
ICANN78 | AGM – GAC Communique Drafting (3 of 5)
Wednesday, October 25, 2023 – 4:00 to 5:30 HAM

DAN GLUCK:

Hello, and welcome to the ICANN78 GAC Communique Drafting Session being held on Wednesday, the 25th of October at 14:00 UTC. My name is Dan Gluck, and I am the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.

During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form. Interpretation for this session will include six UN languages and Portuguese. Click on the interpretation icon in Zoom and select the language you'll be listening to during this session.

If you wish to speak, please raise your hand in the Zoom room, and once the session facilitator calls upon your name, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Before speaking, ensure you have selected the language you will speak from in the interpretation menu.

Please state your name for the record and language you will speak if speaking a language other than English. When speaking, be sure to mute all of your devices and notifications. Please speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation.

To view a real-time transcription, click on the closed caption button on the Zoom toolbar. To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multi stakeholder model, we ask that you sign into Zoom sessions

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.

using your full name. And with that, I will hand the floor over to GAC chair, Nico Caballero.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you very much for that, Daniel. By the way, for the record, I see my name correctly spelled now. Yeah, without an h, I was going to mention that. So I really appreciate that, Daniel. Thank you so much. So, we'll have a 90-minute session, so I guess we'll have more than enough time to fine-tune most of the text discussed today.

So I'll go back to GAC consensus advice to ICANN Board. And right off the bat, let me tell you, maybe we can erase this placeholder here on future rounds of new gTLDs, given the fact that up to this moment we don't have any text provided unless you tell me otherwise. Is there text provided for this?

And I don't see any hand in the room or online. So let's go ahead, erase it. Of course, we can go back and put it back there if needed be tomorrow or during the wrap up session or at any given time between now and the end of the communique drafting. So number one now is GAC consensus advice and GAC early warnings on new gTLD applications.

And I'll read the text as it is, the GAC. I'm sorry, I'm sorry. And by the way, this is still an open question, is this going to be advice or it will go to issues of importance, and I have Brazil in the queue, but that's something to keep in mind. Brazil, go ahead.

LUCIANO MAZZA: Yeah, no, thank you, Nico. Just ask some time to think this through and make a suggestion that gets this on board and also the comments that our colleagues made, and the paragraph that I inserted as issues of importance.

So I suggested for the time being just leave it there to be there, but we are making an alternative suggestion and how to think this through more carefully and find the text that we believe is more convergent with the majority of views in the room. So we will think a little bit about this. Okay. So the mean time, I think it's not useful to read it again.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Perfect. Thank you very much. Greatly appreciated, Brazil. Your microphone is still on, just in case.

LUCIANO MAZZA: Okay.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you so much. So let's scroll down and we'll go to the second point. And we have already talked about this. There were some edits. I'm just going to read the whole thing again, just for the sake of clarity. And again, we stand to be corrected, but if there's anything substantial you would like to change, we can always do it, of course.

So I'll just read the first part. "The GAC advises the board in advance of the next new gTLD round to ensure that the forthcoming applicant

guidebook clearly states that closed generic TLD applications will not be considered." I don't need to read the whole thing because we have already agreed on this, of course, unless you tell me otherwise. But for the sake of time, are you okay to move on since we have already agreed on this? And I have the UK, Nigel.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Nigel Hickson, UK. So, yeah, I just wanted to note in this text a sentence which I think perhaps we could just reflect on. So it's the last paragraph of the rationale. And it says, "Therefore, the GAC is of the view that without community agreement, it will not be possible to ensure that closed generic TLDs serve a public interest goal."

I don't think this is quite right in that I don't think it's the community agreement that's linked to whether gTLDs can serve a public interest goal. And so I just wonder whether that sentence perhaps could be removed. And yeah, I'll leave it there. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you for that UK. Do you have alternative wording for that, or you want to erase the whole thing at once?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yeah, I just don't think that sentence is quite right.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, UK. Any other edit? Any other comment? And again, this is advice to the Board, so we really need to be careful with the wording. I suggest we take our time to very carefully read it again just in case. And I have the Netherlands.

ALISA HEAVER: Yeah, thank you. This is Alisa for the record. Just a very minor thing is that in the previous communique, so the ICANN77 communique, we consequently spoke about closed generic gTLDs. I'm not sure if we should have reflected like that or if TLD makes more sense, but well, for us to consider.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: So if I understand correctly, Alisa, are you referring to the plural and singular thing, or?

ALISA HEAVER: No, it says in the second sentence of the GAC advised that it clearly states that closed generic TLD applications will not be considered, but in the, well, our previous communique was mentioned gTLDs consequently when we were talking about closed generics.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much, Netherlands. Well noted. Any other comment? So if that is not the case, let's move on, unless you tell me you want me to read the whole thing again, but since it is something we had already agreed, I don't think we need to do the whole thing again.

And I see some noting, so let's go. Can you scroll down a little bit? So I'll read follow up advice, I'm sorry, follow up on previous advice in order to see if we're all on the same page. The following items reflect matters related to previous consensus advice provided to the Board.

Number one, enabling inclusive, informed, and meaningful participation in ICANN, the GAC would welcome a written status update from the Board on the activities adopted and implemented by ICANN Org, pursuant to the ICANN60 GAC Abu Dhabi communique advice regarding the development of a simple and efficient document management system and the production of easily understandable executive summaries for all relevant issues, processes, and activities.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

And this is to mention that this is a reflection of a conversation with Switzerland to clarify really what the advice was about in simpler term than the title that was used for that advice.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you for that. Fabian. So in other words, simpler, shorter, sweeter. Comments, thoughts? Seeing none, let's move on. I'll read the second, which is subsequent rounds of new gTLDs. "The GAC recalls its advice to the board in the ICANN56 GAC Helsinki Communique, 30 June, 2016 that 'an objective and independent analysis of costs and benefits should be conducted beforehand, drawing on experience with and outcomes from the recent round.' Such analysis has yet to take place.

The GAC is looking forward to receiving the analysis soon." Soon is seven years later, but yeah, it is what it is. Are we okay with that? Any changes? Anything you would like to-- and I see the UK. Rose, go ahead.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Thank you very much, chair. Rosalind KennyBirch from the UK. And definitely an excellent addition to the follow-up advice section. We were simply wondering about adjusting the end of the final sentence, the GAC is looking forward to receiving the analysis soon, to perhaps receiving the analysis at the earliest opportunity and ahead of ICANN79. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you so much, U, that's certainly better. Any comment? Earliest opportunity. Sorry. So that gives sort of like a specific timeframe for the expected update. So seeing no comments and no-- Switzerland, go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio for the record. Just for the information of the whole of the committee, and as I know that GAC staff has unearthed what has been the follow-up of this really historical advice, could perhaps secretariat share what has been, let's say, the timeline or what has happened since because there was a Board reaction, then there was a follow-up, some years later, there was another Board reaction so that we have the entire picture before we accept this

repeated follow-up to GAC advice. And not that I'm in disagreement because I support this follow-up, but just to have the entire picture. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Switzerland. Well noted. So this is, the way I see it, a mixture of diplomatic and digital archeology, so we're going to have to go back and see what that timeline was as a matter of fact. Very good point. So, again, for the sake of time, let's move on, unless there are any edits or questions on this topic. I see no hands in the room. I see no hands online. So let's move on. Can you please scroll down, Benedetta.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: This is Fabian Betremieux from the GAC support team. So Jorge, your request, let us take that back and determine how best to provide that information you're requesting on the background for the second piece of potential follow-up on previous advice, and we'll provide the information you're requesting.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: And now we'll go back to issues of importance. Okay, so let's review issues of importance to the GAC. If you happen to spot anything weird, anything that we should correct, please chime in and interrupt, and we'll do our best.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Can I suggest we just review that whole section of issues of importance and see where there needs to be further discussion? So our understanding is that the text on HLGGM was read, but not confirmed as final, so we may want to confirm this. On future rounds of new gTLDs, there is still discussion to be held on text for GAC consensus advice and early warnings on new gTLD applications.

As it relates to the issue of diuretics in new gTLDs, we need to confirm the title of that section, and there seems to be editing going on, so we may want to revisit this. It looks like on applicant's support, there was some edit to consider.

On RDRS, we understand that text is forthcoming to possibly replace the entirety of the section. There was text by India that may need to be discussed, but India was not present. I'm not sure if India is present for this session. On urgent requests, I believe we still have discussion on text to accomplish, the same on DNS abuse.

Alternative name space, it sounds like there was an agreement to move the text to another section of the communique. So we'll park this when we review the rest of the communique, we suggest to press it that way. On SOL, believe there was agreement, so that should be okay. And on the emergency assistance program, there was agreement. So we can go back to the beginning and go through those sections that need further discussion.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you. Thank you very much for that, Fabien. So let's do just that. Let's review where the-- no, no, no, the issues of importance. Yes. So

I'll go through the list of topics in order to see if we have agreement, and then we move on in case there's no agreement, we can fine tune the wording.

And remember there's two more sessions, actually three more sessions going on tomorrow if needed. Ideally, we would finish the whole thing this afternoon, but you never know. So let's see how it goes. I'll read the first one, High Level Governmental Meeting, HLG, anything? And there's still some editing going on there, right?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

I don't know, but we corrected government because the official name is high level government meeting, which is on Instagram.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you. Thank you for that, Fabien. And they have already corrected High Level Government Meeting, HLG. So instead of governmental, we have government meeting, a minor editorial detail. The GAC welcomes the invitation from the government of Rwanda to host the next High Level Government Meeting, HLG, in Kigali on 9th June, 2024, with potential opportunities for participation throughout the ICANN80 policy forum scheduled for 10-13 June, 2024.

GAC members agreed to start compiling the list of high-level government officials to be invited, as well as agenda topics to be covered, targeting to have the invitations along with the preliminary or high-level agenda issued earliest in November. So let me ask Egypt,

should we use preliminary or high level agenda? What would your suggestion be in this case?

MANAL ISMAIL:

I couldn't decide, so I put both. Yeah, normally it would've been preliminary agenda, but it gives indication that it is sort of a draft or not final, and we are sending high level invitations. So I was just not sure whether-- and by high level, I meant it's not detailed, so if there is a better word to reflect this, I didn't mean high level as in high level governmental meeting, but it was rather covering the themes or the topics, not annotated agenda or detailed agenda. Sorry if I'm not able to help.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

No, no, thank you. Thank you so much, Egypt. As a matter of fact, I would erase the whole thing, and I would go along with the detailed agenda, something even more specific.

MANAL ISMAIL:

In fact, I meant the contrary because we will not be able to reach a detailed agenda yet, but at least we can agree on the topics and attach this as an overview of the agenda.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you, Egypt. Maybe we can do agenda topics. Would that be okay for everyone? So it would read along with agenda topics issued earliest in November, and so we erased the D and we erased

preliminary and high level. Would that be okay for everyone? And again, I stand to be corrected, this is just for the sake of clarity. And I have Indonesia and then the UK. Indonesia, go ahead, please.

ASHWIN SASTROSUBROTO: Thank you. Nico, I think it's more or less a rather different topics than every point that mentioned here. Previously I mentioned about the possibility for the regulatory impact analysis, whenever we make any study for regulations. Another one I saw a few days ago, I asked to the speaker information about IANA, whether it is organization and if it is and where it is located, things like that.

The Verisign control, file data for example, is it a Verisign contract, with who, and so on. After that, the ICANN staff also inform me, look, the IANA is just a function, it is not an organization, and so my proposal to them is very simple. If it is like that, make it sure that when people read the websites, they have the same similar, what I call it, perception.

For example, if you have iana.org, then we'll say, oh, it's an organization, a direct idea unless you then read all the data and so on and so on. That kind of things that can be improved by the Board to give unique information so that the information for all the people, for so many billion people is clear and precise. That's all. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you so much for that, Indonesia. So if I understood correctly, Ashwin, you would like to include that here, or? I don't understand

ASHWIN SASTROSUBROTO: I don't know whether it is-- my English is not so good. I don't know whether you, you can put it in a general advice or general information, but what I suggest is that all the websites information related to ICANN activities hopefully is clear and give the reader a complete comprehensive information so that they will not think differently.

Just an example I give you is just like IANA, if you have iana.org, what will people think directly? Oh, it's an organization, while in fact, it's not, it is a few people or a few number of people working in the department of ICANN. It'll be different if it is icann/iana than iana.org.

That is kind of things that can be considered how to give so many billion people reading the websites the same perception of the ICANN activities and ICANN organizations.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: I understand the point, Indonesia. Thank you, Ashwin, for that. What I don't understand is how that fits into the topic here, or you want a different section and you will provide some text later on, or maybe it's just me, I was born naturally stupid, so that's why I'm asking. Is that what you want to do?

ASHWIN SASTROSUBROTO: Yeah, I think if it can be included in one of the points, one in front of the issues mentioned there, that is fine. Otherwise, perhaps, we can have additional point just saying that the website information website should be clear and comprehensively understood by all people

reading that so that all of them will have the same perception about activities in ICANN. That's all.

Unfortunately, I cannot make a good sentence, my grammar is so limited and my English word is also limited, so I cannot really make a nice word to say depth.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: No, no. Thank you so much for that, Indonesia. No problem at all, if you're willing to provide some text so that we can understand a little bit better what you mean. But thank you anyways. Well noted. I have the UK and then the United States. Nigel.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Nigel Hickson. So on this text, which is, of course, most welcome, I think as actually Mauritania put in the chat that we could call it a draft or preliminary agenda. I think if we miss out the high level, then probably we don't have that confusion about what-- because it's a high-level meeting as well. That was the first point.

The second point was that when we discussed this earlier in the week, we also had the positive suggestion, I think from Rob Hogarth, that we might sort of seminar or a webinar in the next couple of weeks where we could further reflect on the agenda items.

You remember we had a discussion on the potential agenda and there was some interesting ideas on what the agenda might be, and it was suggested to solidify that then perhaps a there could be a call of

interested parties, I wouldn't call it a webinar, a call of interested parties where we could discuss the agenda. I think if that's a possibility, we should add that to this text here. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much, UK. So let's move on then. So let me just read that last sentence for the sake of clarity. So it will read, "GAC members agreed to start compiling the list of high level government officials to be invited, as well as agenda topics to be covered. Targeting to have the invitations along with the agenda topics issued earliest in November." Are we okay with that?

MANAL ISMAIL: We have China in the queue.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: China, go ahead, please.

GUO FENG: Thank you, Chair. Actually, Guo Feng, from China for the record. Actually, I want to point out the editorial issue around first sentence. I'm not native speaker, correct me if I'm wrong. I have problem with invitation because I think if we change the invitation into offering or a proposal or initiation, it may be better. I'm not sure. I'm in your hands. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, China. Any other comment? I think invitation is correct. Maybe we can put formal invitations, but the invitations are going to be formal anyways, so I don't see the need. I stand to be corrected here, but I really think maybe invitations in plural, but I don't see a problem with invitation. Again, I stand to be corrected. And I see the UK and then Iran. UK, Rose, go ahead, please.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Thank you Chair. Ros KennyBirch, UK. I just had a separate point on the first sentence. Just to note a slight editorial change we've proposed adding with potential opportunities for participation throughout the ICANN80 policy forum. Just to reflect GAC discussions earlier in the week. I'm happy to work with colleagues on wordsmithing, but just thought that might capture a little bit more holistically the discussion. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much, UK. I have Iran.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yeah, thank you, Chair. I think invitation is correct, but if somebody wants to do another words, another alternative would be indication, but not initiatives, indications. But I think invitation is understood by everybody, we don't need to talk anything more than that one. I think it's quite clear. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much, Iran. Any other question or comment? And I have, Mauritania. Go ahead, please.

MOHAMED EL MOCTAR: Thank you, Chair. Mohamed El Moctar from Mauritania, just for the record. I do have a small issue with the fact that we are going to be compiling the list of the high-level officials. I'm not sure it is our role, but it is something that the government should be sorting out through appropriate channels like foreign affairs, for example. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: And that will be the case indeed. So you're suggesting to change the word compiling with sort it out or sort out, or what is your suggestion, Mauritania?

MOHAMED EL MOCTAR: My suggestion is that, at least at my level, it is not up to me to indicate which government official from Mauritania would or should be attending this high-level meeting. And so, we would rather invite Rwanda to send official invitations through appropriate channels so that representative of countries would be identified accordingly, and not at our level here.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Mauritania. But don't you think that GAC representatives are the best qualified, and that's why they're GAC representatives, to guide us on where to send invitations? I'm just asking.

MOHAMED EL MOCTAR: Well, at my level, I don't think so. I think it is an official invitation coming from our country, and it has to be defined as they say, above my pay grade. That's my understanding of it at least.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Mauritania. I have Egypt, the USA, and Iran. Egypt, please.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Chair. And thank you Mauritania, I take your point. Maybe I mischosed my words, but the intention here is that GAC members will consult nationally and come back with the name of whoever should be invited. So you consult at the national level, and then recommend to Rwanda whether they should invite the Minister of ICT, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the head of the regulator, whatever.

It's a national decision definitely, but we just discussed that there needs to be a deadline for everyone sharing with our esteemed colleague from Rwanda, the names that should be invited. I hope this clarifies, and maybe we can, instead of compiling, we can say, GAC members would share the names-

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Or would identify.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Identify, yeah, exactly. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much, Egypt. Well noted. I have the USA. I'm sorry, I'm sorry. I have Iran and then Hungary.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Chair. I suggest inform government officials, but not indicate, not identify. We are not identifying who is high level officials and so on so forth. We inform governments, GAC governments or GAC government high officials, that's all, we inform them.

And instead of agreed, say that the GAC plan or concluded about or not talk about anything about identification. We are not identifying who is high official country A or B. We inform all government to participate, that's all.

And we have a model of the previous high-level meeting. We take the that model before and we repeat that. We should not spend any time on this. This is quite a normal thing, and not talk about identification or initiation, something that inform GAC government. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Iran. I have Hungary and then Egypt.

PETER MAJOR: Thank you, Nico. Well, on the same wavelength. I think the way we should proceed is the GAC representative of Rwanda sends the GAC representatives here a formal invitation on the basis of which the GAC members will identify or reach out to the government and just move

forward with the invitation. And probably that that's the way we should proceed.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much, Hungary. That's more or less what I thought as well because it just makes sense. If you ask me in Paraguay who should the invitation be sent to? Certainly not to the Ministry of Agriculture, that's for sure. You understand what I mean? But anyways, I have Egypt. Go ahead, please.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes, just to clarify, and apologies if I'm not able to make my point clear. Just to clarify that the intention here is not to inform the high-level government officials. The intention here is to inform our colleagues from Rwanda whom to contact in our national countries. I hope I'm able to clarify. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much, Egypt. So again, for the sake of time, unless you tell me that the invitation should actually be sent to the ministries of agriculture, I suggest we move on.

GULTEN TEPE: We have Iran in the queue.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Oh, I'm sorry. Iran, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, sir. I can agree with Manal for the latest in proposal she made, but not identifying. The way she has put it is correct. Thank you. Inform government of Rwanda to send invitation to whoever they want, that is one way. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much, Iran. So again, just for the sake of clarity, I'll give it one final read because I really got confused and I assume you might be a little bit confused as well. Egypt.

MANAL ISMAIL: Just quickly before your final read, I don't think we should say draft agenda. So I proposed that we delete draft because we are sending to high level officials, we shouldn't be sending a draft. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Egypt. Very good catch. I have the USA

SUSAN CHALMERS: Hi, Chair. Just to note, we would support the suggestion made by the Netherlands in the chat. I think that it is just that the text with the use of the word compiling gives the impression that GAC members altogether will compile a list of high-level government officials over the course of a call or something.

It's really a very practical matter, so perhaps the GAC support staff could suggest some clarifying language to go forward. I just wanted to support the suggestion in the chat from the Netherlands. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, US. I have Iran.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, sir. I think we should respect the authority of Rwandan government. We should send them the draft agenda, they may add something to that. We should not exclude that. They are inviting and they have the right to add anything that they deem appropriate. So I have no difficulty to put draft in and allow Rwanda to also do something if they want. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Iran. And I have Egypt, go ahead.

MANAL ISMAIL: So the agenda here is supposed to be attached to the official invitations to the capitals. So we are working together with Rwanda to come up with an agenda that would be attached to the invitations, so this is why I don't feel it's appropriate to be a draft.

And while having the microphone, maybe we can to address the valid point flagged by Mauritanian, also the US, maybe we can say GAC members agreed to share the names or to share the high level list of

invitees, for example, or share could solve the problem instead of start compiling.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Egypt. I have Mauritania.

MOHAMED EL MOCTAR: Mohamed El Moctar from Mauritania for the record. My limited experience in these meetings is that at this level, there is always a draft agenda so that attendees have the opportunity to include some items they feel are important and relevant to the discussions. So a draft agenda does not hurt the intent or the objective of the meeting. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Mauritania. Any other comment? So then for the sake of clarity, I'll read the whole thing as it is at this point. "So the GAC welcomes the invitation from the government of Rwanda to host the next High Level Government Meeting HLGGM in Kigali on 9, June, 2024, with potential opportunities for participation throughout the ICANN80 policy forum scheduled for 10-13 June, 2024.

GAC members agreed to share the list of-- oh, to start compiling the list of high-level government officials to be invited, as well as agenda topics to be covered, targeting to have the invitations along with the draft agenda topics issued earliest in November. The proposal to have an early call of interested parties to discuss the latter issues was welcomed." Is that okay for everybody?

GULTEN TEPE: We have Colombia, and then Iran in the queue.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Okay. Colombia, go ahead please.

THIAGO DAL-TOE: Many thanks, Chair. I just wanted to clarify in this issue, when we mention GAC members agree to share, who are we sharing this to? Through email list, are we informing GAC support staff, are we emailing Rwanda directly? I would like to have some clarity on this on who I'm informing is going to be the high-level official from Columbia. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Colombia. Again, my understanding is that all of those options, but I stand to be correct. I have Iran and then the Netherlands. Iran, go ahead, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: This same question, what about saying that inform the Rwandan government of the list of invitee and so on so forth, information? I don't understand this sharing, which comes everywhere, to share. I mean, we are not sharing anything, we inform them. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Iran. Well noted. I have the Netherlands.

MARCO HOGWWONING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, colleagues. In line with also the comments from my colleague earlier on, I don't think this text is getting any clearer right now. I prefer to have this plain English with all the respect for all the efforts. And I heard all the comments, and I think they're really good, but maybe now is the time to park this text and see if we can come up with some quick read draft and clean it up and then continue discussing this. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much, Netherlands. And I see some nodding and agreement, so let's move on. Let's move on. Let's park it, we'll discuss this tomorrow, and let's move on with the second topic, which is future rounds of new gTLDs. Would you please scroll down, Benedetta. So we're going to be reading the second subtopic, which is consensus advice and early warnings on new gTLD applications.

And the text reads, "In view of the changes to the future applicant guidebook regarding the 'strong presumption' language pursuant to recommendation 30.4 of the GNSO SubPro recommendations, the GAC expresses its understanding that such wording modifications do not affect nor change in any way, shape, or form, the high importance attached to GAC consensus advice by the ICANN Board whenever issued regarding applications under the future applicant guidebook.

Some GAC members also noted surprise at the promptness with which the Board proceeded to accept recommendation 30.4 following intersectional engagement between the GAC and the Board. Some GAC members had proposed adjustments to that language rather than omitting it altogether, pointing to its political significance beyond the legal implications listed by ICANN Org and the Board." And I'll pause here in order to see if we have reactions. I already have Iran on the queue. Iran, go ahead please. Iran, was that an old hand?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, it was old hand. I'm sorry for that.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Okay. So I have Brazil. Go ahead, please.

LUCIANO MAZZA: Thank you, Chair. No, this is just a revised suggestion on this topic, and I thank you for some comments made by Jorge. I think we split this in two, I think one is trying to give a joint, let's say, a GAC message on the recommendation 30.4, and they understand that regarding let's say that concern on how the suggestion for finding some alternative wording or alternative to that issue was handled by the Board, was inserted in a different paragraph understanding that we don't have we have different views on this specific topic.

So that's why I put like two separate issues, but we'd expect to have, let's say, certain level of convergence in relation to the first issue. And

as suggested, we, of course, are eliminating this topic from the GAC consensus advice. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much for that clarification, Brazil. Any other requests for the floor at this point? Seeing none in the room or online, then let's move on. Can you scroll down? Okay. So now we'll check the Latin script accented characters in New Generic Top-Level Domains. To begin with, are we okay with the title, just in case?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: And so we made some edits to the previous proposal, and that's to take into account some of the suggestions that were made, and also to really clarify that we're talking about the top level domain. So by spelling out gTLDs, we're making it clear that this is not about domain names, but about obviously, the name of the top level domains. So hopefully that's helpful.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: And I have Switzerland. Go ahead, please.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio for the record. I have some problem with getting rid of diuretic because diuretic is larger than accents. You can have a [00:48:40 - inaudible] in French, for instance, and I don't think that's an accent. I would keep diuretic somewhere so that we have that that larger understanding. And I think it's a nice word. I

learned it very recently, but you can look it up, and it's very clear in its meaning. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: So Switzerland, would this be a good title for you, Diuretics Latin Script Accented Characters in New Generic Top Level Domains. Would that be good for you?

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you, Nico. I think that that would be great. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Is everyone -- Sorry, Brazil.

LUCIANO MAZZA: Sorry, Chair. No, I think Switzerland has a point because in Portuguese you have a CCWG that is not accented. So I think accent might be ambiguous in this-- yeah, it wouldn't cover this point. I would perhaps, I don't know, find a way of not including accented because hex is accented in low cent as well, so it's not something-- we have some-

NICOLAS CABALLERO: So would that be acceptable for Brazil, Diacritic, sorry, Latin Script Characters?

LUCIANO MAZZA: No, that's fine. Just that the first line, there's a use again on the use of accented characters, so just to --

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Okay. Yeah, we'll make sure we get there.

LUCIANO MAZZA: Thank you very much.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: But are you okay with the title as it is?

LUCIANO MAZZA: Yes, of course. Yes.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Without the accented mentioned there.

LUCIANO MAZZA: Sure, absolutely.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Okay. Thank you so much, Brazil. I have Iran.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, sir. I am agreeing with the deletion of accented because I don't understand what does it mean? Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Sorry, Iran, could you please repeat?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Agree to delete accented and saying that Latin script characters without accented. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Iran. I have Canada.

JASON MERRITT: Yes, I would agree to remove accented from the title and from the first sentence there once we get there. I had suggested that because everybody I talked to and mentioned the word diacritic, they have no idea what I mean. So for simplicity, it was my suggestion and for regular nomenclature, but I think diacritic is the correct term.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Canada.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So we're suggesting if removing accent, the notion of accented in the title, then we propose to revert to Latin script diacritic then in this case, and remove notions of characters in new generic top level domains. And then that way it reads better and it does encompass the cases of accents of CD, et cetera.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: And keeps the message or the spirit. And I have Hungary. Peter.

PETER MAJOR: Since Jason told us that whoever he talked to didn't have a notion what diacritic was, shouldn't we put a footnote as a definition?

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Hungary. Very good point. Canada and Brazil, are you okay with the title now? Is everybody okay with the title? Just to make sure we understand each other, we're all on the same page. And I see nodding. Okay, thank you so much for that. So once again, I'll read the whole thing in order to see if more editing is needed. "GAC gag notes that a potential gap in policy has been identified on the use of diacritic characters in Latin scripts.

ICANN's policies on string similarity review and confusingly similar strings create-- and similar strings create challenges affecting future applicants of non-variant, but confusingly similar strings. The GAC strongly supports a multilingual internet free from unnecessary barriers in existing policy. The GAC looks forward to continued engagement with the GNSO Council on this issue and to reviewing the anticipated GNSO council's issue report on this topic."

And I'll pause here in order to see if there are edits or comments or anything we need to fix there. The only issue I have is using confusingly twice. But anyways, it's just a minor thing, I don't know. If

everyone is okay, I can live with that. So in other words, are we okay in removing the second word, confusingly? Would it be okay?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

So this is Fabien. If we were just pointing to that word because my understanding is that for an applicant who would like to apply for a TLD, including diacritics, they in their projects believe that there's no confusion between the version with accents and the version without accent. But they face a potential string similarity test that might get in the way of their application for the diacritic version with accents to proceed.

So an applicant for a diacritic version of an existing TLD or for two versions of a TLD without the accent and with the accent, might not consider their applications confusingly similar, because their point is that those two application can coexist and work in tandem, so those two TLDs can operate in tandem. I believe that's their case. So if the word confusing in that context may not apply to the intention of the applicant in it.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you for that, Fabien. I have Mauritania, and then the Netherlands. Go ahead, please, Mauritania.

MOHAMED EL MOCTAR:

I was going to propose a full stop after non-variant. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Mauritania. I have Netherlands, and then Iran.

ALISA HEAVER: Thank you, Nico. This is Alisa Heaver for the record. On principle, of course, I am very much a strong supporter of the multilingual internet. But I do wonder, and I haven't made-- well, we don't have a finalized a position on this yet, but adding in diacritics in the Latin script in the TLDs is I think a quite a big change.

We've been used to the Latin script internet for quite some time now, and I understand what Fabien was saying about confusingly similar strings. If we would have a.com with a two dots on it or an accent on it, it could make a lot of people prone to cybersecurity issues. And I think it's something we should really consider more thoroughly than this text reflects at the moment.

As I said, I don't want to say now that it's something I don't want at all because I am definitely in favor of the multilingual internet, but I do see issues in the Latin script on the top-level domain.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: New gTLDs, you mean, right?

ALISA HEAVER: Yeah. Sorry, it sounds like I'm thinking out loud maybe, but we haven't discussed this really that much in the GAC. It's something that has been raised, but it's not, yeah, it's still quite new.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: So is your proposal to do it intercessionally and erase the whole thing and leave it for some of the time? Is that what you're saying? Or I misunderstood your-

ALISA HEAVER: Well, that could be an option as well. I just need to chew on this text a bit longer, I think. And so it would be helpful for me to have a bit more in brackets because of the potential impact.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: So you're suggesting we park it for the time being and see what we can do tomorrow. Is that what you mean?

ALISA HEAVER: Yes, please.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Netherlands. I have Iran. Mr. Arasteh, would you please go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yeah, I said that I have difficulty with confusingly because even we agree all of them to send it to ICANN, when it comes back to us asking, please collaborate what you mean by confusingly. So it's better to park it to see whether we have an alternative or we delete after variant and put something else. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much, Iran. And I have the USA and Switzerland. Susan, please.

SUSAN CHALMERS: Just a brief proposal for consideration in light of our colleague from the Netherlands, her intervention. Should the proponents of this text agree and find it acceptable, one way forward may be just to delete the second sentence. That way the issue is noted within the issues of importance. And I think that the balance of the text left behind still leaves some flexibility in the GACs further discussion and consideration of this issue. Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Okay. So let me read it again before I give the floor to Switzerland, unless it is on the point. Okay, go ahead. Go ahead, Switzerland.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you. Nico, Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. Just to remind ourselves what we are talking about. So first is, there is a problem because we have seen it in Quebec with an accent. And the policies that exist nowadays leads to some unintended consequences.

We don't say that we should get rid of those policies, but that we have to study them to see whether we really want those unintended consequences. And anyways, it's not something that the GAC will be doing on its own, we are just pointing our interest and saying, Hey, we

look forward to the, how is it called, the issues report from the GNSO, which is normally in that long snake of a PDP, it's the very first step.

So that's what it's about. It's not about saying, the policy we have nowadays is crap, let's get rid of it and let's have a multilingual overall. So just to put everything in context. And I think in the communique, we are reflecting our discussions, and in the discussions, this is not an advice, this is not anything like that.

We're just pointing out that in our discussions, we took note of this relevant issue and that we are looking forward to engaging with the community on it to understand it better and to solve the challenges as far as possible.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you for that, Switzerland. I couldn't agree more with you, but just to make sure, you don't have any specific changes at this point, right? To the text, I mean. Okay, perfect. I'll give it a read. So the title would be Latin Script Diacritics in New Generic Top level Domains. "The GAC notes that a potential gap in policy has been identified on the use of diacritic characters in Latin scripts.

The GAC strongly supports a multilingual internet free from unnecessary barriers in existing policy. The GAC looks forward to continued engagement with the GNSO Council on this issue, and to reviewing the anticipated GNSO Council's issue report on this topic." That's where we are basically. Switzerland, is that on old hand? Okay. I have Netherlands and Egypt. Netherlands, please.

ALISA HEAVER: Thank you. The text likes this would work for me. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Netherland. It sounds a little bit weird for me, but this is just me, right? The GAC, and then the GAC again. But just some minor editorial issues. I have Egypt.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Nico. I was going to suggest, but I don't have a strong position on this. If we switch the first two sentences, I feel it's a good introduction that the GAC strongly supports a multilingual internet, and then the GAC notes the potential gap and then looks forward to continued engagement. If this makes sense to everyone, then my proposal is to switch the first two sentences. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Egypt. So just to make sure we're on the same page, I'll read it again. "The GAG strongly supports a multilingual internet free from unnecessary barriers in existing policy. The GAC notes that a potential gap in policy has been identified on the use of diacritic characters in Latin scripts. The GAC looks forward to continued engagement with the GNSO Council on this issue, and to reviewing the anticipated GNSO Council's issue report on this topic." And I'll pause here. I have Egypt, and then Iran.

MANAL ISMAIL: I'm very sorry, Nico. Now that you have read it, I am considering to withdraw, actually my proposal, because the first sentence mentions barriers in the policies, which is not a good introduction without the sentence before. I'm just withdrawing. I'm sorry. Apologies.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: No problem at all. Thank you, Egypt. And I have Iran

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: The hand withdrawn after the explanation of Manal. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Okay, thank you, Iran. Any other comment at this point? So let me just read it again then the way it was. "The GAC notes that a potential gap in policy has been identified on the use of diacritic characters in Latin scripts. The GAC strongly supports a multilingual internet free from unnecessary barriers in existing policy.

The GAC looks forward to continued engagement with the GNSO Council on this issue, and to reviewing the anticipated GNSO Council's issue report on this topic." Is that text acceptable for everyone? Any strong feelings against the way it is worded so far? And I see none.

GULTEN TEPE: We have Iran in the queue.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Gulden. Iran, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yeah, thank co-chair. I don't think we need unnecessary barriers. Barriers is barriers. I don't think there is any necessary barriers, and we want to remove only unnecessary barriers. So either we say any barriers or we say nothing but not unnecessary. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for the catch, Iran. Any other edit, any other comment? Is everyone okay with erasing unnecessary? And I have the USA.

SUSAN CHALMERS: And my suggestion might be the GAC strongly supports a multilingual internet and looks forward to continued engagement. It could be a way to kind of make the text more simple, but I just want to make sure that the proponents of the text would be supportive of that, because I don't want to unnecessarily introduce any complications there.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Susan. Thank you, US. Any other comment or edit? I do have an issue with the GAC, and then the GAC, and then the GAC again, like three times the same wording, but I stand to be corrected, I'm in your hands. UK.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think that's what our distinguish delegate from the US was addressing. So you don't need, the GAC strongly supports a multilingual internet and looks forward. You don't need the GAC in the penultimate line. So just before the and, delete the GAC, delete the full stop, and then it carries on. No. So it says, the GAC strongly supports a bilingual internet free from unnecessary barriers in existing policy, and looks forward to continued engagement.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: It is just the GAC. Okay, so I'll read it again. "The GAC notes that a potential gap in policy has been identified on the issue of diacritic characters in Latin scripts. The GAC strongly supports a multilingual internet free from barriers in existing policy, and looks forward to continued engagement with the GNSO Council on this issue, and to reviewing the anticipated GNSO Council's issue report on this topic."

And I'll pause here in order to see any reactions. Sounds a lot better now, but that's my humble opinion. Would that be acceptable for my distinguished GAC colleagues? Any strong opposition? And I see some thumbs up. Okay. There it is then. Thank you so much. Let's move on with the next identified-- Okay.

And this is new text kindly submitted by the US, topic number three, Registration Data Request Service, RDRS. "The GAC welcomes the imminent launch of the voluntary Registration Data Requests System, RDRS, this coming November.

The GAC encourages members to inform the respective relevant communities of the launch. Widespread use of the new system from both registrars and requesters will help the system meet its intended purpose of gathering sufficient usage and demand data that can inform the ICANN Board's consideration of the consensus policy recommendations related to a future System for Standardized Access and Disclosure, SSAD, of the domain name registration data.

To promote usage, the GAC notes that the Board urged the GNSO Council to consider a policy development process or other means to require registrars to use RDRS, February 27th, 2023, Board resolution."

Other factors that will impact usage-- I'm sorry, that was in brackets. I'm sorry that reference to February 27th, 2023 and so on, that's in bracket, sorry. Other factors that will impact usage relate to whether users submitting legitimate requests receive data relating to the underlying registrant as opposed to information related to a privacy or proxy service.

Currently, many leading registrars provide privacy proxy services to registrants by default. ICANN Org's Operational Design Assessment, ODA, of the SSAD analyze the potential adverse impacts on that system, noting that 'SSAD requesters may have a negative experience using the system if the data they seek is protected by a privacy or proxy service.'

The assessment also observed that 'requesters may feel confused or frustrated with the system if they don't receive the registrant data they seek due to proxy or privacy service use, and that these risks significant user confusion and or dissatisfaction.'

The GAC highlights these risks because registrars, including those that provide privacy proxy services directly for their registrant customers will have discretion on how to respond to requests. The GAC observes that the RDRS's success depends in part on how satisfied users are with the system, with positive experiences promoting repeat usage.

Finally, the GAC also encourages users of the system to provide feedback on the effectiveness of the RDRS." So I'll just pause here in order to see reactions. And I see Iran. Go ahead, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Thank you, sir. First of all, if you agree, I suggest that you take it paragraph by paragraph other than reading the whole text because when we come back, we have to read it again and we don't want to bother you too much. Could you go to the first paragraph, please?

At the beginning, if possible? Yeah. I suggest we delete eminent. The launch, launch is launch. I don't think I need any adjective for launch, eminent on launch. I suggest the first put it-- delete this one. And then in the last line of that paragraph, and other means, I would add other appropriate or equivalent means, but not other means, means maybe anything.

So either we want an appropriate means or equivalent means. I suggest that between other and means and the last line, you add the word appropriate means or equivalent means. This is the first paragraph. I will stop here, and perhaps, you may wish to first clear this paragraph before going to the next paragraph. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Iran.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Appropriate. Yeah, thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: And I have the US. Please, Laureen.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes. Thank you. And I appreciate Kavouss' input. The characterization is actually pretty verbatim from the Board. They did not use the word appropriate. I don't object to the word appropriate, but it's trying to just characterize what the Board actually said in its resolution.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, US. Any other comment? I have Brazil. Go ahead, please.

LUCIANO MAZZA: Thank you, Chair. No, just in this paragraph, when it comes to refer to fourth line, that will help the system meet its intended purpose of gathering sufficient other usage and demand data, I think that the question perhaps that are- I would suggest having sufficient usage, comma, the mandate and other inputs, something like this, because I

think that's possible that the experience of this, let's say, I would discuss this yesterday or today, provisional system may bring about other feedback that may be useful to the establish or the future or the future system. Just as a subtle suggestion too, should be open to other elements that we might be useful in building shaping up the future system.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Brazil. So how would that exactly be?

LUCIANO MAZZA: I would say a comma, erase and

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Okay. And?

LUCIANO MAZZA: And other inputs. After the mandate, the mandate. Sorry, the mandate, and other inputs. Input, yeah. Make sense? I think so.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Okay. So let me read it as it is and then we can discuss. "The GAC welcomes the launch of the voluntary Registration Data Request System, RDRS, this coming November. The GAC encourages members to inform the respective relevant communities of the launch.

Widespread use of the new system from both registrars and requesters will help the system meet its intended purpose of gathering sufficient usage demand data and other input that can inform the ICANN Board's consideration of the consensus policy recommendations related to a future System for Standardized Access and Disclosure, SSAD, of the domain name registration data.

To promote usage, the GAC notes that the Board urged the GNSO Council to consider a policy development process or other means to require registrars to use the RDRS." Is that acceptable for everyone? Brazil, your microphone is open just in case. So the floor is open. And I have the US.

SUSAN CHALMERS:

Just in the interest of simplicity, so we added intended to notes, specifically usage and demand data, but we're recognizing other inputs as well now from Brazil. It could be more simple just to say, to gather sufficient data to inform. That way we just simplify it a bit. Yeah.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you, US. I have Iran.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

And thank you, sir. If the two and a half lines in this paragraph is more or less what Board has said, therefore, I don't need to put appropriate. So I ask Laureen whether it is exactly what the Board said. And other means, other means should be what? If you don't have policy, what

are the other means? At least alternative means or I would say equivalent means.

So we should be a little bit more careful about that. But if it is exactly what the Board asked GNSO, I don't have anything to insist on the appropriate/ I have no problem to delete appropriate if that is what Board has said to GNSO in distinguished. Laureen, could you please confirm that with the permission of Gac Chair.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Laureen, would you like to go ahead?

LAUREEN KAPIN: That is my understanding, but in the interest of making sure, I will go back and look, and if that's not the case, I'll let everyone know. But that, that's my understanding, but I'll check and confirm.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much for that. Susan, would you like to go ahead or, that was an old hand. Okay. Perfect. Thank you. Thank you, US. Thank you, Iran. Any other comment or edit?

GULTEN TEPE: We have Colombia in the queue.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Okay. Colombia. Sorry, I didn't see your hand. Please go ahead, Colombia.

THIAGO DAL-TOE: Yes, Nico, just to point out that in the first sentence, we put the comment in the chat, registration data request service rather than system just to maintain the consistence with the title and the name. Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Colombia. Very good catch indeed.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: This is Fabien Betremieux from the GAC support team. And maybe to save some time to Laureen, the Board resolutions states that, I believe you refer to, the ICANN Board urges the GNSO Council to consider a policy development process or other means to require registrars to use the system as recommended by the small team in the addendum submitted to GNSO Council.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much for that, Fabien. I'll give you the final read again to be on the same page just for the sake of clarity. And we're also running out of time, so I'll read the whole thing, I mean the whole paragraph, not the whole thing, but this paragraph. So, "The GAC welcomes the launch of the voluntary Registration Data Request Service, RDRS, this coming November.

The GAC encourages members to inform the respective relevant communities of the launch. Widespread use of the new system from both registrars and requesters will help the system meet its intended purpose of gathering sufficient data to inform the ICANN Board's consideration of the consensus policy recommendations related to a future System for Standardized Access and Disclosure, SSAD, of the main name registration data.

To promote usage, the GAC notes that the Board urged the GNSO Council to consider a policy development process or other means to require registrars to use the RDRS."

Are we okay with the text? Any strong feelings against the way it is worded? And I see no opposition, which means that we're three minutes away from our coffee break, actually three minutes away from the big party, from the big 25th anniversary reception.

So my recommendation would be to leave it there and continue tomorrow before something else comes up, and we might end up being here till three in the morning, like in South Africa 10 years ago. You remember ordering pizzas. So thank you so much. Thank you so much for your-

GULTEN TEPE:

Before we end, I see US is seeking to take the floor.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

I didn't see any hand, but certainly. Please go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Very briefly, just to note that we have sent a text on DNS abuse to GAC support staff, and that text is submitted by the US, the European Commission, Japan, and Canada. Thank you. And the UK.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you US. Any other remark? Any other comment? Egypt, go ahead.

MANAL ISMAIL: I tried to capture the comments provided on the high-level government thing, and I provided new text also to my best capturing all the comments. I did share it with Fabien, Benedetta, and yourself over email. Happy to put it in the file if requested, but I shared it over email. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you so much for that, Egypt. So in terms of housekeeping details, we'll reconvene tomorrow at 9:00 AM in the morning.

GULTEN TEPE: I'm so sorry to interrupt again.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: I saw Netherlands hands. Don't worry, Gulten, thank you so much for that. I have the Netherlands. Go ahead.

MARCO HOGEWONING: Alongside of Egypt, I didn't know we were both working on it, so I also offered some alternative text to the HLTM text in the draft document. I guess we now have three text to choose from.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much, Netherlands. Any other question? Fabien, go ahead.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay. Can I suggest we very quickly browse the communique and identify where there needs to be input so that maybe --

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Please, do so. Yeah, go ahead.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: -- GAC members can consider that overnight, I suppose until tomorrow morning? Sorry. So Benedetta, do you mind going all the way to the top of the communique so we'll just go very quickly and identify where input is still pending. So let's scroll down to-- slowly. I'm just going to go through.

To GAC working groups. I think we're missing the report of the GAC Public Safety Working Group. So that would be ideal if we could have that text tomorrow to consider. We'll need to consider obviously the reports of the other working group as well. We have that proposed

section on capacity building, which we'll discuss tomorrow as part of GAC internal matters.

There is discussion of the Nominating Committee in GAC operational matters. If we go down to issues of importance. So we have the discussion to close on the HLGGM.

We have concluded on the consensus advice, so we'll clean that up. If we go to RDRS, we'll need to complete the discussion of that text. We only considered the first paragraph, so we'll make that clear. Urgent requests for disclosure registration data, I believe we still have opened the consideration of the India contribution.

On DNS abuse, we've received text, so we'll reflect that in the communique. Alternative name space, I believe we may need to consider that as part of the capacity building section we've added to GAC internal matters.

And I believe that the final item for discussion is in follow-up on previous advice regarding the Helsinki advice on which we're going to be working on sharing information with the GAC on that precise advice and its status to this date. And yeah, I believe that that's helpful.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you so very much for that.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Hope that's helpful?

NICOLAS CABALLERO: It is, it is, by all means. I think we deserve a big round of applause for ourselves. So enjoy the reception, we'll reconvene tomorrow 9:00 AM in the morning. Enjoy.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]