to ask what he said the needs to develop to this communication [and to change] mechanisms between the GAC and the ICANN Community At-Large through the Board. My comment is that they should – my delegation is committed to avoid – try to avoid this kind of disconnects and confrontations. That sometimes [inaudible] discussion like the GAC is opposed to the community.

We'd like to think that, we as government, we are part of the community. We are part of the multistakeholder [performance]. So we are ready to contribute, so it's very hard for governments sometimes to make sure what is the right moment in which we might provide our input in a meaningful way in the policy development process as opposed to having – to actually what it is already in place or already been adopted by the Board. Because that's the impression that governments are opposed to what is doing by the rep of the committee. I think it is the reps to follow up to develop ways in which we can, as we go along make sure that the inputs are already there. They are considered even if they are not of course accepted. But at least there is an opportunity even for governments to be engaged and to understand and to be part to all, also the final outcome of policy development.

I think this is crucial. In regards towards the – Mr. Göran has suggested, I also agree with Mark. I recalled the proposal also made by Olga Cavalli that we should continue to work, it may be in structured form through [inaudible] working together with the Board but in the context of some working group to further develop idea from how we can address those issues or concerns for us. Thank you.

DAVID: Thank you, Mr. Ambassador. The representative from Argentina please.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you David. Agreeing with our colleagues and Mark and Benedicto of better communication. What I would like to express also is this is an important issue not only for governments. It's an important issue for ccTLD and for other members of the community. So keeping all of us in a good [inaudible] of information will be crucial. If we can, as the next step, as the midterm or short term of the next step, there are several countries in the GAC very much interested in trying to understand which is the best way to move ahead with these issues.

So as Benedicto said, if we can get a small group of interested parties in moving forward, when trying to understand which were the deficiencies in the communication that may help us in the future to [follow] that and not [receive] the mistakes and trying to solve what some of us, as some difficulties in the newly established process. Thank you.

DAVID: Thank you, representative from Argentina. Other comments or some people are typing. Just a time check, we allocate 60 minutes, we have about six more minutes to go for the session. The representative from United Kingdom, I recognize you please.

MARK CARVELL:	Yes, thank you. I have now question on the substance, the question for clarification, really, with regard to registration policy and the very relevant requirement on registrants but they may not misrepresent affiliation. What is the check registries or the registrars have to make if somebody is claiming such an affiliation? Is there a standard action that is triggered, if somebody says, "I am representing a government office in some way"? Is there an easy answer to that? Thank you.
DAVID:	Thank you, representative from the United Kingdom.
AKRAM ATALLAH:	David, do you want me to address that?
DAVID:	Yes, if you could, Akram, please.
AKRAM ATALLAH:	Yeah, I don't think that I have an easy answer, Mark, for you on this one, but we will get back to the group on that question. I think that the investigation is important in the sense that there's actually needs to investigate the complaint and then if they find that a registrant is misrepresenting the use, then actually they have to take action on that. Now, I will actually go back and get you a more contractual answer to the question on the standards. Thanks.

DAVID: Thank you, Akram. The representative from Brazil, Ambassador, please.

BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Yes, thank you and apologies for taking the floor again. But also thinking about the measures for [wide] confusion, one comment I'd like to make because this refers to an important point that was raised in the ICANN meeting – in the GAC meetings we had in Copenhagen – is that one of the remedies that were imagined by the Board was to provide for that exclusive availability pre-registration period. I think that was for some kind of a remedy to which governments could exert. Even though it is for a voluntary measure but that would be some kind of remedy.

But in the light of the fact that was disclosed at the meeting that many, many governments are being approached by those who have delegated new gTLDs demanding a huge amounts of money. When we think this can include and encompass hundreds and thousands of gTLDs, I think one of the lessons that maybe we should reflect and the Board may consider when thinking about the future ground rules for that is that that kind of remedy that was thought in practice has proved not to be efficient. Because for governments to resort to that possibility, it would be extremely burdensome and for many, many countries unrealistic to think that they could expend huge sums of money to be able to exert that [exclusivability] clause. I think this is one, maybe one very topic thing that was included in the Board decision that should be further reflective on. Thank you.

DAVID: Thank you representative from Brazil. Thank you, Mr. Ambassador. The Italian representative is having trouble with his audio and he asked me to read out in the chat his comment which says, "Regarding the actual process, it was clear to the Board that the sense of the advice was that the government would like to decide on the issue if we read the Board's posted on December 2016, you can verify that the Board was aware that there is a GAC full consensus that every country should have to say in the advice. The Hyderabad resolution of November 2016, its implementation December 16, runs counter to the advice. It seems to us the GAC advice was not clearly taken into account in that case. We think that ICANN's switched to path 1 of Slide 4 to path 2 even if it was clear to ICANN the governments want to have a say in this. But we agree with our colleagues from Brazil and Argentina but now it's now it's important to find a way forward."

So I thank for that. And then the chat of the representative from Egypt says, "Just to reiterate my comments in writing on the process aspect, I believe that there was a disconnect but I believe it took place right after the public comment. On the substantive side, Measure 1 is voluntary hence it cannot be cut on Measure 2 is an excellent. One got a bit vague in terms of implementation and Measure 3 moves a burden from the registry to government without guarantee. But it's important that we work constructively and find a way forward."

Those are the comments so far and again, Thomas had made a suggestion that we focus any other substantive issues in the time that we have allotted and we're soon coming up to that hour. Okay, any other comments? I don't see any hands for the queue is closed. No one is in the queue and the comments have all been read. Mark Carvell

agrees with the comments from the representative from Egypt. And so to that extent, one last call of any other remarks.

GÖRAN MARBY: May I David?

DAVID: Please, Goran.

GÖRAN MARBY: First of all again, I would like to thank you for taking the time in your busy schedules to have this meeting. As I said before, I am happy to engage in a discussion about the learnings from this process and how we can support the GAC and facilitate the GAC works in a better way. One other thing that I take away from this from my friends in Brazil, is that we need to figure out a way of communication exist when the receiver on the sense what to say. And as you pointed out, you have many other things to do, so we have to focus this a bit [inaudible]. We'll continue this discussion with Thomas.

On the substantive side, there are some further information, so I think we need to address. I will ask GAC also to put them in writing because sometimes during the call, the nuances of things – it is an operational issue close to our heart and we will continue look into it. With that, I would like to thank you very much for taking the time of this call. I'm looking forward to have this kind of calls also in the future. So thank you very much.

DAVID: We would like to thank everyone for their participation and taking the time as noted by Goran. With that, I would like to wish everyone a good evening, good afternoon, or good morning wherever you may be. There will be a second call for the other time zones as well and then we will look at the matters that have been raised and as indicated, I'll come back with more information as you have indicated.

GÖRAN MARBY: Thank you very much.

DAVID: Thank you all.

GÖRAN MARBY: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you, everyone.

DAVID: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]