
ICANN74 | Policy Forum – GAC Communique Drafting (2 of 6)
Wednesday, June 15, 2022 – 15:00 to 16:00 AMS

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: [Reading] the second paragraph reads: [reading] the first question, do we need any text from the first paragraph or we can just delete it? And the second question would be in the comments on the second paragraph? US, please. Susan.

UNITED STATES: Thank you Chair, just to reiterate, we had suggested earlier it would be more accurate to replace consultation with public comment period which I believe is the phraseology used and therefore would suggest striking the text in brackets.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, US. Any other comments? Are we good to delete the first paragraph? Yes, Susan please. go ahead.

UNITED STATES: Thank you, sorry, just reading in realtime. Did the GAC receive input during the public comment period.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Susan, the way it's put following, it's correct in the sense that it's after, no? Just seems to me that now it's actually correct.

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, European Commission. I see Brian's hand up,.

BRIAN BECKHAM: Thank you. Brian Beckham, just with a small thing I think you need where it says to, something like may or could, something to that effect. But I think as Velimira has pointed out since it says following the public comment period, or you could for example say further to a briefing on public comment period which situates the fact that the GAC did receive input that was after the briefing on the public comment period update.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Brian. Are we able to capture this? Does the text accurately reflect your proposal Brian, further to a briefing on the public comment period on the policy status report relating to the UDRP? I see nodding. Any other comments on this paragraph?

UNITED STATES: Thank you. And just to revisit the point that I had expressed prior to the break, we would prefer to leave the timing of the discussion open so not -- [indiscernible] the schedule for ICANN75 before we have had the opportunity for an agenda setting discussion for ICANN75, so that would be our suggestion.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Is the proposal -- therefore the GAC intends to discuss the matter, full stop, or discuss the matter in preparation for upcoming meetings?

UNITED STATES: I think we would be comfortable with either-or, either of the two proposals offered by the Chair. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Any comments on deleting reference to ICANN75 in specific? Yes, European Commission, please.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Yes, we have discussed this during the pause. We definitely have some issues with deleting this, but of course we cannot oppose this so if it's okay that we take it out, I'm just wondering in terms of [indiscernible] sorry, Manal, could you repeat what you said, the suggestion afterwards?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: In preparation for upcoming meetings or...

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Yes, and also capturing the fact that this will also be discussed not only in preparation but also during the meetings themselves. Or at the meetings.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So let me try this. In preparation for discussion at upcoming meetings? I see the US nodding, European Commission, is this okay? So the GAC therefore intends to discuss the matter in preparation for discussion

again -- maybe we need to fix this -- at upcoming meetings. Okay, maybe therefore the GAC intends to discuss or consider the matter, any discussions or preferences? Let me read the clean text one more time. Further to briefing on the public comment period on the pals status report relating to the UDRP, the GAC received input from some GAC members in relation to whether the scope of the UDRP could or may be extended to address geographical indications. The GAC therefore intends to consider the matter in preparation for discussion at upcoming meetings.

IRAN: Manal, do you see my hand?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Sorry, I see your hand and then Nigel, UK. If I may, Kavouss, your sound is very far away. Can you speak closer to the mic? Much better, thank you.

IRAN: No problem to say further to a briefing or no, the problem, I don't want you to put may because for from the structure of the sentence it's not correct, could be, not -- we don't need the term probability, so please delete may, kindly. I have another one. During the upcoming meeting is very vague. Upcoming meeting maybe in 2000 -- I don't know, 2030, 2050, we could are more specific, maybe subs subsequent meetings, that means 75, 76 instead of upcoming. If nobody has a problem, I have no difficulty to mention ICANN75 but, I would be in favor to say that during the subsequent meeting pref preferably, at ICANN 75 if possible.

I don't insist, Manal. Instead of upcoming you said subsequent meetings, I introduce ICANN75, but subsequent meetings, that means, 75, 76 and so on.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kavouss. So let's delete upcoming and leave it as subsequent meetings, yes, we have it in plural, and frankly I'm not in favor of preferably during ICANN75, as if we're waiting a decision from someone, it's exposing too much detail of which we should agree within the GAC. If okay Kavouss, I propose that we have a full stop after meetings.

IRAN: Madam, [indiscernible] means yes.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kavouss, for answering me in Arabic. Nigel please, go ahead.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thank you very much, I won't attempt any language. I fully agree with the amendments now made. I just really want to make the point, I think simpler the better and we have a lot of other text to work on but certainly good we reflected this in our Communiqué, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Nigel. Trying to check if there are -- I see no further requests for the floor. So I think we're good to delete the first -- thank you. So thanks to support staff for reflecting our discussion.

Then we're coming to the point 7, review of the UDRP, and I think there was a comment, I can't remember any comments on this part? Yeah, I think there was a comment from Jaideep from India. If we can -- I think it's a friendly amendment, I see no opposition. So thank you, Jaideep. Any other comments before we move to auction proceeds? Okay. Now we're under 7 new gTLD auction proceeds, reads the GAC acknowledges the ICANN Board's adoption of recommendations from the empowered community Working Group on new gTLD auction proceeds, the GAC will closely monitor implementation planning and design of the CCWG ap recommendation and remains available to provide input throughout the process. Paraguay, please.

PARAGUAY: I'm not sure the GAC will be able to closely monitor implementation. How will that be done? I find it a little bit difficult to implement.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Paraguay. I don't think the intention here is to implement but monitor the output of the implementation if they announce something, provide any updates through blogs and so on, but...

PARAGUAY: I understand but saying that the GAC will closely monitor implementation, I don't know, maybe we should change the language a little bit? Because who is going to be in charge of monitoring implementation, more precisely?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yeah, so if we can find a language, more a follow-up?

PARAGUAY: Yeah, something more like follow-up or something. I'm just -- yeah, something like that.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. So the GAC will follow up on implementation planning and design of the CCWG ap recommendations and remaining available to provide input throughout the process. I see Paraguay nodding. Any other comments on this part? Thank you very much. Apologies Kavouss.

IRAN: No problem, I fully agree with Paraguay. Because we cannot monitor at all. Follow up perhaps -- when we say closely follow up, it's also a little bit more I would say too much. When we're sitting in the GAC meeting we could say many things but when we go to implement that it's difficult. So I would suggest that when we say the GAC will endeavor, will endeavor to follow up, that means we try. We may not be able to, we try. So -- distinguished Manal, will, when you say it, that is a deterministic verb, meaning we'll do it certainly, we cannot do it, so we could say we'll endeavor to do it.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you Kavouss, and if I may propose an amendment -- and I fully take your note and Paraguay -- can we say we plan to follow up? Maybe we can or cannot, I think it's a bit stronger than try.

IRAN: Yes, even better.

PARAGUAY: Agree.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Paraguay. Any objection? I see none. I think we can move on to GAC consensus advice to ICANN Board. Yes, Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: We have received text for the DNS abuse section, so maybe if you want to go back while we are on issues of importance.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Sure.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Is it coming instead or after?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: We're just waiting for the text on DNS abuse to be displayed on the screen.

Thank you very much. Can we make the text slightly bigger? Thank you. So the GAC highlights the continued importance of effectively responding to domain name system, DNS abuse and appreciates the continued work by ICANN org and the ICANN community on these issues. solutions can [indiscernible] take the form of enhanced DNS abuse reporting and improved contractual requirements through appropriate amendments and compliance programs including intent actives for achieving relevant anti abuse metrics. And policy development processes. Could enable more productive and evidence based anti abuse dialogue within the ICANN community and provide basis for targeted, improved, and potentially more effective contractual improvements. More comprehensive and rigs reporting activity to include abuse reporting made granular to the registrar and registry level more detailed breakdowns of the types of DNS abuse measured and availability of raw aggregate data would assist in developing contract provisions by making them more targeted and effective. The GAC welcomes the launch of the DNS abuse initiative's free, centralized Abuse Reporting Tool, NetBeacon, and notes its alignment with recommendations made in both SSAC 115 and SSR 2 final report, and -- the SSR 2 is a report that came out from the second review of security and stability also of the Internet.

Improved contractual provisions could focus on areas such as reporting, handling and enforce, of DNS abuse. In its role as a public benefit corporation tasked with ensuring the stability and security of the Internet's unique identifier systems, ICANN org is particularly well placed to receive public policy input from the ICANN community and negotiate updates to the standard registry and registrar agreements.

This would allow ICANN org to ensure these contracts promote the public interest by including clear and enforceable obligations to detect and respond to DNS abuse and security threats. The GAC notes that contract improvements could also result from a policy development process, PDP. Should any PDP or on DNS abuse proceed, it should be narrowly tailored to produce a timely and workable outcome.

Do we have more text? Okay, and -- but the initial text from Japan is not incorporated in the -- okay. So let me continue. This is the text received from Japan. Building upon ICANN 72 discussions on the topic of registrar hopping, the ICANN73 discussions on the topic of domain hopping were registrants who seem to be the same involved in multiple different abusive domain name registrations with the same registrar. The GAC discussed the matter registrants are hopping more rapidly and the tendency for abuse using domains domains to be concentrated at a few specific registrars. Registration data accuracy, ensuring trust in information as well as effective and continuous auditing of registrars by ICANN compliance could help prevent registrars from being abused by registrants and registrars recognize abuse of the domain name that it has registered.

The GAC believes that it is important to continue to consider what ICANN can do and implement to improve the Internet environment, including amendment of contracts.

So we have now received the text from the topic leads and also the text from Japan. If we can scroll up to the first paragraph, and I'm going to

ask whether there are any comments on the first paragraph. Kavouss, please.

IRAN:

Thank you, Manal. I have no difficulty with the text but you know and all distinguished GAC colleagues know that all of GAC advice will be fully scrutinized by other SO and AC, and in particular by the GNSO. Sometimes there are two, three pages of comments. That doesn't mean we don't send the advice to the Board, that means we should be very careful of every single word that we use, in particular GAC advice a part of the most important elements. I have no difficulty to the substance but I would suggest –

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

Kavouss, I fully agree with you, just to note, this is not under consensus GAC advice to the Board. This is issues of importance to the GAC.

IRAN:

Yeah, because I said GAC advice under title, if it's issues of importance, I have no problem.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

Thank you, my bad, I probably confused you. We were moving to the consensus part and then we were notified that we had received the text under DNS abuse so scrolled up again.

IRAN: But if you agree kindly, you need to add a paragraph before that. GAC reiterates its previous advice on the importance of the continuation of the Board's action in regard with DNS, so on, so forth and then add in this connection, then you put this one. So we need to have something that we connect that to our previous advice in one way or the other if you agree. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kavouss, if you can repeat slowly at dictation speed.

IRAN: With pleasure. Below the DNS abuse you indicate the GAC, or GAC, whatever you want, reiterates its previous advice on the importance of continuation of the Board's action in regard with -- then you put whatever you want, registration, whatever, DNS abuse -- in regard with, and then put full stop and says in this connection, and you add the first paragraph. In this connection, semi colon, and I suggest for your consideration and Fabien, maybe we try to put a number to the paragraph because too many paragraphs and so on, so forth, maybe we put a number.

So that is I would say a preamble that we want to say that we know the Board is addressing but we want that they continue that address to the matter because for us very important and in that connection we say something which I have very much appreciative with that because it raises a new element in our familiar -- it's not repetition of what was said before. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Kavouss. So any comments on the preamble? The GAC reiterates its previous advice on the importance of continuation of the Board's action in regards to to DNS abuse. In this connection the GAC highlights -- and the text continues. I see Chris' hand up, go ahead.

CHRIS LEWIS EVANS: Thank you, Chair. Chris Lewis Evans from the UK, for the record. Just to be accurate, I don't know that we have had previous advice on all these points before, so however, we have had had a previous stance on the importance of DNS abuse. So I wonder if we just change the word advice to stance. Might work a little bit better, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Chris. Indeed we have never had explicit GAC consensus advice on all of the listed issues. So maybe we reiterate our position or stance, as you mentioned. I hope this is okay, Kavouss. I see your hand up.

IRAN: I have no problem with stance but an alternative would be position. Thank you. Just an alternative. Stance is also right. But I would suggest that perhaps the alternative of the stance could consider to use its position. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. Stance, position, views, I mean I'm flexible. Any preferences? Okay. If not, then let's keep position as suggested by Kavouss. Any further comments on this? Okay. Moving to the second paragraph, any comments? Sorry, yes, Brazil please.

BRAZIL: Just a general comment. I think -- I think the general idea was to have a more streamlined record of the meeting. I know it's a very important topic and members have a very clear view on what really matters in this case to understand it, we don't have a problem with that. I don't think necessarily everything that's here was fully discussed in terms of our presentation, not sure it reflects the [indiscernible] things presented here, they fully reflect actually the debates that had. But we're fine with that, it's an important topic and warrants the [indistinct] reflected here.

Just clarification in the first paragraph, when you say including incentives for achieving relevant anti abuse metrics. What is the line, what is exactly the objective, when you think of metrics in the sense of having a better understanding of -- an amount of -- is it just a matter of knowing how to measure -- just a clarification.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Brazil. Any clarification from our penholders? Yes, US please.

UNITED STATES: Thank you Chair, and we welcome the question from our colleague from Brazil. My colleague who focuses on the incentives work, I don't

believe he's in the room so I will have to come back on that for further explanation, but it relates to an ongoing discussion that has been around the notion of -- I mean, to be rather informal, [indiscernible] and carrot to incentivize more responsive behavior by the contracted parties to certain forms of DNS abuse, as it is.

I will try and reach out to my colleague, but we're happy to welcome proposed edits in the meantime if this is an insufficient response. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much Susan. I see two further requests for the floor, Laureen and then Chris.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I just wanted -- (audio distortion) should I just use this mic or through the computer?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: The physical mic.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. My colleague Susan is exactly right. These are financial incentives that can be used to reward contracted parties if they are able to maintain low levels, for example of DNS abuse, so that's the concept here. And Chris may be able to clarify further, but Susan had the gist of it exactly correct.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Laureen, and I am giving the floor to Chris but also there was a question regarding the things that were discussed here versus things that were maybe discussed within the group. So I would suggest if anything that was not discussed directly in GAC plenary, maybe we can put it in the reporting of the PSWG. So we're not throwing anything away, just moving it to the Working Group reporting maybe.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I do think the intent for the drafters was just to include things that were actually discussed in the presentation. If for some reason we're incorrect about that and someone wants to bring it to our attention, of course we can place it someplace else, but that was the intent. There was a lot in the presentation, so certain things may not have leaked out.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Chris please.

CHRIS LEWIS EVANS: I just wonder whether changes metrics to levels might make it a bit simpler and clearer but the reason I chased my hand was reviewing the first two sentences with -- they pretty much say the same thing and for concise -- as our Brazilian colleague reminded us -- I just wondered if we would want to delete one of those two sentences. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Chris. All for briefness.

PARAGUAY: I agree, and actually I would suggest putting somewhere else from solution -- I would not erase but put that part somewhere else and just give the first -- up until on these issues, ICANN community on these issues, full stop.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So the text between brackets, you are proposing we move it elsewhere.

PARAGUAY: Correct, I don't know where else but just proposing it should be somewhere else.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So yeah, I think -- and have we deleted the text that Chris proposed to delete? Chris, if you could please repeat which part to delete and then we will come to Paraguay's suggestion.

CHRIS LEWIS EVANS: Thank you, I was just saying the first two sentences effectively say the same thing, that they are important to the GAC, DNS abuse. I don't mind which sentence gets deleted, whether it's the initial pen holder's one or Kavouss', no preference, but I just believe they say the same thing.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Chris. So the GAC reiterates its previous position on the importance of continuation of the Board's action in regards to DNS

abuse. In this connection the GAC appreciates the continued work by ICANN org. I see Chris nodding, so thank you. Paraguay, if you can give it another thought and let us know.

PARAGUAY: I'm okay with that. I just thought that giving like specific examples, you know, those part should go somewhere else, but I'm okay with the way it is right now. No problems.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. Paraguay. I see US please, go ahead.

UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. Just looking at the first sentence that has been proposed, it seems to focus on three different entities here. We're referring to the Board, we're referring to the org, and we're referring to the community. I'm not entirely sure if when read together that sentence very clear? To this extent, I think, because discussion during the DNS abuse sessions focused more so on the work of -- well, certainly of the community, and I believe reporting was also mentioned or discussed, reporting by the org.

I kind of question whether or not it makes sense to have that first sentence in there and perhaps to retain the text as proposed. Also I just want to note that Switzerland and the UK I believe have made a useful point in the text regarding the first sentence and reiterating a previous position, et cetera. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, US. So we are unstriking the deleted text. Does this reflect your proposal, US? Any opposition, objections? Are we good? Any comments on the second paragraph? I'm sorry, European Commission, apologies to overlook your hand up in the Zoom, sorry, go ahead.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Not at all, Chair, I probably get a bit lost among the comments of my colleagues in the GAC. I just wanted to ensure, and I realize now actually the brackets have disappeared on the solutions and when I raised my hand it was in order to say that I would find it useful precisely for the purpose of leading the reader of putting the three different points in order to better specify what follows and why those are important because intervening at different levels and bringing complementary [indiscernible] depending on the three, so apologies if repetition, the striked text has been put back.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Velimira, and apologies for overlooking your hand. Any comments on the third paragraph? Chris please.

CHRIS LEWIS EVANS: Thank you, Chair. Chris Lewis Evans, for the record. Sorry, just on the second one, again, a comment, I think it says initiative [indiscernible]

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: The second paragraph? Okay. DNS abuse initiative?

CHRIS LEWIS EVANS: It should be institute.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Sorry, so it's corrected on the screen. Thank you for the correction. Anything on the third paragraph starting with improved contractual provisions? Okay. Chris, okay, old hand. If we can scroll, is this up or down? So last paragraph, and I'm going to read it again because I think I faced some difficulty reading a part or two. So maybe we can read it once more and fine tune the language if needed.

Building upon ICANN 72 discussions on the topic of registrar hopping and ICANN 73 discussions on the topic of domain hopping where registrants who seem to be the same are involved in multiple different abusive domain name registrations with the same registrar. The GAC discussed the matter. It was noted that registrars are hopping more rapidly and the tendency of abuse using domain names to be concentrated at a few specific registrars. Registration data accuracy ensuring trust in information as well as effective and continuous auditing of registrars by ICANN compliance could help prevent registrars from being abused by registrants and registrars recognize abuse of the domain name that it has registered.

So I think the first part that confused me is already fixed. Thank you. I'm still finding difficulty -- and it may be only me -- in the last sentence. Registration data accuracy, yes, US please.

UNITED STATES: Just looking at two things. I might suggest that in light of the text that has been added above, I would suggest that -- and further to Chris' comment to strike that last sentence. And then I'm not quite sure about -- though I appreciate the intent, I might suggest under that could help prevent registrars from being abused by registrants, and registrars -- might suggest could help mitigate DNS abuse and just simply -- or to help to mitigate. That was nice, and then just simply end that thought there. But welcome the views of others?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, US. Luisa, please. Canada.

CANADA: Thank you, Manal. Just making sure you can hear me well.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: If you can just speak closer to the mic, much better, thank you.

LUISA PAEZ: Perfect, this is Luisa Paez, Canada, for the record. And we were trying to make this text a bit more clear, and so we do have a few, they're more editorial edits. Perhaps what I would suggest would be easier, I can provide the text via email to Fabien and Benedetta, it could just be added in brackets underneath, it might take a little bit too much time to do it live right now, Manal, if you think a good suggestion. And again, it's editorial, just to make the text more clear to understand. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Canada. So we can mark it, yes, whatever, and make sure we get back to it again, we will still iterate in the Communiqué, so definitely thank you for the proposal, and we will note this and come back to the text again whenever you're ready with the clarifications. Thank you. So any further comments? Yes, India, please.

INDIA: I think the sentence, the first part okay, noted registrants are happening more rapidly, but then the second part, and the tendency for abuse using domain names to be concentrated at a few specific registrars. Maybe we can note registrants hopping more rapidly and there is a tendency -- with a tendency for abuse, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jaideep, I think it provides more clarity. So I think the proposal was with the tendency.

INDIA: But then using domain names to be concentrated -- there is a tendency for abuse using domain names, being concentrated at a few specific registrants. I mean, -- not fitting. Open to suggestions.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I think we have received suggestions from Canada, and I appreciate also circulating on the GAC mailing list maybe I hope Japan -- not sure about the time zone but again, we will keep the text open also until

confirmed by Japan since they were the penholders. So just checking the time. We have four minutes. If we can scroll down to see if we can accomplish anything in the remaining four minutes?

IRAN: Manal, I had a comment on that paragraph.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Kavouss, sorry.

IRAN: No problem. Manal. I think with all due respect to my distinguished Japanese colleagues, the first part of this is narrative. I don't believe that we need that. We could -- from the second part, registration, data, accuracy and so on, so forth and not consider the first part of who said what and putting the quotation which we don't know whether it's right or not, I don't know, I don't have any problem but I suggest taking from the second part, registration data accuracy, ensuring trust in the, so on, so forth would be an effective way to mitigate. So I suggest, if my Japanese colleague kindly agree, we just take the second part of this program, registration data accuracy, thank you, but not the first part.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kavouss. And I'm not sure we have Japan on the line with us. And they were reporting their practice in this so we will not be able to conclude now, but we noted your suggestion, Kavouss. And I have European Commission next, please.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thank you, Chair. And apologies, I will try to be brief. First, thanks to Kavouss on the fact that I think the description of previous sessions might be redundant. Point taken, indeed, let's see what our Japanese colleague thinks, I just wanted to -- even if Japanese colleague not connected right now, I believe the last sentence, it was noted registrants hopping more rapidly and there is a tendency for abuse is rather than a sentence of analogies and showing a trend in terms of DNS abuse. And I'm just wondering would it be more appropriate to eventually keep it because it's more a [indiscernible] sentence than a descriptive one, I would say. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, European Commission. US next.

UNITED STATES: Thank you. And we appreciate the point made by the European Commission. I think what we were reacting to predominantly was the registrars being abused by registrants sounds a little bit direct, and I think even one could read that out of context. So if the commission could propose some revised wording to reflect the analytical point, we would welcome that.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So European Commission, would you like to respond now?

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Yeah, Susan, I just want to be sure we're speaking of the same sentence. I think you are referring to prevent registrars from being abused by registrants, no? I think you are referring to the second pair of brackets, correct? Whereas I was referring to the sentence starting by it was noted that –

UNITED STATES: I'm sorry, Velimira, you're right.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Just to be clear, okay, perfect.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Great. Thank you. And I note also that we have received Canada's proposal over email. So if you would like to check your inboxes. Meanwhile, we put it on the screen, also noting that it is the scheduled end time of the session.

So sorry to interrupt you again, can you please let me know how much text do we have remaining that we have not read before?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So we have -- I believe there's been a few edits unresolved in the new gTLD –

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Completely new text.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: I don't see -- there is text under accuracy of gTLD registration data under GAC consensus advice, that is new text. That is the only -- and actually we have added text in the internal matters in connection with the GAC elections that will be organized after ICANN74, and we also have the GAC for the GAC Public Safety Working Group.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. So anyway, it's time for a coffee break so please let's be back in the room at half past, and we would start with Canada's proposal and see how much we can achieve. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]