ICANN74 | Policy Forum – GAC Communique Drafting (3 of 6)
Wednesday, June 15, 2022 – 16:30 to 17:30 AMS

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So if you can start taking your seats, please.

GÜLTEN TEPE ÖKSÜZOGLU: Hello, everyone. We will continue with the final Communique drafting session for today before leaving the floor, Manal, I just wanted to remind our on-site participants to raise hands via Zoom. Otherwise it becomes very challenging to manage the queue. Thank you. Over to you, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Gülten, and welcome back everyone, so one last hour and then we will have the community cocktail so we have a good incentive to finish quickly. I think --

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: We're having activity -- okay, we're back. Okay, that's fine, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. So, I think we agreed to start with the part on DNS Abuse let me read this first building upon ICANN72 and ICANN73 discussions on the topic of registrar hopping where registrants involve --

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: (Audio dropped) (Zoom connectivity dropped).

(Zoom connectivity re-established).

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. Thank you, so the paragraph is okay in full, thank you for the confirmation. So much appreciated. I see Alisa and then Kavouss, please. Netherlands, go ahead.

NETHERLANDS: I was wondering to what extent the presentation and the information presented by our colleague from Japan should be or is it's broadened to be presented here in the text as if it counts for many registrars or almost like world-wide, and I'm not sure if that is appropriate, maybe as we have our colleague from Japan here he could give nor information on it not that I want to discuss the whole presentation but just to be accurate on what we're noting here, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Netherlands, and how did we report on the presentation at ICANN73? Did we mention for example it was a presentation shared by Japan or how did we put it and meanwhile let me give the floor to Kavouss. Please, Kavouss.

IRAN: Have you given me the floor?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Please go ahead.

IRAN: Manal, thank you very much. Still doesn't know what you want to say. Still I don't know. Very unclear. Building upon ICANN72 and 73 discussion. Which discussion? On what area? On what subject? And what area? It is not clear and then the topic of registrar hopping, I don't know. Of what is the issue of hopping to discuss here? I am not clear on this.

Maybe our colleague from Japan has some other thing in his mind, but difficult to express it, I am not sure what you are saying here really believe me. I don't know what has to do with this point partners for GAC. This is under the points important for GAC, or what is it? What we, what we are saying? Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Let me try to help out here. So this is under DNS Abuse and our Japanese colleague presented during the session their experience with registrar hopping so... or I mean presentation on the same topic that we received at ICANN73, and 73 so maybe, maybe some clarity that this was a presentation by one member of the GAC would clarify and address your point and maybe the Netherlands as well.   So

any -- Fabien, did we find how was it referenced? Please?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Manal. This is Fabien Betremieux for the record. There were 2 references to the presentations made by Japan around registrar hopping that was in the ICANN72 Communique and in the ICANN73 Communique. In the OING 72 Communique the text under DNS Abuse and issues of importance referred to the issue of registrar hopping a practice in which registrants seek to avoid contract based consequence for the DNS Abuse, etcetera.

So that was a short one sentence that described the practice. In the -- it did not refer to any geographical region or -- it's about the practice. In the ICANN73 Communique we -- the text referred to the ICANN72 discussion and building upon the discussion continued discussing different issues in general terms again without any geographical reference of where these happen. Is that what you wanted to know?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, thank you, Fabien. So, yeah, obviously it's along the same lines we've done at ICANN72 and ICANN73, but I still see colleague's point, and I'm wondering whether we can say building upon presentation by GAC member or I don't have the exact language on top of my head but I'm sorry, I should also look at the queue. Kavouss?

ICANN|74
THE HAGUE

IRAN: Yeah, yeah, still I am not sure the first paragraph. What you are going to say. Some discussion has happened. We want -- we are going to refer to that discussion, and then register hopping and so on and so forth. I don't know what -- ICANN sentence is more relevant. ... ensuring trust information as well as effective and continuous auditing of registrar by ICANN compliance could help prevent abuse. This is the second part that I have. I try to say that this is -- you could -- the remain be part it's difficult to understand. Very difficult to understand.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kavouss, but yeah, if we go to the second part only it may be even more generic, and does not address Netherlands' concern. I note your point. I know it's not yet resolved. I'm going to go through the rest of the queue and then see how far we reach, so U.S. and then Argentina, please. U.S., go ahead.

UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. We would just -- so we appreciate the consolidation of the text by our colleagues from Canada we would just suggest a brief deletion in the last paragraph to delete ensuring trust in information, and the reason is that we believe that the reference to trust might generate some confusion between -- we did receive a data free flow with trust presentation during that session, on the one hand and there's also forthcoming proposed text on accuracy, so just in the interests of avoiding any confusion, that would be the only amendment that we would propose to the revised text. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, U.S. I have Argentina next.

ARGENTINA: Yes, thank you. Just a comment to be consistent with the 7 topics of this just of importance to the GAC that the rest of the topic have one or two paragraph maximum, and this seems to be longer. And just to comment maybe we can link, or just put in there an annex.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Argentina. Yeah, so indeed this part of the issues of importance to the GAC looks more loaded than other sections so and this also relates to previous comments, if we can make the text shorter maybe this would help. I'm trying to look at the pen holders, if you can help us make the text shorter, shorter would be great, but of course not necessarily during this hour. Thank you Argentina.

Anything else on this part? Oh, yeah, we need I'm sure, if we refer to a presentation by GAC member would this resolve your concern Netherlands, and also, Kavouss? I'm giving Netherlands the floor first, thank you.

NETHERLANDS: Thank you, Manal. The thing is I don't know the details of the data presented by our colleague, so it's not the problem that if it would have

been one or 5 GAC members presenting. It's about the substance of what he presented, and I should be aware of it better, but I'm not sure to what extent it can be, yeah it can be broadened in the scope that we are discussing it now, so it's more of a -- a substance question I have towards our colleague.

And I'm just realizing it now we're drafting this text actually, sorry for that.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Netherlands, and I see Brazil's hand up as well. If we try to mention that this is a national experience and not necessarily a trend, is this what you mean, so maybe we can try to find some language to that effect? Brazil please go ahead.

BRAZIL: Just to add that I think that the topic that colleague from Netherlands raised also relates to the text from the previous paragraphs. I think that the discussion is what should be reflected in the Communique? Because I think we had a very rich session on those issues, but most of the debate was centered on presentations.

So again, if I have to refer to previous topics and connect them to presentations made, something different, so of course it's not easy to translate into the text, the wealth of information and discussions that we had and I think a lot of what is there in the previous paragraph is also -- was also contained in the presentations themselves, not

necessarily debated or discussed by GAC itself. So it's not very simple many to manage this, so I think that's why we -- I think other colleagues see merit in having shorter texts just to avoid I mean well what's the source of this? It's not right it's not easy to establish precisely where the information comes from. Just a general comment that I think sits well our collective agreement from the Netherlands said before. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much. So, I see probably we need to work on the drafting of this section maybe make it shorter and this would help on different levels, first of all the wordsmithing would be definitely easier but also being short and concise and maybe be able to address the concerns, so Kavouss, you allow me to park this until tomorrow I think it will be difficult to go through the we'll thing here in session, so maybe we can sleep over it, have some homework and come back tomorrow morning to discuss the text, if okay with colleagues, and, of course, topic leads? Please Fabien, go ahead.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: This is just to note that Australia I believe had some text to pro EPDP on specific pose so I'm not sure if you want to be involved in the effort are reconsidering that text?

AUSTRALIA:	Happy to be involved, I've tried to send you something via e-mail. I'm not sure if it's come through and let me know and I'll try again.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:	It has. I just want to note I have the text and I'm not sure what to do with it whether we just -- whether you want to consider it now or whether that's part of the reconsideration sort of off line.

AUSTRALIA:	I'm happy to work on this off line in the interests of moving forward.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:	Okay. Then I'm noting, so please, if you can arrange together and we can try to have a more concise text, and discuss it tomorrow, I think this would be helpful. So I think with that we're parking this part until tomorrow, and let's go through text that we haven't read before.
	We have under GAC consensus advice to ICANN Board, we have accuracy of gTLD registration data, and the text reads, the GAC advises the Board in recognition of the important work being taken forward by the accuracy scoping group, and with appreciation to the ICANN Board, and the ICANN organization for their support, we believe it is important that the group take forward all aspect of their work in a timely manner, including their proposed survey of the process registrars undertake to determine the accuracy of the registrant data.

This we believe will gain insight into how the current obligations under the registry accreditation agreement WHOIS accuracy program specification are implemented by registrars and learning what data is currently collected by registrars on the accuracy of registration data. This work should not be inhibited or be held up by the recent communication by ICANN with the European Data Protection Board.

Thank you very much for the text. I'm just wondering whether this should go under issues of importance to the GAC or because I don't feel we have a concrete ask here. Do we? I see the U.S. and then then Mark, U.S. please.

UNITED STATES: Actually, I'm happy to let our colleague from Denmark go thirst.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Please, Finn, go ahead.

DENMARK: Thank you. Finn Petersen from Denmark. The context of the message is good but whether it is an advice to the Board. What can the Board do? It's in a group we discuss it and I don't think that the Board actually have a role to play at the moment, so whether this is right place I will have my doubts, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Finn. Yeah, and I fully agree, I don't see a concrete ask to the Board here, so maybe well more fitting under issues of importance to the GAC. U.S. please go ahead.

UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. So we share the view of Denmark on the proposal, and whether it would constitute actionable advice, so we might propose that the accuracy text under issues of importance, which is forthcoming, perhaps we can take a look at this text in conjunction with that text, and consider how to merge the two if needed.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, U.S., and thank you also, Jorge, in the chat, noting that this looks more like a message to the GNSO again, not -- and degreeing to Susan's proposal but I see also Nigel's hand up so please, U.K., go ahead.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes. Thank you, madam chair. I mean, I drafted this in recognition really of our discussion with the Board. I mean, we discussed the work of the scoping group, we recognized the importance of it, and in the discussion we had with the Board this morning, you know the Board came back and they said they thought this work should -- some of the work of the scoping group should not go ahead until we received the advice from the European Data Protection Board.

ICANN|74
THE HAGUE

This is something that we think is not correct. We think it's inappropriate. We want this work to go ahead as I said ... is a litmus test for the credibility of ICANN. I recognize the difficulty it is of drafting advice where we draft advice to the Board, and the work is being undertaken through GNSO channels, but this is something which we've you know confronted before, and if we look back over the GAC advice we've drafted, you know, over the years, we haven't always -- the advice that we've drafted hasn't always been if you like in the purview of the Board.

Sometimes it's been in the purview of the GNSO or elsewhere, and you know we recognize, we recognize this but we think you know it's important that the that, the Board you know recognize our concern that this work should go ahead, we think this survey, the proposed survey is very important. We think the you know, the survey results should be taken on Board and considered by the ICANN Board.

So I think there is something here to be considered, which is relevant to advice. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Nigel. I have European Commission next. Velimira, please, go ahead.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Apologies. Yes, so the first point that I wanted to raise is many thanks to U.K. colleague for having really made the effort of suggesting

something which tries really … the longstanding issue that we have around accuracy. I just wanted to mention that I think we have held a little bit of co-ordinate among all GAC members in the sense that the GAC topic leads on accuracy are drafting proposal and need to go into issues of importance so we are clearing this text now.

I guess it will be with the rest of the colleagues in ten minutes or so. So however for the sake of coordination I'm wondering whether we should not go over it and see whether once the other GAC colleagues if they acknowledge what you're proposing text for the issues of importance section to see whether those two could be combined or what link we could make and then also to see what we could possibly, if at all ask the Board.

I appreciate this is indeed at the level of more the GNSO Council, however that's true that it was never easy to draft an advice, so I would suggest it's okay also for the rest of the topic leads, our U.S. colleagues probably to… to what we are suggesting, and then talk about it tomorrow morning if okay for you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, European Commission, and, yeah, so no problem, I think we can leave the time to colleagues to read it and we can definitely come back to it tomorrow morning, so once the text is ready to be shared, just let us know, and I hope, Nigel, you are okay, yeah, if we can give it a try and see -- it's an important message to the Board maybe, but not advice because I think advice is, we're asking the Board to go implement

ICANN|74
THE HAGUE

something, and if they don't do it triggers the Bylaws, so, and it has to be something that they are responsible for or -- because otherwise the response would be this is something with the GNSO go talk to them.

I'm sorry, so maybe again important message but I think we can convoy through issues of importance to the GAC but let's not preempt the discussion of tomorrow. I leave it to tomorrow, just noting that issues of importance to the GAC receive equally good attention from the Board and we normally discuss it with the Board after the meeting, and it gives an indication of where the GAC discussions are heading, and what could materialize later to an advice if applicable.

So, with that we will wait for the consolidated text under accuracy of gTLD registration data, and then take that discussion from there. Anything else -- yeah, we have -- I'm just trying to go through all the text we have received, and haven't made any reading of GAC elections.

So, 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 nomination period.

The nomination period will close on 5 August, 2022. If needed, a voting process will be conducted from and we will insert the date, until 20th of September, 2022, ending during the ICANN75 general public meeting where the election results will be announced so this is straightforward text on the upcoming elections.

Any comments? If in the, yes, let's go to the reporting from working

ICANN|74
THE HAGUE

groups. And first we have the GAC -- Rob please, I'm sorry, go ahead.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you, Manal. Robert Hoggarth for the record, I just wanted to bring something to your attention, and didn't want to type it behind the scenes but give it as a heads up to the whole GAC. You may recall, Manal, that we've determined that if time is available there may be some discussion tomorrow morning among GAC members or maybe it's tomorrow afternoon, of the high-level governmental meeting planning, I'm not sure if time will permit, if you ultimately get to it but I just wanted to flag that, are as a potential place holder to either as an internal matter on are a potentially an operational matter. It's something that ultimately I think would be helpful to promote in the Communique, but that's for your determination. Just wanted to flag it for you. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Rob, and indeed, we -- we normally hold high-level governmental meeting every other year, the last meeting was in Barcelona 2018. The following one should have taken place in 2020, but of course with the pandemic thing, things slipped, and we are now in 2022. So 4 years without a high-level governmental meeting.

So it's high time that we triggered a discussion and we can speak to the details, but if there is no objection we can put one sentence to the effect that we are triggering this discussion, so if this is okay, we can have the one sentence that that effect and read it tomorrow, and I see some

ICANN|74
THE HAGUE

nodding, so -- many nodding, so thank you everyone, and thank you very much Rob for alerting us, if you can please help with a sentence that we are going to launch the discussion, thank you.

Next is the reporting from the working groups, and we have the text from the GAC Public Safety Working Group and it reads "the GAC Public Safety Working Group continued its work to advance or improved measures to combat abuse and promote effective access to domain name registration data, the PSWG had a session to update the GAC and DNS Abuse that included one, 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 Abuse security facilitation initiative technical study group. Which would support the creation after information sharing platform which the PSWG in other business sectors has contributed to the reduction in harm and the increase in best practices."

2, a follow-up presentation by Japan regarding domain hopping and data free flow with truss, 3 a presentation from the DNS Abuse Institute about a new DNS reporting tool. The PSWG also pointed out that DNS Abuse cannot be measured. Just by a reduction in the number of malicious domains affected, but also needs it take into account the magnitude of the harms to users of the net.

The PSWG continued its active participation to support the GAC small grew through participation in the phase one implementation review team. The SSAD small team discussing ICANN organize's operation design phase and the GNSO accuracy scoping team.

ICANN|74
THE HAGUE

The PSWG emphasized the importance of accurate registration data to better 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 share concerns that a time-line for the prove of consent and proposal for dealing with the recommendations no the considered under a proof of concept would need to be created.

The PSWG continued its outreach to public safety bodies not currently engaged with ICANN. With the support of the European Commission the PSWG gave presentations to 17 member states at Europol detailing the benefits of participating in if the multistakeholder model within ICANN and how it can benefit operational activity.

During ICANN74 the PSWG held discussions with ICANN org including representatives of the office of the chief technology officer, the security stability resiliency team, global domains and strategy and contractual compliance. The security stability and advisory SSAC. The registrar and groups, and At-Large Advisory Committee, ALAC and the commercial stakeholder group CSG.

So any comments and I think this thorough reporting from the PSWG may also help us make the text under DNS Abuse may be a little bit more concise if things are reported under the working groups maybe this would help shorten the text under issues of importance to the GAC.

ICANN|74
THE HAGUE

So if there are no comments or requests for the floor, maybe we can move onto the human rights and --

GÜLTEN TEPE ÖKSÜZOGLU: Manal, before we move on I see... in the Zoom room, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much. Apologies, Netherlands, go ahead.

NETHERLANDS: Just one very small edit in the first paragraph. It says domain name hoping. I know we're hoping for good domain names but we should do hopping.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Alisa, for spotting this. Any other comments? Okay. If not, then we can go to the Human Rights and International Law Working Group. The GAC was briefed by the Human Rights and International Law Working Group co-chair regarding the recent discussions of the Workstream 2 community coordination group on the diversity recommendations stemming from the GAC Workstream 2 prospective proposal document. Regular updates will be provided to GAC members as discussions develop. So any comments? I think this is short and straightforward. Jaideep.

ICANN|74
THE HAGUE

INDIA:

I think between the first and second and third one, we seem to be having a lot of disparity in the reporting that is happening. The first one we discussed was very much detailed. Maybe we can have some more content on this if possible. Otherwise, the first one which you just read through was too much details, and the other two are just two lines each.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

Yeah, I would tend to shorten, not to add text. So again, if there are any proposals to make things more balanced, again, I would not ask the same topic leads again to shorten their text. I have just said the text there could make us shorten the issues of importance to the GAC. But again, the sentence, the shorter and more concise the better. So if by any means, if it's possible it would be welcomed. Otherwise I fully understand the reporting; so many things have taken place. And thank you, Jaideep for flagging.

The third Working Group is the GAC operating principles evolution Working Group. And the text reads: 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. The 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 ICANN 75. Any comments? Okay. Seeing none, any text that we have not read, once?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Sorry, I'm marking what we have read so I will be behind you. I believe we have read all the text that is available right now. There are some edits that we might need to get back onto confirm on subsequent rounds of new gTLDs. There is a dependency on the outcome.

GÜLTEN TEPE ÖKSÜZOGLU: Could you please speak closer to the mic?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: I was saying I believe there is no new text that hasn't been read but there are a number of changes pending or sort of alternative suggestions in subsequent rounds of new gTLDs as well as in the new gTLD auction proceeds text that I'm not sure we have confirmed. Maybe we could go there and clarify that. Then we have the dependency on the outcome of the GNSO Council on EPDP security rights protection for IGOs and I believe we're still waiting on a text on the SSAD Light and accuracy of registration data.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Any heading we are missing, without text.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Accuracy of the registration data and SSAD Light.

ICANN|74
THE HAGUE

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I am in your hands. We can try to go through the edits and finalize text. We can conclude now and have colleagues maybe sit together to resolve any things that need to be drafted collaboratively. We still have like 12 minutes if this would be of benefit to co-drafting. Any preference? Luisa. Sorry, Canada, go ahead.

CANADA: Thank you, Manal. And I hope my mic is okay. Sometimes it doesn't come out very clear, can you hear me well?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, it's very clear now, thank you.

CANADA: Perfect. It's Luisa Paez from Canada. Just in terms of -- we would be very happy, given we have ten minutes, perhaps we can review the text which were minor suggestions under Subsequent Procedures on the auctions, and then tomorrow we could probably reconvene to discuss the text under DNS abuse and accuracy. But again, I will leave it up to you. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Luisa. So a good suggestion. Let's read the subsequent rounds, finalize the text, and then start tomorrow with other parts. So if we can get the text on subsequent rounds as much as possible on the screen? Thank you.

The text reads: The GAC discussed subsequent rounds of new gTLDs and received an update from ICANN org about the current status of the Operational Design Phase relative to policy recommendations on the final report from the Subsequent Procedures for new gTLDs, GNSO policy development process. 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

And we have added here in capacity building in response to Tracy's suggestion: It was proposed that specific capacity-building activities be implemented or organized, time permitting, in the lead-up and during ICANN 75 in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia and at subsequent ICANN meetings. Any comments? Luisa please, go ahead.

CANADA: Thank you, Manal. Apologies again, for making sure my mic is clear.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Loud and clear.

CANADA: Perfect, thank you. Just wanted to provide quick clarification for this addition that was consulted as well with Jorge from Switzerland, the other topic lead on Subsequent Procedures. So we very much welcome

the text on capacity-building activities. We just thought perhaps we shouldn't make them time bound only to the ICANN 75 meeting so we added subsequent ICANN meetings. And again, just in terms of editorial instead of implemented, perhaps it make more sense to say organized and time permitting, recognizing ICANN 75 is coming very quickly so to have inter-sessional workshop could be challenging. But that being said, we can of course strive for that and have.

And as I mentioned in one of my previous interventions, before the pandemic we organized with the help of the ICANN org government engagement team in physical, in-meeting capacity-building workshops a day before ICANN meeting. Perhaps it can be explored with ICANN 75, of course in addition to virtual sessions that ICANN org could provide to GAC members on specific topics of importance related to Subsequent Procedures. But I will leave it there, just wanted to explain some of our edits but very much welcome the capacity-building activities. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Luisa. And yeah, I recognize Nigel's hand but just to note that, frankly, I would be more in favor of making the time frame less specific, because I feel that we write specific time frame and then say time permitting. So maybe we should just iterate our intent without being less specific. But anyway, sorry, Nigel, to keep you waiting.

ICANN|74
THE HAGUE

UNITED KINGDOM:	Thank you, Manal, not at all. You are very wise, as they say. I just wanted to flag really to support what Luisa said, whether it's in the context of the subsequent process or whether in the context of other specific issues that the GAC is engaged on. And I was going to raise this tomorrow in our wrap-up session, I think we should ask ICANN org and the engagement team or the global stakeholder engagement team to perhaps, if it were at all possible, to facilitate a workshop as they have done before in a most successful way at ICANN meetings at Kuala Lumpur, if possible but as you say, if not, at a future ICANN meeting.
	But I know that -- well, I know more GAC members found this incredibly useful to have a sort of session of half a day or three quarters of a day on capacity building, on a range of ICANN issues. Thank you.
MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:	Thank you very much, Nigel. And I think it's definitely time for one. We are back with the face-to-face aspect of the meetings, so good to have also our capacity-building activities reconvene, especially with the large number of GAC new representatives.
	So any objections to deleting implemented and leave organized, as suggested by Canada? I see none, but I see Kavouss' hand up. Please, Kavouss,
IRAN:	In fact I wanted to do the same thing because we cannot implement; we organize. So organize was a proper word. So delete implement,

organize, and time permitting? What do we mean? You put a condition if time permits? I think an important issue and we should not associate with time permitting; we should try to do it as soon as possible, because still there are a lot of I would say misunderstandings or lack of understanding or lack of awareness among members about these very important steps. So we should not put time permitting, we should find a good time. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Kavouss. I have a proposal maybe to delete time permitting but also delete at ICANN 75 in Kuala Lumpur and maybe leave it at it was proposed that capacity building -- it was proposed that specific capacity-building activities be organized in the lead-up to and during subsequent ICANN meetings, if this makes sense, and happy to have Tracy also here to confirm whether this language would be okay.

Because we mentioned ICANN 75 and then we felt we might not be able to, we haven't checked with the government engagement team, so we inserted time permitting. And we're trying just to simplify things and keep it a bit flexible.

TRACY HACKSHAW: That's fine.

ICANN|74
THE HAGUE

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. Any other comments? Okay. Then I think we're fine with the text under rounds of new gTLDs. I think we can accept all changes, and I'm giving you back one minute. So thank you very much, and I appreciate it was a long day and now time for the community networking hour. Please enjoy. Benedetta? Oh, Brian, sorry.

BRIAN BECKHAM: Not at all. Brian Beckham. I hope this allows us to leave on a good note. I know we're not there but I was anticipating the next section just to report that we could take out the TBC. I'm happy to report that I came earlier from the council meeting where there was a unanimous positive vote in support of adopting the recommendations of the final report of the IGO curative Working Group. So I take out the TBC, that is done, and a very good result to report back on that. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you for helping. More progress sharing, positive news. And I see Nigel celebrating. So on this positive note, thank you very much everyone. Enjoy the rest of your day, and see you tomorrow at 900 local time, 700 UTC. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: And for the PSWG participants in the meeting with the contracting parties, I was just informed that we're changing rooms and we will stay here. So if you would like to attend the bilateral meeting between the PSWG -- contracted parties house, the registries and registrars, you will

ICANN|74
THE HAGUE

have to meet here.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN|74
THE HAGUE