

---

ICANN74 | Policy Forum – GAC Communique Drafting (5 of 6)  
Thursday, June 16, 2022 – 10:30 to 12:00 AMS

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So if you can start taking your seats, please. So we will -- thank you very much, Gülten, and if we can also have the Communique on the screen, and have everyone seated please.

GÜLTEN TEPE ÖKSÜZOĞLU: GAC members, could you please take your seats? Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So, thank you very much everyone. Just a quick thing before we get started with the Communique drafting. You will find in your inboxes a new link to the Communique, and this is because the original link was shared on the chat in Zoom, and this made it publicly available for editing, which we don't normally do, so please, if you can be mindful of not sharing the link of the Google doc of the Communique further, again we draft in public, and everyone can follow the drafting but definitely not everyone is allowed to contribute to the drafting, so please be mindful of not sharing the link to the Communique, and just note a new link is being shared with everyone on the GAC mailing list and the mailing is coming from Benedetta.

That said, if we can have the Communique, the new Communique

---

**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.**

---

Google doc on the screen, please? And let's scroll down to DNS abuse, and if we -- yes, please, thank you for making the text larger. And the text reads, the GAC reiterates the importance of building on the community's work on Domain Name System, DNS abuse. The GAC highlights the continued importance of effectively responding to DNS abuse and appreciates the continued work by ICANN org, and the ICANN community on these issues. Solutions can include, 1, enhanced DNS abuse reporting, and 2, improved contractual requirements and compliance programs including incentives for achieving anti-abuse goals, and 3, targeted policy development processes.

So I think maybe we can remove the and before 2. Enhanced abuse reporting could enable more focussed dialogue with the ICANN community and provide the basis for targeted contractual improvements. Abuse reporting at the registrar and registry level, more detailed break downs of the types of DNS abuse measured, and availability of raw aggregated data -- all would assist in developing such contract provisions. The GAC welcomes the launch of a free, centralized abuse reporting tool by the community in response to recommendations made in both SSAC 115 and SSR2 review final report.

Improved contract provisions could focus on the reporting and handling of DNS abuse and enforcement of related contract requirements. 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 ICANN community, and negotiate updates to the standard registry and registrar agreements. This would help ensure that these

---

contracts promote the public interest by including clear and enforceable obligations to detect and respond to DNS abuse.

Targeted policy development processes could also yield contract improvements. Any PDP on DNS abuse should be narrowly tailored to produce a timely and workable outcome.

So, any comments on this part before we move to the paragraph on the presentation by our colleagues from Japan? I see Chris, please, Chris go ahead.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS:

Christopher Lewis-Evans, for the record. Sorry, I'm just still struggling getting access to the new document. On the enhanced abuse reporting part, there's a list of items will assist in developing contract provisions just very hard to tell where the list starts so I wonder if moving the all could assist in developing and started it with the following would assist, in developing contract provisions. I just think it might read a little bit better that way.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

Thank you, Chris, for that proposed enhancement. Any other comments? Laureen, please go ahead.

---

LAUREEN KAPIN: Just a plug for the such because it loops back to the prior sentence targets contractual improvement so if it we use the word such it will make explicit that what we're talking about is targeted contractual improvements as opposed to just contract provisions.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Laureen, and I see Chris nodding, so I think we're good to keep such, and I see a hand up from Nigel please, U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thank you very much, Manal, and thanks so much for this -- thank you for authors of this new text. Yeah, it reads very well. I just had really one question, in the -- in the paragraph that starts enhanced abuse reporting it says enhanced abuse reporting could enable more focussed dialogue. I mean, presumably it could, but can we not say would? Could seems rather subjective. But obviously there's other experts who will have a view on this but I just wondered whether that might make it more effective. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much U.K. I see nodding by Chris, and Laureen, and no objections and no requests for the floor, so I think we are good to change could to would.

So, anything else before we move onto the text from our Japanese colleague? Okay then, let's scroll down.

---

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: If I may this is Fabien speaking. My understanding of the 2 paragraphs that we are seeing here. The one that's highlighted in yellow on from yesterday. This was the Canada proposal that followed the initial Japan proposal, and the paragraph that is underneath is a newer Japan proposal so I believe we would be working off of the second paragraph an assuming that this replaces the one that's highlighted in yellow.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Fabien, for the clarification, and let's start by the second paragraph, so building upon ICANN72 and ICANN73 discussions on the topic of registrar hopping, a presentation was made by a GAC member highlighting that the abuse of domain names of this type continues, and it is important to ensure compliance with the registrars. Accuracy of registration data as well as effective and continuous auditing of registrars by ICANN compliance could help mitigate DNS abuse.

So, any comments? And I see Alisa's hand up, please. Netherlands, go ahead.

NETHERLANDS: Thank you, Manal, and thanks to our Japanese colleague for drafting a new text. Would it be interesting to maybe add something about welcoming more research or more being done on, on this topic because

---

it's -- we've noted now, it's a national study. It might be interesting to advise this to be researched at the anti-phishing working group or something, or other countries inviting other countries to do a similar research, something like that. Thank you. Sorry, I don't have any text on it right now.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, the Netherlands.

So I think it makes sense, and we can incorporate this. I don't have ready access as well, but -- and we can maybe say building upon ICANN72 and ICANN73 discussions. Anyway, I need to think it -- but first, I see a queue forming so I don't want to keep everyone waiting. I have Brazil, U.S., and then U.K. Brazil, please, Luciano go ahead.

BRAZIL: Yes, thank you, Manal, the -- it's a small suggestion perhaps highlighting this type of abuse of domain names continues.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you for the suggested enhancement. I have then Susan, please, U.S. go ahead.

UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. The text it is important to ensure compliance with the registrars seems to read that, that the issue of registrar hopping is

---

already in the contracts, and part of compliance efforts, so I'm just wondering if there might be any suggestion to tweak the language recognizing of course the importance of work in this area, but not giving the impression that this is already a requirement for compliance to avoid giving the wrong interpretation or misleading statement. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, U.S. Well noted. I have Chris next, please. U.K., go ahead.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Yeah, thank you Chris Lewis-Evans for the record. I just thought it might be helpful considering some of the comments especially from the Netherlands, so this type of use is used in other criminal types so the registrars and registries are supporting the IWF and the in Hope network to tackle this type of activity against CSAN type material so it is a wider thing than just the, sort of the Japanese example here, and there is work going on that is American colleagues says there is already contractual work that covers this, I don't know if there's anything new needed. It just needs support.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Chris, for the proposal. Have support staff been able to capture the comment?

---

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: We wouldn't mind to be helped. I'm not clear of changes suggested.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So Chris, please, if you can repeat.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Christopher Lewis-Evans I was trying to give more after flavor of where this sits over all and I didn't have a proposal as such but let me have a think and I've got the Communique up now so I'll add a comment in. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay, so we're taking note of all the comments and I think we need just a few minutes to have some concrete suggestions on the text but first allow me to give the floor Brazil please. Luciano, go ahead. No? Okay, okay, I'm sorry, Susan, is this a new hand?

UNITED STATES: No, my apologies.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: It's okay, thank you. And sorry, I keep hitting the microphone with -- I need to calculation the dimensions better.

---

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: And, Manal, there were 2 suggestions in the chat. There's one from Susan, the U.S., suggesting the edit that I've put in here in the text which reads it is important to promote work in this area in replacement of ensure compliance with the registrars. So just reflected that by adding brackets around the original text.

And I understand there is a suggestion on the following sentence to make it stronger, as suggested in the text.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Fabien, for bringing to our attention, and I see Laureen's hand up much please Laureen, go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN: As a friendly amendment I would note that in the ICANN73 Communique there was a reference to a definition of registrar hopping -- I mean not the definition will you just an attempt to put it into an easy to understand framework, and its in the PSWG meeting text, and I can -- I can read it out loud for consideration if that might just make this easier to understand? I'm saying that, and now I have to find the document where I pulled it up from.

So the definition is -- and this again is from the ICANN73 Communique describing the presentation as about malicious domain name

---

registrants and the strategies they use to avoid detection and responsibility. Just as a concept for what domain name hopping -- what the registrar hopping is, so a friendly amendment suggestion.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Laureen. Well noted, and also if we have our colleague from Japan on and off line maybe it would be helpful also to confirm if we can -- to confirm the edits that are being proposed, and I think it would be good to stick the -- to the definition that we have already used before. Fabien, please go ahead.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: I would like to highlight the comment we inserted over this footnote that was suggested by Japan, and we were referencing a description of registrar hopping that was in the ICANN72 Communique and which was repeated to some extent in the OING 73 but in another section of the document so realized that we have a discussion in the owning ICANN73 Communique of the issuing in 2 different ways of slightly using different terms, so maybe we may want to select one of the two.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay, thank you, Fabien, for alerting us, and definitely we don't want to introduce a third, so -- and I see Laureen agreeing in the chat with the ICANN72 reference, so let's stick with this, and I hope Japan also confirms that its okay to stick with the definition that was discussed at

---

the time, and agreed with them during ICANN72.

Please, Fabien, go ahead.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So we can make that edit and bring back that language for the footnote as the description of registrar hopping. In the meantime in the chat there is a suggestion or a edit in the last sentence of this paragraph here I'm unable to identify who the suggestion is from. The user in the room.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: It's from Paraguay.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay, I wasn't sure, thank you. So then I'll just reflect it in the text.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: And meanwhile I see Japan in the queue, so please Teruyuki, go ahead.

JAPAN: May I -- can I speak?

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Please go ahead.

JAPAN: Oh. This is explanation of registrar hopping but general presentation in ICANN73, and this issue of registrar hopping not mean registrant to appear to the same, continue the same type of abuse using different domain names (indiscernible) they just start to same registrar but ICANN72 we -- sorry, sorry, sorry, registrar hopping in registrar hopping in ICANN72, we, we (indiscernible) in 73 we, we explanation domain hopping that.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So maybe let me try to help out here because I think in the definition provided in the current Communique you say the same registrar with the same registrar, and I understand that.

JAPAN: Well --

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: That the hopping here is intended to be from one registrar to the other, so I have the feeling that the previous definition describes what you meant better, if you can please confirm.

---

JAPAN: Well, we share 2 case on registrar hopping and domain hopping at ICANN72 and 73. We introduce on this on this time presentation hopping, hopping mean, hopping mean registrar hopping and domain hopping so registrant continue -- some registrant continue to hopping, registrar hopping, and another, other registrar -- registrant do domain hopping so we, we consider in both of them, both of them are continuing. Sorry, sorry, I'm sorry, I'm not good at English.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: It's okay so, we have 2 things here, registrar hopping and domain hopping, so I see India seeking the floor so if you allow me please.

INDIA: If you look at the first version he sent he mentioned in ICANN72 the issue of registrar hopping was there. In ICANN73 in the original text domain hopping was there. What he's trying on say is both issues are relevant so instead of billing upon ICANN72 and ICANN73 discussions on the topic of registrar and domain hopping maybe we could include that and have a general clause is what he's trying say. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jaideep, so we are reflecting this on the screen, and please Japan if you can confirm -- so does this make sense now, building upon ICANN72 and ICANN73 discussions on the topic of registrar and domain hopping?

---

JAPAN: It can be possible domain and registrar hopping is better I think.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay, so if we can separate the terms, so quotation registrar hopping and quotation domain hopping.

JAPAN: Yes, yes, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: And I'm being told domain in capital please. So, building upon ICANN72 and ICANN73 discussions on the topic of registrar hopping and domain hopping a presentation was made by a GAC member. Can we maybe say sharing a national experience that this type -- sharing a national experience highlighting -- yeah, it's okay highlighting that this type of abuse of domain names continues, and that it is important to promote work in this area.

And I see ensure compliance with the registrars between square brackets because this text implies as we have heard the comment earlier, implies that there is something already in the registrar's contracts that we would like to comply with, which is not the case. So, Japan, I hope you are okay if we delete the text between brackets?

---

JAPAN: Okay, ensure incorporation -- okay and but, I would like to clarify. On what, what, what, what, what promote what indicate.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Sorry, I'm just getting to the text a presentation was made by a GAC member sharing a national experience highlighting that this type of abuse of domain continues, and that it is important to promote work on this. I think here the intention is to encourage continuation of investigation and study in this area does this sound okay, Teruyuki?

JAPAN: Well --

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: It's to encourage.

JAPAN: Encourage, encourage [inaudible] okay okay.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So, would you like to replace promote by encourage?

JAPAN: Promoter encourage.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So.

JAPAN: Encourage, encourage so promote, promote replace encourage.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay done. If you can see it on the screen and that it is important to encourage work in this area, and then the GAC recommends ICANN org to ensure accuracy of registration data as well as effective and continuous auditing by ICANN compliance would help mitigate DNS abuse, and I continue to struggle reading this sentence. It doesn't read well to me, so any proposals to fix? So let me read it. The GAC recommends ICANN org to ensure accuracy of registration data as well as effective and continuous auditing of registrars by compliance, which could help mitigate DNS abuse? Is this the intended meaning?

INDIA: I think we should end it. We are saying GAC recommends. There is -- we could end after ICANN compliance if that is the end.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jaideep, for your help, so proposal is to have a full stop after compliance, and delete the rest of the sentence, is this

---

okay Teruyuki?

JAPAN: Okay, okay.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. So let me read the paragraph one more time for everyone's consideration. Building upon ICANN72 and ICANN73 discussions on the topic of registrar hopping and domain hopping, a presentation was made by a GAC member sharing a national experience highlighting that this type of abuse domain names continues and that it is important to encourage work in this area. The GAC recommends ICANN org to ensure -- the GAC recommends ICANN org to ensure accuracy of registration data as well as effective and continuous auditing of registrars by ICANN compliance.

Paraguay, please.

PARAGUAY: Thank you, madam chair. The idea was too put there the GAC recommends ICANN.or ICANN org to ensure accuracy of registration data as well as continuous auditing of registrars by ICANN in order to mitigate DNS abuse or something like in order to help mitigate DNS abuse, but that's more or less the idea. Thank you, madam chair.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Paraguay. So you're suggesting that we keep the text and fix it by in order to help mitigate DNS abuse?

PARAGUAY: Exactly, if it's okay with --

JAPAN: Obviously with everybody.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So Japan, I appreciate your confirmation and then I have Lauren in the queue.

JAPAN: I agree, I agree with, I agree this...

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay, thank you for confirming that the current wording is okay and it now reads this order to help mitigate DNS abuse. Lauren, please. Sorry to keep you waiting. Go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN: No, no, no, first of all I appreciate the clarification that my colleague from Japan has made that we're talking about two types of sneaky tactics here by registrants, domain name hopping and registrar

---

hopping, and in that case in terms of a definition I think the current footnote only refers to one type of deceptive behavior, and I'll go back to my original definition from ICANN73 which I think may be more accurate because it talks about malicious domain name registrants and the strategies they use to avoid detection and responsibility. That I think would encompass both types of deceptive behavior.

I think the current footnote only describes one, so I offer that as a suggestion for the GAC, and my colleague from Japan to consider.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So, if -- please, Japan could confirm that the current footnote refers only to one type of hopping, and we now have two types, and U.S. is everything a more general definition that was already used before that could cover both. Is this okay? And it's already on the screen, it says malicious domain name registrations and the strategies they use to avoid detection and responsibility.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think it's registrants, not registrations.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay.

---

JAPAN: Domain name, registration --

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So meanwhile, if you allow me to give the floor to Chris while you read this Teruyuki so please, Chris, go ahead.

JAPAN: Oh, I think as far as domain name registrant, that registration, but the (indiscernible) they, registrant, so (indiscernible).

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So Teruyuki if you may give us a second just to listen to Chris's intervention and then get back to this point is this okay.

JAPAN: Oh.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. So Chris, please, and then we'll get back to the text.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Yeah, and thank you, Manal. Christopher Lewis-Evans, for the record. Just with the readdition of help to mitigate DNS abuse, with this I don't think it's strictly DNS abuse, it's abuse of the registration process, so I'd just propose to strike DNS abuse and replace that with this.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Chris. Makes sense to me. Any objections to replacing DNS by this? Just to be more accurate? So I have -- I'm seeing no objections so far. I have Fabien and then I'll come back to Japan. Please Fabien, go ahead.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Manal, and this is to mention a suggestion in the chat by Portugal to here in the first sentence a presentation was made by a GAC member sharing a national experience highlighting this this type of abuse of domain names -- and the suggestion is to remove of domain names since the registrar hopping -- with the question of whether registrar hop something abuse of domain or is another type of abuse.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Fabien, for bringing this to our attention, and thank you Portugal. I think it makes sense again to try to be cautious to cover both types of abuse, so maybe staying more general to make sure we're covering -- now that we know we have 2 distinct types of abuses.

I'm just reading Japan in the chat. Registrar hopping means that registrants transfer the same domain.

---

JAPAN: Registrar hopping mean that registrant transferring the same domain name onto the -- [inaudible] and domain hopping mean using different domain name that are [inaudible] registered to the same registrar so 2 type of hopping. 2 type of hopping, they use to avoid detection and so.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yeah.

JAPAN: Registrar hopping and domain hopping and [inaudible] abuse.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yeah, well noted Teruyuki, thank you. So we have two different type of abuse, and please confirm whether, confirm whether the text on the screen is accurate on accepted by Japan. I'm going to read it once more. Building upon ICANN72 and ICANN73 discussions on the topic of registrar hopping, and domain hopping, and we have a footnote here reading malicious domain name registrants, and the strategies they use to avoid detection and responsibility.

A presentation was made by a GAC member sharing a national experience highlighting that this type of abuse continues, and that it is important to encourage work in this area. The GAC recommends ICANN org to ensure accuracy of registration data, as well as effective and continuous auditing of registrars by ICANN compliance in order to help mitigate this abuse.

---

Any comments? India, yeah, please go ahead.

INDIA:

Two observations. One, I think I was wondering instead of saying a GAC member because we have already in the text indicated there was a presentation in Japan so is there an issue in us to just write the presentation was made by GAC member of Japan rather than having a GAC member. That is the first observation.

Second, I think the last sentence that is the GAC recommends, I mean is this the section where -- because we have an advice section separately coming in, so whether we want to keep such a strong word here or recommendation in a section which is not exactly the consensual advice section or are we going to replicate.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

Thank you, Jaideep, on the first question I don't think we have an explicit mention of Japan so --

INDIA:

In mention of working group there is a mention of Japan presentation on domain hopping. Those sections.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: We were trying to be consistent it with what we have done in previous Communique, and I think in ICANN72 and ICANN73 Communique we didn't explicitly mention but I stand to be corrected.

INDIA: Scroll up I think. Go to the PSWG working groups.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yeah, I take your point. That there is an explicit mention under the working groups.

INDIA: Presentation made by Japan is there I think on domain hopping.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you for noting this. So was this the case also in -- so support staff if you can help, was this the case in the previous Communique? Did we mention that presentation was by Japan? And is this a custom, and can we reference the GAC member? Of course, if --

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: I will double check but I believe the practice is not to name the country so we have a general reference to a GAC member or some GAC members, but never listed and --

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yeah, and this is my understanding too if this is the case then we may need to fix this in the working group reporting so that we are consistent, and thank you for flagging this India.

On your second point, again, this is -- this has not been really a GAC discussion that materialized into a consensus GAC advice that can be shared to ICANN Board, so I take your point that if we are sharing a consensus GAC advice it has to be in the right section, but for now, this is, this is WA we have discussed here, and -- which doesn't yet mature to be a consensus GAC advice, and I see you nodding so I hope this addresses your question.

So, while we are checking how we did report on this in previous communiques in terms of the section of working group reporting, any comments on the paragraph? I see no requests for the floor, and Japan please if you can -- if you can confirm that the text is okay as is stands on the screen?

JAPAN: Let me see. I check (indiscernible) domain name registrant on strategy of -- okay I confirm this edit (indiscernible).

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, thank you very much, Japan. I'm just catching up with the chat. I appreciate your participation remotely. Much appreciated.

So I -- Laureen in the chat confirming that we remove specific country reference to be consistent. Thank you, and Portugal asking English issue, the initial abuse was singular, now it's plural. I'm just checking the text. Here we say those type -- those types of abuse, okay thank you Fabien. Benedetta, does this address the point?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So I reverted to the original text in this sentence much these type of abuse. I'm understanding the comment in the chat as related to maybe a discrepancy answer between this type of abuse and at the end of the second sentence this abuse in order to help mitigate this abuse so I don't know -- to me it feels readable the way it is, but might be incorrect.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yeah. Thank you, Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: And we can check that as an editorial matter.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Sure, and I see a hand up, if you can please introduce yourself and then I have Brazil, Luciano.

---

UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. This is Kenneth Merrill, U.S. for the record. We wanted to GAC to the last sentence, I think we have a little bit of a concern that it makes the impression that ICANN compliance is not already auditing for accuracy, and so wanted to maybe pro propose some slight wordsmithing to make it a little clearer to the reader.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kenneth, and apologies for not recognizing your last name in Zoom. So, you are recommending that the -- putting some language to make sure we're not saying that ICANN is not currently doing this, right? So maybe the GAC recommends ICANN org to continue to ensure -- I see nodding? Please.

UNITED STATES: Yeah, so perhaps something like the GAC notes the importance of continued audit of registrars by ICANN complains in order to aid in mitigation of abuse or DNS abuse. I would note also that the accuracy working group hasn't finalized what exactly accuracy means, and so I think we just want to note that as well. Thank you, Chair.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, U.S. Good point. So the GAC recommends ICANN org to ensure accuracy of data as well as effective -- I'm sorry, I'm -- yeah, so, meanwhile as we fix this Brazil, please, if you would like to intervene.

**BRAZIL:** No, no the discussion about the plural singular I don't think it's necessarily important but there was a previous discussion indicating that those are two different types of abuse the registrar hopping and domain hopping so if it's -- I don't think it's really -- I don't think it's really makes a lot of difference but if there's agreement that we were talking about two different types of abuse then I think should be plural. Otherwise can be singular. That was a discussion that reflected here in the chat. So if it's plural should be those types of abuse. Continue. If it's singular of course it's this type of abuse continues.

**MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:** Thank you very much, Brazil, and indeed we will review the language and make sure we do the right singular or plural depending on the context indeed. I saw a hand up -- yeah, Paraguay, please.

**PARAGUAY:** Thank you, madam chair, and the same magic applies to the last part of the sentence where it says continued auditing of registrars by ICANN, ICANN compliance in order to help mitigate DNS abuse, I would suggest instead of writing these or those just DNS abuse, because my understanding registrar hopping and domain hopping are cases of DNS abuse.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So this was the original text and the suggest was replace DNS by this because registrar hopping is not necessarily a dozen, but rather maybe abuse of the process itself, so they are not at the same level sort of. So, and I see you nodding, I hope this is convincing.

Portugal, I'm sorry.

PORTUGAL: So it's both are DNS abuse, but registrar hopping is not a domain abuse.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much. Well noted.

PORTUGAL: Thank you, Chair.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. Kenneth is this an old hand or a new hand. A new hand please go ahead.

UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. So just to refine the last sentence a bit more I think the GAC encourages ICANN org to conduct effective and continuous auditing of registrars to help.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So --

UNITED STATES: Mitigate DNS abuse.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: If you can repeat with a dictation speed.

UNITED STATES: Sure. Apologies. Okay the GAC encourages ICANN org to conduct effective and continuous auditing of registrars to help mitigate DNS abuse.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Kenneth, and while waiting for the text to be reflected on the screen, so allow me to read it, the final final final I hope.

And let's see if this is agreed. Building upon ICANN72 and ICANN73 discussions on the topic of registrar hopping and domain hopping, a presentation was made by a GAC member sharing a national experience highlighting that this type of abuse of -- this type of abuse continues and that it is important to encourage work in this area.

---

The GAC encourages ICANN org to conduct effective and continuous auditing of registrars to help mitigate -- I think we changed DNS abuse. I'm lost now. So to help mitigate this abuse? To help mitigate abuse? Yeah, if we can just remove DNS and keep it as was agreed shortly, which I think to help mitigate this abuse, yeah, thank you.

My apologies, yeah, let's separate the text between brackets, and have a final look. So the last sentence now reads the GAC encouraging ICANN org to conduct effective and continuous auditing of registrars to help mitigate this abuse.

I see nodding. Thank you U.S., Australia, Paraguay, thank you everyone. Japan, I hope we are good to move on? And again, thank you very much for your participation on-line. Yeah Jaideep? I'm sorry, Japan, please. Sorry, I -- were you responding?

JAPAN: I thank you for -- I understand, so, the GAC encourage ICANN org to conduct [inaudible] oh.

GÜLTEN TEPE ÖKSÜZOĞLU: Teruyuki, we cannot hear you. Could you speak closer to the microphone? And at a reasonable pace.

---

JAPAN: Oh, sorry. [Inaudible] okay I confirm, so.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So I understand -- yeah, if I understand correctly you're confirming the existing paragraph right?

JAPAN: Yes, okay.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. Thank you very much Japan. And India please sorry to keep you waiting.

INDIA: I was just wanting to confirm the last sentence because it new exactly what I was trying to say. Instead of using the words recommends encourages is better so totally support that.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Perfect, thank you. So I think we're good to clean this text, and consider it final. And just doing a time check. I think we're supposed to finish in ten minutes?

---

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Manal, this is Julia. We are going until noon.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay, sorry.

JULIA CHARVOLEN: No problem.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Good to know, thank you. So, anything else that we need to finalize before doing a final read through the whole Communique? Okay.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Sorry, I was looking at the text and I believe that once this is cleaned up we do not have any new edits. Let me scan quickly. There is maybe still a comment in the -- in the accuracy of registration data section under issues of importance. There was a comment inserted by Jorge. I'm not too sure what was the status of that comment. Maybe we can stop there on our way back up and we should be able to then read the final text.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. Then let's see the comment, and check if Jorge is still on-line, confirm this, and then start our final read of the Communique.

---

So I'm reading the comment here, we should in my opinion be explicit that the proposal comes from the interim report and link the interim report here, if the interim report is already final.

I think we discussed this verbally and noted that the interim report is not final, and agreed that it's better not to link to something that is temporary, and may vanish with time. So I think we have already addressed this and I have Ros from U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Thank you. Ros U.K.. We wanted to propose one slight change to this section and it's just the accuracy section. The sentence that says this topic remains under discussion and should move towards resolution. We wanted to propose removing remains under discussion, and the and after that, just based on the scoping team meeting yesterday. I was under the impression that the topic had closed in this that regard, the discussion. Thank you very much.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

So, the proposal is to -- okay does this reflect your suggestion accurately, Ros, the text on the screen? The topic should move towards resolution?

---

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thank you, Chair.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. Any comments? Okay seeing none, then let's try to do our final read of the Communique in the remaining time.

And as mentioned earlier, text in highlighted in yellow will be updated in due time when we finalize and circulate the date will be fixed and when we receive no objections the text will be -- the highlight will be removed, and when we finalize the count of attendance, also we will remove the highlight.

So, the The Hague Communique was drafted and agreed in a hybrid setting during the GAC -- during the ICANN74 policy forum with some GAC participants in The Hague, the Netherlands and others remotely. The Communique was circulated to the GAC immediately after the meeting to provide an opportunity for all GAC members and observers to consider it before publication. Bearing in mind the special circumstances of a hybrid meeting. No objections were raised during the agreed time-frame before publication.

And just a quick question to the Netherlands. Is the Netherlands a capital T or small t? I see The Hague with capital T and the Netherlands with a small t.

---

NETHERLANDS: I've been wondering this since I inserted it, and I'm actually not sure so I should be googling this.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay.

NETHERLANDS: I'll come back to you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: It's a small editorial thing and we will take care of it as soon as we receive a confirmation.

I see a hand up in the back, please? Go ahead.

IRAN: Just for the record, I am Hosein from Iran, that as this is the first time I'm taking the floor I should thank all your efforts to have it done, just in line 3 I'm -- I wonder when you, whether we write the Communique was circulated to the GAC immediately, what we mean by GAC? Is GAC members or GAC -- like just this meeting? What is, what does it mean exactly?

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, to the GAC membership, members and observers.

IRAN: Okay, because just in line before it is mentioned some -- GAC participants, so I was --

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yeah, so --

IRAN: What does mean exactly?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Participants are those who were present at the meeting but when we circulated we circulated to everyone, so even those who were not present here, so that is why we do not refer to participants when we circulate so thank you Iran. Under introduction the text reads the Governmental Advisory Committee, GAC of the ICANN corporation for a signed names and numbers. ICANN met in The Hague in Netherlands in a hybrid setting including row meet parts paying from 13 to 16 June 2022. 80 GAC members and 8 observers attended the meeting. The GAC meeting was conducted as part of the ICANN74 policy forum. All GAC plenary and working group sessions were conducted as open meetings.

Under interconstituency activities and community engagement we have meeting with the ICANN Board, the GAC met with the ICANN Board

---

on discussed SSAD Light, accuracy of registration data, Global Public Interest Framework, and future GAC information opportunities. And SSAD, the transcripts of this session in specific is normally attached to the final Communique.

Next is meeting with At-Large Advisory Committee, ALAC, the GAC met with members of the ALAC and discussed, Universal Acceptance and Internationalized Domain Names, GAC -- ALAC and at large co-operation at the national level, geo-political issues and advancing the multistakeholder model.

Next is the our meeting with the generic names supporting organizations, the GNSO. The GAC met with members of the GNSO Council and discussed subsequent rounds of new gTLDs including closed generics and the GNSO guidance process, DNS abuse, accuracy of registration data, SSAD Light, and Global Public Interest.

Under cross-community discussions we have GAC members participated in relevant cross-community sessions scheduled as part of ICANN74 including working together on progress of subsequent rounds of new gTLDs, and 5 year follow up to who sets ICANN's priorities?

Under internal matters we have first GAC membership. I'm sorry I can see a hand up in the chat? Portugal, this is, this a new hand?

---

PORTUGAL: Yes, I have a question. The first line. Second chapter I believe is something like constituency?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Which section if we can scroll up?

PORTUGAL: Up please. More please.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: No up.

PORTUGAL: Up, yes. Here, SSAD Light, one line up please is not an opportunity to try to the proof of concept? If they are the same.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Right, we were trying to stick to the agenda that has been circulated, so this was the initial agenda but yeah, I think it's a matter of sticking of what exactly was shared before the meeting, what was agreed as an agenda. But --

---

PORTUGAL: Thank you, Chair.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: But in the more description we explained, we explained the proof of concept but, I think this sticks to the agenda as was circulated. I hope it's okay. Thank you.

So if we can scroll down to internal matters, and first we have GAC membership. There are currently 179 GAC member states and territories, and 38 observer organizations. Under GAC elections the 2022 election process for the positions of GAC chair and vice chairs will be initiated shortly after the ICANN74 meeting with the start of the -- with the start of the nomination period. The nomination period will close on 5 August, 2022.

If needed, a voting process will be conducted from 29 August until 20 September, 2022, ending during the ICANN75 public meeting where the election results will be announced.

Under GAC working groups, we have the GAC Public Safety Working Group, the PSWG. The GAC PSWG continued its work to advocate for improved measures to combat DNS abuse and promote effectively access to domain name registration data. The PSWG led a session to update the GAC on DNS abuse that included 1, updates on various initiatives from ICANN org, the GNSO, and private entities to research, assess, and mitigate DNS abuse, in particular recognizing recommendations from the DNS security facilitation initiative technical

---

study group, which would support the creation of an information sharing platform which the PSWG notes, which the PSWG notes, in other business sectors has contributed to the reduction in harm and an increase in best practices.

2, a follow-up presentation by a GAC member regarding domain hopping and data free flow with trust.

3, a presentation from the DNS Abuse Institute about a new centralized DNS abuse reporting tool, NetBeacon. The PSWG also pointed out that booze cannot be measured just by a reduction in the number of malicious domains affected but also needs to take into account the magnitude of the harms to users of the Internet.

The PSWG continued its active participation to support the GAC small group through participation in the Phase 1 implementation review, review team, the SSAD small team discussing ICANN org's ODA, and the GNSO accuracy scoping team. The PSWG emphasized the importance of accurate registration data to deter and investigate DNS abuse. The PSWG noted the possibility that a proof of concept could be a valuable addition that could "reduce overall risk through the use of a prototype to reduce the unknowns for specific technical and operational concerns", but shared concerns that a time-line for the proof of concept and proposal for dealing with the recommendations not considered under a proof of concept would need to be created.

If we can scroll down, please. As per the Work Plan the PSWG continued its outreach to public safety bodies. With the support of the European

---

Commission and Europol the PSWG gave presentations to 17 member states. The PSWG also held discussions with a number of constituents groups within ICANN.

And I see Laureen's hand up. Please, Laureen, go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

I just noticed a punctuation correction that is in the first paragraph after the number 2, a follow-up presentation, I think we need a semicolon there instead of a -- right. There we go. And also, I think -- I don't think it's necessary to name the reporting tool, sometimes these names change over time, so I think that probably can be just deleted.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Laureen. Well noted, and taken care of. Any other comments? Okay, if not, then let's go to the GAC working group on Human Rights and International Law.

The GAC was briefed by the Human Rights and International Law co-chair regarding the recent discussions of the Work Stream 2 community coordination group, CCG, on the diversity recommendation stemming from the GAC Work Stream 2 prospective proposal document. Regular updates will be provided to GAC members as discussions develop. Then GAC Operating Principles Evolution Working Group, the GAC was briefed on recent activities carried out by the GOPE Working Group including the finalized GAC Working Group Guidelines. GAC members endorsed the GAC Working Group Guidelines, GOPE

---

Working Group members will meet inter-sessionally to commence review and discussion of the GAC Operating Principles, and share relevant developments with the GAC membership at ICANN75.

Under GAC operational matters we have the GAC share alerted GAC members to the need to start discussions regarding planning for the next GAC high level government meeting and this was welcomed by GAC members.

Now moving to issues of importance to the GAC. First, we have the system for standardized access and disclosure, SSAD of gTLD registration data.

The GAC appreciates the work of the small group focussing on issues identified in ICANN org's operational design phase, ODA, and encourages progress that paves the way for the Board's consideration and action upon the approved consensus recommendations of the Phase 2 expedited policy development process for gTLD registration data.

A small team of ICANN community members concluded that the ODA does not provide enough information to determine the cost and benefit of the SSAD recommendations. The small team also considered what further information may be needed, and how this information can be obtained to allow the GNSO Council and the Board to confidently determine the costs and benefit, and if modifications needed to be made to the SSAD recommendations.

---

As a result, the small team recommended a pause in its consideration of the SSAD recommendations so that a proof of concept formerly known as SSAD Light, approach could be implemented. ICANN org is currently supporting the small group's work in developing such a proof of concept. The GAC emphasizes the importance of providing specific time-lines and goals for the proof of concept.

This clarity will serve to notify the community of the schedule of the proof of concept, and will happen after the proof of concept phase concludes.

Providing an effective centralized system for access and disclosure of domain name registration data remains important, and the GAC looks forward to the timely completion of the proof of concept which may assist the Board in its assessment of the Phase 2 policy recommendations.

If we can scroll down, please. Now moving to subsequent rounds of new gTLDs.

The GAC discussed subsequent be rounds of new gTLDs and received an update from ICANN org about the current status of the operational design phase. ODP. Relative to policy recommendations on the final report from the subsequent procedures of new gTLDs GNSO policy development process PDP. In preparation for the next round of new gTLDs, noting the increasing number of GAC newcomers, GAC members emphasized the importance of organizing topical training and capacity building sessions and webinars tailored to GAC members. It was

---

proposed that specific capacity building activities be organized in the lead up to and during subsequent ICANN meetings.

The GAC reaffirmed its intention to take part in the upcoming facilitated dialogue between GAC and GNSO, proposed by the Board, to explore a mutually-agreeable way forward on closed generics and its encouragement of At Large Advisory Committee participation in the effort. The GAC will continue to engage in seeking such a mutually agreeable solution relative to closed generic applications in the next round of new gTLDs, in keeping with the GAC Beijing Communique whereas "exclusive registry access should serve a public interest goal".

Now under EPDP on specific curative rights protections for IGOs the text reads the GAC welcomed the progress on this expedited policy development process EPDP, specifically the agreement to the recommendations by the GNSO Council. The GAC looks forward to the adoption of the recommendations by the Board and the timely implementation of this important policy.

Under accuracy of registration data, the text reads, the GAC recognizes the efforts of the accuracy scoping team, and appreciates the team's work to assess the current state of accuracy. At the same time, the GAC notes with concern some recent developments, namely a proposal to pause the team's work pending resolution of ICANN org's planned outreach to the European Data Protection Board, EDPB on whether ICANN has a legitimate purpose to access nonpublic registration data, in order to review the accuracy of such data. The GAC believes that pausing the work would be counterproductive.

Given the GAC as interest in seeing the work of the team resolved in a timely manner, the GAC suggests that the team focus on additional -- and complementary -- work that may continue in the interim.

For example, the team should strive to reach agreement on what current accuracy requirements encompass. As part of assignment 1, the team agreed to refer to a current description of how existing accuracy requirements are understood and enforced. This topic should move towards resolution. In this context the GAC stresses that contractual requirements are not limited to accurate but also to reliable data. The team has not yet analyzed whether there are procedures in place to ensure that the registration data are both accurate, and reliable.

Further, the accuracy scoping team could focus on obtaining more detailed information from the contracted parties about how they currently enforce accuracy requirements. In this context, the GAC welcomes the draft interim reports recommendation "that the GNSO Council requests ICANN org to carry out a registrar survey" with the aim of collecting information on the verification procedures that registrars have in place to assess accuracy. The voluntary nature of the survey, however, could limit the volume of feedback received.

Therefore, if we can scroll down, therefore, the GAC encourages the team to explore additional and complementary work items such as testing accuracy controls in a manner that is not dependent upon

---

access to personally identifiable data. So, we're 2 minutes after the scheduled time, but I appreciate your patience. We have just a small part remaining and then we can release the final session on of the Communique drafting.

So, under DNS Abuse Mitigation, if we can scroll down please, the text reads the GAC reiterates the importance of building on the community's work on Domain Name System, DNS abuse, the GAC highlights the continued importance of effectively responding to DNS abuse and appreciates the continued work by ICANN org, and the ICANN community on these issues. Solutions can include 1, enhanced DNS abuse reporting, 2, improved contractual requirements and compliance programs including incentives for achieving anti-abuse goals, and 3, targeted policy development processes.

Enhanced abuse reporting would enable more focussed dialogue with the ICANN community and provide the basis for targeted contractual improvements. The following would assist in developing such contract provisions -- I'm sorry, the following would assist in developing such contract provisions. Abuse reporting at the registrar and registry level, more detailed break downs of the types of DNS abuse measured, and availability of raw, aggregated data. The GAC well coming the launch of a free, centralized abuse reporting tool by the community in response to recommendations made in both SAC115 and the SSR2 review final report.

Improved contract provisions could focus on the reporting and handling of DNS abuse and enforcement of related contract

---

requirements. 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 help ensure that these contracts promote the public interest by including clear and enforceable obligations to detect and respond to DNS abuse.

Targeted policy development processes, PDPs, could also yield contract improvements. Any PDP on DNS abuse should be narrowly tailor today produce a timely and workable outcome.

Building upon ICANN72 and ICANN73 discussions on the topic of registrar hopping on domain hopping a presentation was made by a GAC member sharing a national experience highlighting that these types of abuse continues and that it is important to encourage work in this area. The GAC encourages ICANN org to conduct effective and continuous auditing of registrars to help mitigate DNS -- to help myth date this abuse. We need to delete DNS here.

Now under UDRP we have 2 sub-titles A, UDRP and geographical indications further to a briefing on -- so, this is the text between brackets should be deleted is it --

SPEAKER:

We missed this earlier it was just to choose between I believe briefing and or following the public comment period. I don't think it was

---

decided which one or whether to include it or not.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. So any preference between further to a briefing on or following the public comment period, yeah, I see Dominico, Italy, please go they'd.

ITALY: Yes thank you. Dominico from Italy, for the record. Maybe is better to leave following the public comment period, or further to a briefing on of the public comment without period. So this is the choice.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Dominico. So if we can delete further to a briefing on, and leave following following the public comment period on the policy status report relating to the UDRP, the GAC received input from some GAC members in relation to whether the scope of the UDRP could be extended to address geographical indications. The GAC therefore intends to consider the matter in preparation for discussion at subsequent meetings.

B, review of the UDRP. The GAC received an update on the status of a planned review of the UDRP and in particular notes reference to section 13.1 of the ICANN Bylaws which calls on and indeed encourages the Board and the constituent bodies to seek advice from the relevant public bodies with existing expertise that resides outside of. Between

---

brackets notably in the context of the UDRP the UDRP author and steward, the word intellectual property organization WIPO. To inform the policy process and looks forward to further exploring this provision prior to any review of the UDRP.

We have next new gTLD auction proceeds and the text reads the GAC acknowledges the ICANN Board's adoption of recommendations from the cross-community working group on new gTLD proceeds CCWGAP final report. The GAC intends to follow implementation planning and design of the CCWGAP recommendations, and remains available to provide input throughout the process. And finally on under next meeting the GAC is KED scheduled to meet next during the ICANN75 annual general meeting in Kuala Lumpur Malaysia scheduled for 17 to 22 September, 2022. So I'm sorry, I missed a hand up from Alisa, the Netherlands.

NETHERLANDS:

You didn't miss it because. I just put it up, thanks. This is Alisa Heaver, for the record. Just to confirm the Netherlands is with a small t, so you know.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

Thank you very much, the Netherlands with a small t. I see a hand up from Nigel, U.K.

---

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thank you, Manal. It was really on that last bit about the UDRP and I think Bryan is on the chat Brian Beckham on the chat from WIPO. It doesn't quite read right in English this steward bit so whether there can be some minor change because I just don't think it's very clear. I mean the expertise in the -- in WIPO and in other areas but it's just the words steward in this context but I'm sure there's mine or editorial -- thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Nigel. Is everybody okay that we can take this off line and you will receive it in the final version over e-mail. Any objections? So we will take care of this part the steward thing and circulate the final version. I have a hand up. Canada, Luisa, please go they'd.

CANADA: Thank you. It's Luisa Paez, for the record. I just wanted to highlight (audio problem) edit under the subsequent procedures section if you don't mind scrolling up. Thank you, so I think it reads better the GAC will continue to engage in seeking such a mutually agreeable solution on closed generic applications. So the edit would be to delete relative to, and just replace it with un. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Luisa. Noted and taken care of. And I think with that we are done with the Communique drafting. I thank you very much

---

for your hard work, dedication, and flexibility and compromises and -- oops a hand up. Yes, Kenneth please go ahead.

UNITED STATES:

Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to highlight a sort of a small clerical item in the on the accuracy text and issues of importance. We had discussed linking to on the proposal to pause I just want to make sure that's linked to the correct correspondence there, and I believe that it's correspondence from the accuracy scoping team to the Board, I believe, or -- possibly the GNSO Council. If if -- yeah, Fabien go ahead.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Sorry, I've looked into that. I understand that there are 2 references to a pause in the context of the scoping team, the first one was made in the public change request, sorry the project change request that was sent by the scoping team to the GNSO Council in may, suggesting that there may be a need to pause the work. It was a may.

Now, more recently in the draft interim report there is discussion of a recommendation to the GNSO Council to pause the work. So it's Amore affirmative reference so I believe the current note references the most current and most and less conditional. And less uncertain -- request or recommendation for a pause. Does that make sense?

---

UNITED STATES: It does, yeah, and we just wanted to follow up from our Swiss counterparts note of this earlier just for the sake of clarity. So thank you very much.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much. Thank you very much everyone for the constructive spirit and flexibility. We're done with the Communique drafting. So we are releasing the session that was supposed to start at 13:15 to 14:30 but please be back here at 15:00 local time, 13:00 UTC for our GAC wrap up. We will be talking about elections taking stock and planning forward so I hope to see everyone participating to the wrap-up session please. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**