
ICANN73 | Virtual Community Forum - Joint Meeting: GAC and GNSO Council
Monday, March 7, 2022 - 16:30 to 17:30 AST

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the GAC GNSO bilateral, scheduled for an hour. I would like to welcome all GNSO Council members and colleagues who joined us in the room, and I would like to recognize Jorge and Jeff for the continuous coordination, facilitation, and inter-sessional work which resulted in the agreed agenda we will discuss today. Allow me to hand it over to you, Philippe.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Manal, and good morning, good afternoon, and good evening everyone. Good evening to all GAC colleagues. And indeed, thanks, Jorge for coming up and Jeff, for coming up with this agenda as usual, I should say. We certainly have [indiscernible] with an update on the ongoing work, I should as usual, address the term. You will appreciate some of these are on the way, but we certainly are happy to take your input on those items and looking forward to this discussion. Back to you, Manal.

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.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Philippe. And as we see on the screen, we have four agenda items in addition to any other business. So we have the operational design phase, the SSAD ODP and SubPro ODP, also the DNS abuse, EPDP, IGO curative protections, and we have under any other business "accuracy matters" and any other emerging issues. And I'm not sure, Philippe, would you like us to address here the closed generics under emerging issues?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Manal. We can certainly say a word about it, mindful of the fact that these are really early days, literally speaking. I'm not even sure everyone would be aware of this but certainly happy to say a few words on that letter that both of us received on Friday and certainly circulated [indiscernible] with respect to the prospective organizations. So why not, I guess is the answer.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Philippe, was confirming to roughly estimate the time needed for each agenda item. So I think we can go to the next slide.

[Audio interruption]

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Someone needs to mute. So starting with the Operational Design Phase of SSAD and from the GAC side, we would like to discuss the operational design assessment findings with the GNSO Council, and we are of course interested also to hear GNSO Council's views on the ICANN Board's concerns expressed in relevance to the ODA findings. And what does the GNSO see as its role to revise the SSAD recommendations should the Board reject them; would PDP have to be reconvened or can recommendations be amended by a small group.

So I'm stopping here. Any comments or reflections from the GNSO side?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Manal, yes, that was (audio distortion) expecting the convener of the small team.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: My name is Sebastien Ducos, I am the convener and Chair of this small group, and using Philippe's term about the closed generics, this is early days. We have convened a small team given the sensitivity of the subject, a small team of subject matter experts. We went outside of the council and asked every group to send one representative and a potential alternative. Usually people that

partook in the EPDP Phase 2 deliberations knew what we were talking about.

So the small team side was convened first and foremost, to answer the questions from the Board sent to us shortly before the publication of the ODA that are obviously in line also with yours. So we decided first to give ourselves a bit of time to review the ODA and particularly to ensure that it correctly interpreted all of the recommendations made on the SSAD. Also to make sure that the ODA [indiscernible] key aspects of these recommendations that should have been factored in, and then looked in view of the concern raised by the Board. In the letter from the Board there were a few concerns and questions, it wasn't just questions, and see if there was something we wanted to answer or assist about it and any other aspect of the questions that we might have about it.

Now, again, this is very early days. We have met only twice, and we have asked the small team to transfer a questionnaire that we have prepared with possible clarifying questions and first thoughts. We haven't had time to gather the questionnaire, we wanted to have this done before this week in order to be able to discuss this with the rest of community but also to go back to the ODA team with our clarifying questions in hope of getting answers this week or weeks to come.

So we have identified a few clarifying questions that have been sent to the ODA team. Like I said, we have identified a few and I'm sorry, I'm just trying to be precise so reading at the same time but trying not to read the text directly. We have identified a few assumptions that seem to be inconsistent with the recommendations and -- sorry, let me get back to this in a second.

And we also pointed a few aspects that were not covered by the ODA and finally, there were a few comments made directly in response to the question sent by the Board. And so one, for example, of the comments, it seems to the small team in general, most members of the small team, that the ODA does not clearly provide enough information to confidently determine the cost/benefit, that from some point of view this is something that the Board needs to come up with about from our point of view the ODA probably didn't provide all the elements. Sorry, again trying to not read directly. The other point -- and we didn't have any proper discussion but there were comments about the possibility of having a pilot, an SSAD pilot, without discussion on the nature of the pilot and what it would look like.

So there is some, having a pilot possibly on a voluntary basis or a ticketing system in order to be able to test a number of assumptions including assumptions on traffic and the number of queries. I'm open for questions.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Sebastien, for sharing at which information as available at this early stage. So I'm pausing to see if there are any follow-up or questions from GAC colleagues -- or any additional comments from the GNSO side, of course. And seeing no requests for the floor -- Nigel please, go ahead, UK.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, good evening, and many thanks indeed and thank you, it's always good to have a discussion with the GNSO. Really your last remarks took my remarks away, in that I certainly we think a pilot would be a very good idea. I mean, clearly the cost figures that have come out in the ODP process are very interesting, to say the least, and challenging I think for governments as well as perhaps other stakeholders. And I think a pilot to understand the process better would be an excellent way forward. So thank you very much for the remarks so far, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Nigel. So any other comments?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: This is Philippe here, if I may. Thank you, Manal. I was just going to say that if GAC colleagues are interested in more detail, obviously the [indiscernible] mailing archives are available on the

wiki space and since next steps [indiscernible] I think all options are valuable at this point, according to the GNSO operating procedures, and that is very much for the small team to propose to council anything they see fit given their findings. Hopefully that is helpful.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Philippe. With that, I think we're good to move on to Operational Design Phase, and we're now talking about subsequent procedures.

So the GAC continues to follow with interest all the developments in the Operational Design Phase of the subsequent rounds of new gTLDs. And we welcome the GNSO Council's view on how the operational design phase may capture the objective and independent analysis of costs and benefits drawing on experience with the outcomes from the 2012 round of new gTLDs that we called for in the Helsinki communique and Kobe communique. Such objective and independent analysis would allow the GAC to offer further advice ahead of a launch of a new round of gTLDs in this regard and noted in the GAC ICANN70 communique, has yet to take place. GAC notes the Operational Design Phase may provide opportunity for this analysis.

So what are the views of the council on this and how does the GNSO Council see the Global Public Interest intersecting with the work of the SubPro EPDP? We have been talking about Global Public Interest throughout the day today, so it pops up here again as well. I will pause here, and I already see Jeff's hand. Please go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yes, and hopefully you can hear me, I had to switch to phone audio, apologies for making that switch. These are great questions, and I will leave a lot of these to councilors to answer. One thing I do want to mention is that earlier in response to a question from Michael [indiscernible] that a study ICANN had put on its website on Friday, I think it was, in response to that question asked in the executive Q&A, ICANN indicated they believed that the study they're doing now relates to this independent analysis of costs and benefits. So I think that may be the answer. I don't think the GNSO is engaged in any other activities other than that study. But at some point after we get some views from councilors, I would like to introduce a subject that was -- well, sort of brought up in the letter from the Board to the GNSO Council but also introduced via the question set number 2. So Philippe, I will go back to you to address these questions, and whenever you think it's appropriate I will discuss the other items.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Jeff. Maybe at this point it would be probably interesting for GAC colleagues to have an update on the initial sort of framework that we put together whereby the GNSO Council would review the interpretation, the reading of the ODP team for them to give some feedback just in general terms how we proceed in terms of you as a [indiscernible] providing inputs, the various streams you follow within the ODP and the sort of inputs you provide council with maybe is a starting point that would be useful to GAC colleagues and then move on to specific questions, if that's okay.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, okay, Philippe. And I am just reading also in the chat, Jorge of Switzerland saying we had some initial look at the RFP for study and apparently it doesn't really fully match what we asked for in the Helsinki advice. And Keith, to Jeff: Isn't what was posted an RFP for the study and not the study itself? Apologies if I missed that but you broke up for a second. And Nigel agreeing with Jorge that what has been published does not really match what the GAC asked for in the Helsinki advice, supported by Finn from Denmark. And thank you, Jeff, I now see your answer in the chat as well pointing out they are good questions to the Board.

So any further comments from my GAC colleagues? And Susan, I see also US in the chat, we are still reviewing the scoping terms to address its consistency with Helsinki advice. So thanks, US.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: And maybe to this point, if I may, Manal, I'm sure GAC colleagues attended the ODP-related session earlier today, but I think it was clear that -- and surprising that -- that exercise is not meant to accommodate the various minority statements that were put forward. I think that was a clarification that was made during that session.

I just wanted -- I know Jeff, your connection broke up at some point. Maybe it would be useful for my GAC colleagues to understand how council is expected to weigh in on the clarifications requested by the ODP team, the work streams that you would monitor, follow on behalf of council, and if you would clarify how we do that from a practical standpoint, maybe that would be useful for our GAC colleagues here. Jeff, would you mind doing that?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yes, and apologies, I turned off my video to see if that helps with my audio connection. So I'm still here, just apologies for the video. Not sure what's going on.

ICANN's ODP team sent the GNSO Council a second set of questions related to -- what they said was related to applicant support. However, when you look closely at the questions, it really relates more to process than it does the substance of applicant support itself. And the question to the GNSO Council was whether the recommendation from SubPro envisioned or envisaged the IRT, implementation review team to do work that is beyond mere implementation but rather involved policy or something more than implementation

The reason I bring this up is because I think it provides -- and the council will discuss this on Wednesday -- but I think it a unique opportunity for the community, including the GNSO and the GAC and the ALAC as well, to engage in discussions on these very important topics while the ODP is going on. And if the discussions by the GAC, GNSO, and ALAC result in additional recommendations. The GNSO Council has the ability to add those recommendations to the final recommendations of SubPro in their final report so by the time the Board votes on the policies within the SubPro final report, it could also be helped with additional information from any work that we do between now and when the Board considers those final recommendations.

So all of that is a very long way of saying that the council is going to be discussing ways in which to work with the community to

address certain distinct areas of the SubPro recommendations even while the ODP is going on. And of course if we take on that work, we look forward to the entire community participating in that work, including of course the GAC and the ALAC.

So that's just a little bit of an advance preview of what the council will be discussing on Wednesday at its meeting, and I hope that the GAC would endorse such a way forward so that we don't have to lose 12 months while the ODP is going on and we can continue the important work of some of these areas. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jeff. Thank you for flagging this and noting that the council will be discussing on Wednesday and also the open invitation for feedback from GAC and ALAC as well, much appreciated.

And Philippe, you mentioned an ODP session this morning. I'm not sure if GAC colleagues were able, we normally have full-day agendas, so I don't think --

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Yeah, thank you, Manal, and my apologies for this, it has been rescheduled. And I know it was a problem, not only for the GAC colleagues but also from GNSO participants as well but

nonetheless, that was sort of explained during the session today. So again, my apologies for forgetting that it was rescheduled.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Philippe, and I see an active chat. If anyone else would like to comment, please raise your hand. Otherwise, I think we're good to move on. And seeing no requests for the floor, then let's continue with our agenda. If we go to the next slide --

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Manal, sorry to jump in, I'm having difficulty finding me [indiscernible] apologies, I just want to note a bullet point you have on the screen, noting that we may not come back to it later on -- and again, I'm sorry, referring to the session that was held a moment ago on the Global Public Interest Framework that a number of people took part in that, Avri and others, and described as a pilot, I think it's questioned questions, especially in light of the other question that was asked by the Board on closed generics in their letter on Friday.

Maybe there are some learnings from that framework to be taken -- and I'm just speaking to maybe post [indiscernible] because we haven't discussed this within the council, but it's totally relevant to our discussion, including the closed generics aspect of this. But

appreciating that we haven't discussed that at all at council.
Thank you, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Philippe, for the keen follow-up on every part of the question. Frankly, I forgot about it but yeah, we have discussed the Global Public Interest Framework today for the first time within the GAC and then attended the community plenary, and indeed, we are still brainstorming and nothing yet concrete within the GAC either so I think we're not that far from where you are. But yeah, definitely we continue to refer to Global Public Interest within the GAC, it is in the core of our discussions so we will be keenly looking into how to benefit from this tool and how to factor it in in our work.

So now moving on to DNS abuse. Where the GAC continues to have a great interest in the topic and would welcome an update from the GNSO small group and would be interested to know at which stage input from other parts of the community would be considered and what are the GNSO Council expectations for the small team on DNS abuse in terms of concrete output?

And that said, I have to acknowledge that we have received this morning UTC time, from the GNSO group on DNS abuse the reaching out to the community with three concrete questions. I

have forwarded this to the entire GAC membership. I'm sure not everyone had the chance to read the email, but I will stop and give you a chance to reflect on this.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Manal. And on this indeed, I believe the small team that the GNSO Council convened just a few weeks ago reached out to a number of community members who have an interest in seeking their input on that, not only of that issue on the definition of DNS abuse but also on the policy work that in their view is necessary and that might be taken aboard by the GNSO Council.

As for the update of the small team, I would like to turn to either Mark or Paul, they jointly Chair the small group, the small team on the council. Wondering whether Mark, Paul, might like to provide -- I see Mark.

MARK DATYSGALD: Thank you very much. Not sure if Paul is present but the decision we have come to that we need to understand where the community is in terms of where does the matter of DNS abuse fit within policy making of the GNSO? So where exactly can we help? What would be the key areas that we would actually be able to contribute to without generating an endless process that would just drive another one of these multi-year projects? So what are

the concrete steps that we can try to take as a policy driver to better frame this issue?

So we have been reaching out to different community stakeholders with a tentative message -- this is by no means the definitive approach, it's more to capture the interest so we can better discuss with the council whether inside the small team or with the entire group. And right now it is still very insipient, just gotten started, but very optimistic this is the right approach for this, so we don't end up lost or trying to advance something that doesn't make sense for the community. And we are very keen to hear the GAC's point of view. We would definitely like to engage if there are any efforts that would like to engage with us, please feel free. We are really trying to sort of capture the whole picture. Open to answer any questions, but for now this is what we have and what we have to offer. Thank you very much.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Philippe and Mark. So we took note of the deadline for commenting on the 21st of March, and the questions were circulated to the GAC, as mentioned, and I hope we will be providing you with our input by the deadline. I am pausing to see if there are any follow-up comments from GAC colleagues and I see Nigel please, UK.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thank you very much, and thank you indeed for the letter concerning the study on DNS abuse which I must admit the UK read with a lot of interest, and I think it certainly deserves some study and certainly deserves a reply, not just from the GAC, as you say, but from all the different parts of the stakeholder community. And in that respect -- and I know we're having further discussions this week about this, but a lot of discussion of course has focused on the respective roles of registries and registrars and hosting providers and Internet service providers.

So I suppose my question would be whether these different actors and players, whether there will be sort of a holistic discussion on the questions you asked by the different players, as we clearly see the different players have different roles and responsibilities but to holistically tackle DNS abuse requires a holistic approach.

MARK DATYSGALD: Thank you, Philippe. We want to stick to this goal of trying to see what is feasible and not create another mountain for the community to climb, this is literally the thing we want the least. So in terms of scoping this out, we're hoping to see whether there is a general direction that the community is imagining, because if there is a general direction, then great. But if on the other hand

there is a lot of different directions that we can possibly head towards, then it became as matter of assessing how exactly we can proceed with that information.

And I see Paul has joined. And Paul, if you have any anything to add, please jump in. I'm currently answering Nigel's question. So in that sense, I think we're hoping to get a good view before we're able to properly scope. But either way, Nigel, feel free to follow up with us and in case my answer was not sufficient, please do follow up.

PAUL McGRADY:

So sorry for being late. But I think, Nigel, what we're trying to accomplish I think is how to quit talking past each other, right? To quit having the same debates over the same subtopics to see if we can find a way to bring the community together and build solutions instead of just being stuck. So I know it would be more fun if we said well here's our eight-step plan and we will be done by April of 2024, but we're not there, we're early days and like Mark has said, we're gathering the input but it's not input for the same old thing, I think it's input to see if we can find problems that are the right size to solve, and I think perhaps stop trying to repair the entire universe and see if there are some things that we can fix. And as Lori says in the chat, the good news is we're finding commonalities, and I think that is true. Have faith in us, Nigel.

UNITED KINGDOM: I do, indeed, Paul. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mark and Paul, and thank you Nigel for the question. So anything else on DNS abuse before we move on? Okay. If not, then let's go to IGO protections and, again, another long-standing issue of importance to the GAC as IGO are recognized as legally unique and that goes to confidence in the DNS, we understand the processes have to run the course and look forward to a positive resolution of the EPDP, so we decided to keep the topic on the agenda. As you know, Philippe, wondering if there are any potential challenges which may arise as the EPDP rounds up to develop the final report.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Manal. And indeed, as the team meets, it's heading towards that final report. Maybe I will turn to our liaison who might provide us with the most recent update on this. [indiscernible] Maybe John is not with us. Nigel has a hand up. In that case we have to go back to -- oh, I see Brian, maybe he can update.

BRIAN BECKHAM: Good evening, hi, everyone. Brian Beckham, for the record. I think John may be here, don't want to take away from him but a small update to say we're being led through the work in good manner by the Chair. Obviously the work still undergoing but I think it's safe to say that a lot of good discussions and compromises made along the way so fingers crossed we can report back to this group in due course with a good update. But for the time being, it's still a work in progress. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Philippe and Brian and Chris also, recognizing him in the chat. So thanks everyone for the update. I am pausing again to see if already any follow-up comments from GAC colleagues. Otherwise, again, thanking you for the IGO protections and I think we can move on to any other business.

We have two potential placeholders for accuracy of registration and any other matters for discussion where we can maybe, Philippe, jointly announce the letter we have received -- I'm not sure whether it was today or yesterday but anyway, on accuracy, we have had accuracy as one of the topics that we wanted to discuss with the Board during our bilateral and having shared this with the Board, we have received some initial answers from the Board, again, that I have circulated today to GAC colleagues. So I

do very much appreciate that they might have not seen the email nor the text yet or at least they have not digested what has been shared.

So I understand you had the same topic to discuss with the Board too and have received more or less the same guidance on the same answer. So on this, I'm just flagging the topic. Happy to hear comments either from your side, Philippe, from the council or from GAC colleagues, otherwise we can move on. Any initial reflections? Velimira, please.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Yes, thank you, Manal. I will be very brief just because you mentioned accuracy. What I wanted to flag, actually the questions we were thinking to discuss with the Board were much more linked to the question of accuracy of registration data rather than related to accuracy and whether ICANN would have the legitimate interest actually for accessing registration data for the purpose of very fine [indiscernible] contractual agreement which was accuracy. So just to give you my initial thoughts and reactions to this email and to share this with GNSO colleagues. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Velimira, for sharing initial thoughts on this. Any other requests for the floor on accuracy of registration data? And if not, then I hope at least GAC colleagues -- I know Philippe, you already had your discussion with the Board I believe today, but again, I hope GAC colleagues will be warming up for our discussion with the Board on Wednesday.

With that, I think we have one last -- any other matter for discussion? And Philippe and myself, we have received an invitation from the Board that was addressed to the GNSO Council and the GAC to explore a mutually agreeable way forward on closed generics. And the Board also offered that they could facilitate a dialogue to formulate a workable framework to identify how to handle closed generics applications. And of course once an initial agreement is reached, it will be considered through the appropriate GNSO policy development process and of course would include the wider ICANN community, including all other parts of course of the community.

The letter also noted that a draft framing paper proposing a more detailed scope and methodology would follow in the coming days. So Philippe, we look forward to working together on this and hopefully getting something out shortly to the community to weigh in on.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Yes, thank you. And as you said, this was only shared at least with the council on Friday night, I think, so it's too early probably to say -- not to say anything, but there would be a lot to say about this but to be factual in terms of next steps. We have had informal exchanges at this point. I know that a number of us are eager to engage. I also know that there is some concern over -- the framework referred to in the letter and the assistance that the Board may offer in that respect.

And speaking personally at this point, since there hasn't been any discussions at council, I think we will be looking at the -- since that issue has been addressed by the PDP, I think a number of people in the GNSO community will be looking at what I would like to refer to as the new elements in the equation, that given the time and effort that was spent on this particular question during the PDP, I think we want to make sure that this can converge within a reasonable time frame, and I think we're anxious to do that.

So that's pretty much what I can say. And a lot of this is only personal because it hasn't been discussed in detail with the [indiscernible] within council and I hope that's helpful. I don't know if Jeff would like to add anything but as the former co-chair of the PDP, feel free.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Sure, thanks. I said this in the chat, but SubPro spent a lot of time talking about closed generics and I'm not sure if we just engage in a wholesale review of closed generics like SubPro did, I'm not sure the outcome is going to be any different than it was for SubPro. One of the things that some of us were hoping for would be that the Board would have in its request narrowed down the focus of the group such that some of the issues that SubPro got distracted with -- I will put it that way -- would not have to be encountered again. So at SubPro you had individuals that wanted no closed generics whatsoever. You had another group of people that wanted completely free and open applications for closed generics with no restrictions. And then you had another group that was closely aligned with the GAC advice which was that closed generics had to serve a legitimate public interest. But because the different groups really didn't deviate too much from their original positions, it became very difficult to focus the conversation and to get agreement.

What would have been better would have been the ICANN Board sending us a letter narrowing the focus for future discussions, perhaps saying that we look for ways in which applicants can serve -- or applications can serve a legitimate public interest. In this way you don't have groups of people arguing that there should never be closed generics under any circumstances, nor do

you have groups of people arguing that it should be completely open, but rather you can hopefully converge in a focused area. And as Tomslin points out in the chat, perhaps that is coming from the framing paper from the staff, we will see, but I really hope if a group were to be set up that it would be very focused, a short time frame, and have concrete deliverables. Thanks, Chair. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Philippe and Jeff. And first, I have to note that likewise, Philippe, we have not discussed this within the GAC yet and we should be responding to the letter we have received after we discuss it within the GAC tomorrow. Our session is scheduled for tomorrow.

So again, I circulated it to the GAC, but I appreciate they may have not seen the letter yet so apologies for preempting tomorrow's discussion. But we had initial discussions, myself and Philippe, informally of course, and we agree in principle should this effort get launched, we have to agree that we meet in the middle. It is obvious that both extreme positions were not able to conclude during the SubPro PDP, so it's now time to try to meet in the middle. So I think this is the merit behind the whole initiative by the Board and hopefully also facilitated by the Board, if need be.

And as you mentioned, Jeff, we are still to receive the framework so I'm optimistic and will let you know how things develop after we discuss within the GAC tomorrow as well.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Manal, and I just want to reiterate what you just said. Appreciating the candid nature of our conversation -- and mindful of not running over time, but that's really as far as we can go given the timing. But we're hopeful that the framing paper shed some light and make sure that we don't reiterate the effort that was spent to no avail during the PDP. And like you, we're optimistic and looking forward to next steps. Thank you, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Philippe, and Jeff of course. Anything on this agenda item? Topic leads from the GAC, also freely free to chime in if you have any additions. And if not, Philippe, I think we're good to conclude.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: I think we are. Thank you, Manal. Thanks GAC colleagues for this fruitful get-together, as usual, and again, on this last point, looking forward to next steps. Thank you, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Philippe, Sebastien, Mark, Jeff, Paul, and GNSO Council and GAC members and Nigel and Jorge. This concludes our meeting today and to GAC colleagues, we will start at 900 San Juan time, 1300 UTC, with our bilateral with the ccNSO.

And before that, any who have missed any of today's sessions are welcome to join for the GAC update, and again, stay safe and have a good rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]